

END OF PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

End of Project Evaluation, Empower women and youth for a free,
fair, transparent and violence-free Referendum

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

Lawrence Robertson
Independent Evaluator

4 August 2020

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of UNFPA or the implementing UN Agencies.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in Papua New Guinea (PNG) commissioned an independent End of Project Evaluation of the “Empower women and youth for a free, fair, transparent and violence-free Referendum” Project. The project was funded by the United Nations (UN) Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) through the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI), and came to be referred to as GYPI in Bougainville. UNFPA and two other Recipient UN Organisations (RUNOs), UN Women and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), implemented the project in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville (ARoB) from May 2018 through 31 December 2019. The evaluation is designed not only help to better understand how the PBF-funded project was implemented towards reaching its objectives and its impact, but also help inform future potential PBF contributions to peacebuilding in PNG and other countries.

Background and Context

The UN has been a key international partner in peacebuilding in Bougainville and has had an important, active role in supporting the implementation of the Bougainville Peace Agreement (BPA) as well as development and governance, including in Referendums and public awareness. With the Referendum approaching, UNFPA, UN Women, and OHCHR developed the GYPI project to support the participation of women, youth, and people living with disabilities (PLWD) as part of supporting the Referendum. The \$2 million PBF project was signed in December 2017; UN Women (the lead agency), UNFPA and OHCHR were to implement the project.

As the date for the referendum was extended, the Project requested and received a no-cost extension from the PBF, making the project 2 years in length to end 31 December 2019. To support finalisation, the project asked for and received a one-month exceptional extension to complete financial and narrative reporting on the project.

Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The evaluation objectives include assessing the project relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, contributions towards impact and sustainability, and gender equality and human rights responsiveness, as well as identifying best practices and providing recommendations that may be used for future programming.

Evaluation Approach and Methods

The evaluation was conducted by an independent evaluator contracted by UNFPA. The evaluation’s data collection methods included review of documents on the project, Bougainville and United Nations’ engagement in peacebuilding and then conduct interviews with the project team, UNFPA, UN Women, OHCHR, and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) as well as with implementing partners (IPs), stakeholders, plus key beneficiaries. The evaluation process ensured the independence of the evaluator, a focus on evaluating the most important project activities vis-a-vis reaching project objectives, purposive sampling of the most relevant and knowledgeable partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders for interviews,

triangulation of data, and comparison of findings. The COVID-19 pandemic affected the evaluation's plans. When PNG prohibited travel to the country, the evaluation switched to remote methods for interviews. Fieldwork was conducted in Bougainville by a national consultant hired to work with the evaluator, who mobilised interviewees when in person work became possible in the AROB by Bougainvilleans in late May 2020, including travelling to Central and South Bougainville. Interviews were conducted through Skype and Messenger with the international consultant when internet connections were not adequate; the consultant in Bougainville asked the interview questions and wrote down the answers to the questions from interviewees when connections were inadequate. A total of 60 people, 48 from partner ABG institutions or CSOs in Bougainville (26 female) and 12 UN staff (four female) were interviewed for the fieldwork.

Data Analysis

The evaluator has compared findings and triangulated data gathered through document review and interviews from across categories of informants. The comparison and triangulation of findings has been used to validate findings, reach conclusions, find lessons learned and make recommendations. A day-long workshop with a remote presentation on the evaluation report was held in July 2020 with partners and stakeholders to discuss the evaluation and validate findings.

Findings and Conclusions

Relevance

GYPI was seen as relevant and doing the right things in Bougainville in the run up to the 23 November to 7 December 2019 referendum on the future status of Bougainville to expand the peaceful participation of women, youth, and PLWD. A successful referendum was the priority of the ABG; the referendum was central to peacebuilding as the second pillar of the BPA that ended the fighting almost 20 years ago. The design of GYPI was seen as appropriate, although ambitious (and perhaps over ambitious).

Coherence

GYPI was seen as compatible with other interventions, particularly UN interventions and ABG goals, in Bougainville. The objectives of the project remained valid throughout implementation, which had longer time through a no-cost extension that followed the postponement of the referendum.

Effectiveness

The GYPI was seen as an effective project that had results and met its objectives, although UN Women's activities were revised after a slow start. The project was seen as troubled at first, with UN Women challenged in hiring the project coordinator and limited in implementing its activities under its first manager. The replacement of the UN Women project coordinator and revision of activities produced implementable UN Women activities, albeit one not as ambitious in its reach to local levels, and better coordination across RUNOs in Bougainville. A number of programme management factors challenged GYPI implementation. Bougainville is a difficult, expensive environment for programme implementation. The ways UN Women coordinated the project and implemented their activities made a tremendous difference; the first project coordinator was not able to implement effectively; project implementation picked up with a replacement as project coordinator, as the referendum approached, and with a revision to UN Women's activities. Internal

GYPI coordination was poor under the first project coordinator, but improved under the second one – as did engagement with other UN projects. Working with the limited capacity of ABG and CSO partners also proved challenging.

Efficiency

RUNOs used and delivered GYPI's revised work plan, which particularly adjusted UN Women's activities. Financial expenditures were said to be in line with this plan in interviews. Qualitative monitoring data was collected, including through joint missions; these missions were seen as useful for programme management. The evaluation lacks the comparative data needed to make a rigorous assessment of value for money (vfm). However, UN staff, ABG partners, CSO partners, and beneficiaries were able to identify areas and ways that GYPI had been attentive to the economic use of resources in delivery, such as holding workshops at the regional level rather than in Buka. The environment in Bougainville is not conducive to scaling up, as there are few alternative sources of funding and a dearth of capable IPs to scale up GYPI activities. Potential savings that could have been made without compromising delivery were identified; Delivery would have been strengthened by RUNOS, particularly UN Women as the lead and as the Agency that faced the most challenges in implementing activities, hiring strong staff earlier, investing more resources in management and coordination, and more extensive training for staff at the start of GYPI.

Impact

While no detailed, disaggregated data was collected by the BRC, the main impact of the project was recognized to be the high participation of previously marginalized communities in the referendum. This participation was seen as important in the central political event in Bougainville in years, following through on the second pillar of the Bougainville Peace Agreement through a referendum. GYPI was seen as having made a difference in Bougainville by encouraging the turnout of informed women, youth, and PLWD for the referendum and the unity that was expressed in the referendum about Bougainville's future. One of the main impacts attributed to the project, the placement of two women on the post-referendum Task Force, was a result of UN Women's support to the Women, Peace and Security Technical Group; as well as advocacy with key ABG partners and leaders by UN Women and the Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA) Peacebuilding Coordinator.

.

Sustainability

Projects of short duration (GYPI was designed as an 18-month project) have limited likelihoods of sustainability. Some lasting benefits of GYPI were identified, although the capacity-building for ABG institutions through GYPI was limited by the design of the project and the focus on a key event, the referendum. CSOs too gained more capacity, some of which was seen as sustainable. Another way lasting benefits of GYPI were perceived was through the contributions of the project to the high turn-out, peaceful conduct, and overwhelming support for independence in the referendum by women, youth, and PLWD. ABG institutions and GYPI's CSO partners have some capacity to continue project activities after closure – based on the capacity of their organisations and staff, but this is limited by capacity challenges and a lack of funding. Key factors positively affecting sustainability are that UN Women, UNFPA, and OHCHR designed GYPI to build on existing partnerships with the ABG and CSO partners and the ways many

activities were implemented in partnerships where key technical roles were played by consultants or RUNO staff (particularly on human rights); negative influences on sustainability are limited financing and that the capacity of GYPI partners remains limited. GYPI was seen as difficult to scale up or replicate, with the limited finances and capacity available in Bougainville. Unanimous sentiment was found for a continuation of project approaches as the way to make the project more sustainable; an extension or a new project was sought. The UN was seen as central to the future for Bougainville, particularly through project support.

Other Project Qualities

GYPI was seen as influential and UN Women GYPI staff important in unlocking future funding for gender equality through Australia in Bougainville. GYPI explicitly addressed risk in its processes and products, and managed to address and avoid some of these risks in implementation. Other risks due to limited capacity – both for counterparts and for UN agencies – were realized. GYPI was seen as timely because was developed, implemented, and revised to take advantage of an important peacebuilding windows of opportunity: the Referendum.

Gender Equality and Human Rights

The GYPI Project was designed with a focus on gender equality and human rights by focusing on expanding the peaceful participation of women as well as the youth and PLWD in the referendum. Attention to gender equality and human rights were seen as positives by UN staff, key ABG partners, and beneficiaries. The establishment of the parliamentary committee on gender and human rights is also seen as the project's contribution to institutionalise human rights protection.

Lessons Learned

Sustained UN engagement and partnerships through successive mechanisms and projects builds relationships with key partners in Bougainville that can effectively support shared goals through PBF funding.

UN Agencies and their partners in Bougainville have processes, products, and relationships that can effectively reach women, youth and PLWD to support awareness, engagement, and participation in community and ARoB affairs.

Long-lead times are important for successful project implementation and results in Bougainville.

The limited number of key partners in Bougainville can be overburdened by UN and other development partner priorities and partnerships to the detriment of project implementation.

UN agency-developed products are valued by government partners, but partners may not be able to continue these approaches and develop follow-on products in current conditions in Bougainville.

Management takes resources; RUNOs should budget for staff to manage projects in their proposals for PBF funding and elaborate processes and procedures to manage joint projects in joint fashion.

UN agencies appreciate the support of the PBF for peacebuilding and joint programming.

Limited coordination amongst UN agencies and implementing partners was challenging and may have limited potential results.

Recommendations

UN agencies and the PBF should continue to support peacebuilding work in Bougainville particularly engagement between the ABG and GoPNG on the steps that follow the referendum's endorsement of independence by Bougainvilleans.

Lessons and experience from the GYPI project should be used to raise awareness on the importance of inclusive participation of women, youth and PLWD in post-referendum discussions and the 2020 ABG elections.

UN agencies and the PBF should continue to focus on supporting sustainable capacity development of ABG departments, the BHOR, and CSOs in Bougainville.

The PBF should consider developing funding instruments with longer time frames – or making it clear that sequential awards are envisioned - as peacebuilding problems and opportunities in Bougainville are not of short duration.

RUNOs should develop ways to strengthen activity implementation in Bougainville by systematically planning realistic activities in a comprehensive way with all stakeholders and then ensuring that all partners carry out their roles effectively.

RUNOs should develop management structures to strengthen joint programming and the overall integration and implementation of joint programming.

The PBF should continue to fund joint projects and should consider providing additional support for UN Country Teams to support the joint development, management, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting of projects that have more than one RUNO. This support is even more valuable when project implementation is distant from the UNCT as in Bougainville.

To enhance the independence and robust financing of evaluations, PBSO should consider funding evaluation of PBF-funded projects through PBSO rather than through RUNOs that manage PBF-funded projects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	viii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT.....	1
3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES	4
4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS.....	5
5. DATA ANALYSIS.....	7
6. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	8
7. LESSONS LEARNED.....	30
8. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	32
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	36
ANNEX 2: LIST OF DOCUMENTS	47
ANNEX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWS	49
ANNEX 4: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS.....	51
Document Review Guide	
Semi-structured interview guide and questions	
Introduction and Informed Consent	
Questions for RUNOs and Other UN Informants	
Questions for Key Partners and Stakeholders	
Questions for Partners, Beneficiaries, and Stakeholders in Person	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluator would like to thank all of the project's UN agency, government and civil society implementers, partners and beneficiaries for their work supporting the peaceful participation of women, youth and the disabled in the Referendum and peacebuilding and the open, frank, clear ways that they shared their experiences for the evaluation even without in-person fieldwork from the evaluator.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ABG	Autonomous Bougainville Government
ARoB	Autonomous Region of Bougainville
BDPO	Bougainville Disabled People's Organisation
BHOR	Bougainville House of Representatives
BPA	Bougainville Peace Agreement
BRC	Bougainville Referendum Commission
BRSP	Bougainville Referendum Support Project
BWF	Bougainville Women's Federation
BYF	Bougainville Youth Federation
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DCD	Department of Community Development
DCG	Department of Community Government and District Affairs
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
DPAI	Department for Peace Agreement Implementation
DPPA	United Nations Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs
DYA	District Youth Association
HR	human rights
IP	Implementing Partner
IRF	Immediate Response Fund
JSB	Joint Supervisory Body
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NRI	National Research Institute
OHCHR	United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
PBF	Peacebuilding Fund
PBSO	Peacebuilding Support Office
RUNO	Recipient United Nations Organisation
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UN Women	United Nations Women
UYA	Urban Youth Association

1. INTRODUCTION

The United Nations (UN) Population Fund (UNFPA) in Papua New Guinea (PNG) has commissioned an independent evaluation of the *Empower women and youth for a free, fair, transparent and violence-free Referendum Project*, known as the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative or GYPI project in Bougainville. GYPI, a joint UN Women, UNFPA, and Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) project funded by the UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), targeted critical peacebuilding gaps with respect to disenfranchised groups in Bougainville in Papua New Guinea (PNG) – mainly women, youth, and persons with disabilities – to ensure their informed participation and contribution to a free, fair, transparent, and violence-free 2019 Referendum. The \$2 million joint project was implemented by the three Recipient UN Organisations (RUNOs), with UN Women as the lead agency. GYPI was implemented in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville (ARoB) from 19 December 2017 through 31 December 2019.

In accordance with UNDP monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures as well as section 7.1 of the PBF's guidelines, every project is required to undertake an evaluation upon the completion of implementation. The evaluation is an opportunity to assess the PBF-funded project's achievements in an inclusive way and examine its overall added value to peacebuilding in Bougainville. The evaluation assesses the overall progress of the project against its intended goals and objectives utilizing Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria. The evaluation is designed not only help to better understand how the PBF-funded project has made progress towards its intended results, but also help inform future potential PBF contributions to Bougainville and other countries.

The Evaluation Report consists of eight sections. First this introduction explains why the evaluation is being conducted and outlines the report. Second, background and context briefly describes the environment for the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative: PBF/IRF-204: Empower women and youth for a free, fair, transparent and violence-free Referendum and outlines the project, including its outcomes and outputs from the Project Document, and how it has evolved over implementation. Third, the report details the evaluation scope and objectives, explaining the purposes of the evaluation, including the questions to be answered. The fourth section explains the evaluation approach and methods. Fifth a brief section is provided on data analysis. Sixth, the report provides the findings and conclusions of the evaluation, organized by categories of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and gender equality and human rights. The penultimate section covers lessons learned. Finally, the report concludes with recommendations. The body of the report is followed by five annexes: The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the international consultant for the evaluation, the list of documents used, a list of interviews conducted, and the data collection instruments used in the course of the evaluation.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The foundational document for the “Empower women and youth for a free, fair, transparent and violence-free Referendum Project” is the Project Document (ProDoc). The ProDoc followed Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) procedures and used PBF templates to explain the peacebuilding context and rationale for PBF support, the objectives of PBF support and proposed implementation, and how the project would be managed and coordinated, including a project results framework.

Per PBF requirements and guidelines, the ProDoc developed a short-duration two-tranche project with a budget of \$2 million from the Peacebuilding Fund for an 18-month joint project to be implemented

by RUNOs UNFPA, UN Women, and OHCHR. The ProDoc was signed in mid-September 2017 by UN Women, the Autonomous Bougainville Government (ABG) and Government of PNG (GoPNG), UNFPA, OHCHR, and the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) so the proposal could be considered for PBSO funding in the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative competition. After PBF selected the proposal for funding, PBSO signed the ProDoc 2 December 2017. The proposed start date in the proposal was 30 November 2017 with a proposed end date of 31 May 2019.

Based on the approval of PBSO, and clear in the revised ProDoc, the formal start date of the project was 17 December 2017, substantially before the referendum was expected to be held (in June 2019).

At the point in which the ProDoc was approved, the language used by the GoPNG and ABG was on the “target date” for the referendum. The “target date” was set for 15 June 2019 in May 2016 by the Joint Supervisory Body (JSB), the joint GoPNG and ABG body that manages BPA implementation. The process of setting the final date was slow, with decisions made late – behaviours which continued to make the implementation of the referendum more challenging. In a decision that came 1 March 2019 (just three and a half months before the expected referendum), the JSB finally set the actual date for the referendum for 17 October 2019, slightly later than had been expected. After the referendum was delayed, the ProDoc was revised and a no cost extension was granted to extend the period of implementation for 6 months, until 31 December 2019. This revision brought project implementation through to cover the period of the actual referendum. The revised ProDoc was signed 21 June 2019, making the project 24 months long in total.

The BRC was consistently challenged in its preparations for the referendum by funding difficulties, with limited resources provided by the funding-challenged GoPNG.¹ The BRC then requested that the JSB further delay the referendum, as well as make the vote a two-week long process, to ensure the credibility of the voter roll for the referendum and create conditions under which more people could vote. The JSB on 3 August 2019 delayed the referendum for a second time and made the referendum vote over a two-week period, from 23 November to 7 December 2019. Both governments committed to these dates at the JSB and asserted this delay would be the last one.

The GYPI project had two outcomes, each with two outputs:

Outcome 1: ABG institutions are increasingly accountable to women and youth for a free and fair Referendum

Output 1.1: Responsible institutions have strengthened accountability to the rights of women, youth and persons with disabilities in the Referendum process

Output 1.2: Responsible institutions have enhanced capacity to enable women and youth to effectively engage in the Referendum process

Outcome 2: Women and youth effectively participate in delivering a violence-free Referendum in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville

Output 2.1: Strengthened capacity of women and youth to foster unity and reduce triggers of conflict for a violence-free Referendum

¹ For its own accountability reasons, PBSO did not want to use the basket fund mechanism to contribute to the women, youth or PLWD activities of the UNDP Bougainville Referendum Support Project (BRSP) as a way to support peaceful inclusive participation. Instead PBSO use the competition for GYPI funding to support the joint proposal from UN Women, UNFPA, and OHCHR to address these needs.

Output 2.2: Increased opportunities and incentives for women and youth to support social cohesion and peacebuilding efforts in the Referendum process

The Project Document provided substantial information on the context as part of explaining the importance of empowering women and youth for the Bougainville referendum.

The peacebuilding context section of the ProDoc noted the history of conflict in Bougainville, which suffered from a decade-long armed conflict from 1988 to 1998 that ended with the signing of the Bougainville Peace Agreement (BPA) in 2001. The ProDoc succinctly reviewed Bougainville's history and its implications, including the causes of the conflict. The region had a different pre-colonial and colonial history from much of PNG and was remote and underdeveloped – except for the exploitation of the rich gold and copper deposits in the Panguna area; disputes about the destruction of land in the area by mining and the distribution of opportunities and revenues from the mine in Bougainville and between Bougainville and PNG sparked the conflict, which spread from the Panguna area to the whole archipelago. The BPA had a referendum as one of its three pillars, along with autonomy and modalities for disarmament and weapons disposal. The context section explained the importance of the referendum and the challenges to maintaining national peace and security that remained in Bougainville despite the progress made since the end of the civil war.

The context section also explained the importance of reaching women, youth, and PLWD (people living with disabilities). Women and children were among the most affected during the hostilities and by the long-term legacy of the conflict that restricted rights, including through pervasive sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV). This legacy and continued SGBV has continued to significantly restrict the freedom of movement, access to education, political participation and freedom of expression of women and youth across Bougainville. Women and youth are approximately 67% of the population of the Autonomous Region of Bougainville (AROB), estimated to be 300,000 people. The ProDoc estimated women were 49% of the population and young people between 15 and 24 years old 18.8% of the population.

The ProDoc assessed the current peacebuilding strategies being used in Bougainville and gaps in these strategies. Systematic engagement and support for women and youth, including women and youth with disabilities, for the implementation of the BPA – particularly for the impending referendum. The ProDoc reviewed past interventions and noted current PBF and other interventions that supported peacebuilding, including where these engagements had had successes with women and youth that could be replicated and scaled up. The project was noted as complementing other projects - including the UNDP project supporting the BRC to implement the referendum, other PBF projects, and the 2014-2017 PBF Peacebuilding Priority Plan.

The rationale for the GYPI project was that under prevailing conditions in Bougainville, more support was needed to support the inclusive participation of women and youth as well as people with disabilities in the referendum. The ProDoc explained how UN Women, UNFPA, and OHCHR support would work in coordination and collaboration with other PBF-funded projects to contribute to increasing the inclusive participation of women and youth as well as people with disabilities in the referendum, how this should ensure social cohesion through their active involvement and ownership in the referendum process, and how this would contribute to peacebuilding and the leadership of women and youth in the referendum and post-referendum periods. Prevailing circumstances in Bougainville more than a decade after the signing of the BPA have been characterized as “negative peace.” While there has been an absence of large-scale violence, the structural social, political, and economic issues that affect the population across the region leave Bougainville volatile, with high levels of SGBV that particularly limit the rights of women and youth, and at risk of broader violence.

Support from the GYPI project through UN Women, UNFPA, and OHCHR was delivered to a wide range of ABG government and CSO partners in Bougainville, including: the ABG Department of Peace Agreement Implementation (DPAI), ABG Department for Community Development (DGDO, Department of the President and the Bougainville Executive Council (Office for Gender Equality), ABG Department for Community Government and District Affairs (DCG), Bougainville House of Representatives (BHOR), ABG Department of Police, Correctional Services and Justice, Bougainville Women's Federation (BWF), Bougainville Youth Federation (BYF), and the Nazareth Centre for Rehabilitation (NCFR).

The referendum was successfully held between 23 November and 7 December 2019 as planned. The BRC implemented referendum had 87.59% of 206,731 registered voters turn out, and 98.31% voted for independence rather than the option of greater autonomy. High turnout and consensus were seen as successes in the participation of the population, particularly women and youth, and supporting social cohesion in Bougainville. While the BRC did not collect gender disaggregated data or information on the age of people who turned out for the referendum, the BRC nevertheless reported that equal numbers of women and men turned out and that 25 percent of them were first time voters when reporting the results of the referendum 10 December 2019. The BRC submitted its final report to the GoPNG 4 June 2020, this text does not yet appear to be in the public domain.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

According to the ToR for the international evaluator (attached as Annex 1), the purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative in Bougainville in order to determine how the impact aligned with the project outcomes. The evaluation will examine who benefited, how resources were utilised and how partnerships contributed to the project. The findings from the evaluation will be used by UN Women, UNFPA and OHCHR to inform future programme planning and implementation.

This entails telling the story of the project with evidence gathered and analysed from project materials and staff, project partners, and beneficiaries and stakeholders about what GYPI has been able to achieve, what if anything GYPI planned to do but was not able to accomplish, how beneficiaries have been impacted by project interventions, and lessons learned for similar future interventions in Bougainville, PNG, or elsewhere.

The project evaluation will address the eight specific evaluation objectives in the ToR:

- i. Assess the relevance of each RUNO's contribution and of the project as a whole to the post-conflict priorities in Bougainville relating to the referendum, including alignment with international agreements and conventions on GEWE and youth participation in peacebuilding.
- ii. Assess effectiveness of project support for organizational development in progressing towards the achievement of GEWE and youth empowerment results as defined in the intervention.
- iii. Assess efficiency of project support for organizational development in progressing towards the achievement of GEWE and youth empowerment results as defined in the intervention.
- iv. Assess the sustainability of the intervention in achieving sustained GEWE and youth empowerment.
- v. Determine the impact of the intervention with respect to GEWE and youth empowerment.
- vi. Analyse how human rights approach and gender equality principles are integrated in implementation.
- vii. Identify and validate lessons learned, good practices, examples, and innovations of efforts that support gender equality, human rights and youth empowerment.

- viii. Provide actionable recommendations for UN Women, UNFPA and OHCHR with respect to each agency's work in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville.

4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS

The evaluation was conducted by an experienced independent evaluator from March to early June 2020 with the support of a national consultant in Bougainville. With COVID-19 making travel impossible, the national consultant set up and facilitated interviews by Skype for the international consultant as well as carry out interviews directly in areas with limited internet connectivity and where Tok Pisin was preferred.

Per the ToR, the evaluator has collected and analysed data and make conclusions and recommendations aimed at consolidating the achievements of the project as well as draw general lessons from the project that may be useful for the participating UN agencies and their implementing partners for future programs in these areas.

The evaluation was conducted through transparent and participatory processes with UNFPA, and project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries in accordance with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations in the UN System, PBF evaluation procedures, and UNFPA evaluation guidelines.

The evaluation developed methodological approaches of reviewing documents and conducting interviews, to collect valid and independent data to use to evaluate and tell the story of the project. The evaluator collected and analysed documents on the project, Bougainville, and the UN's engagement in PNG. COVID-19 pandemic prohibited travel for in-person interviews. The evaluator thus worked with the national consultant to arrange Skype interviews when feasible; the national consultant carried out in person interviews using the protocol and questionnaire when Skype was not feasible.

Interviews were conducted with staff and former staff of the project, UNFPA, other UN agencies, GoPNG and ABG institutions, CSO IPs, and other partners and stakeholders as well as with beneficiaries in North, Central, and South Bougainville. The evaluation design is based on the independence of the evaluator, a focus on evaluating the most important activities towards reaching GYPI objectives, purposive sampling of the most relevant and knowledgeable partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders for interviews, triangulation of data, and comparison of findings.

The evaluation has been independent of UNFPA, UN Women, and OHCHR. However, the evaluator has collaborated with all three RUNOs to identify the most relevant informants for interviews and worked extensively with a national consultant that earlier worked with UNFPA on GYPI to reach them, as well as to mobilise them for interviews. To enhance independence, all remote interviews were held without the presence of the national consultant.

Focus has ensured that the evaluation emphasized the three outcomes of the GYPI and collecting data to analyse to answer all of the evaluation questions about the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project as well as on cross cutting issues of human rights and gender equality.

Purposive sampling has been used to select individuals for interviews; selection has focused on the people who are the most well-informed about the GYPI in RUNOs and implementing partner organisations, and among beneficiaries and stakeholders. This has ensured that interviews have provided useful information

about the activities, achievements, and lessons of the GYPI project relevant to the purposes of the evaluation.

Triangulation has been used both through the triangulation of data gathered through different methods as well as comparison of information from different types of informants. Triangulation adds confidence to the validity and reliability of the data, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

The purposes of the evaluation and objectives of the project plus data from the project were used to develop a Draft Inception Report for review and discussion, revision, and UNFPA approval. The Inception Report developed an evaluation matrix and evaluation questions to be used to collect data in the fieldwork. These evaluation questions were used to gather data through document review and interviews.

Systematic document analysis was used to learn about project design, activities, outputs, outcomes, and lessons learned and recommendations that flowed from this work. The data from documents has been compared with data from interviews in the analysis. Documents reviewed include the ProDoc, work plans, annual reports, baseline and monitoring reports and lessons learned, and other materials produced by the project. Documents used in the evaluation are included as Annex 2: List of Documents.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with staff from the PBSO, UNFPA, UN Women, and OHCHR as well as with key project partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders (see Annex 3). The interview protocol and semi-structured interview questions were used to gather qualitative information in-person in Bougainville or over WhatsApp and Skype for key informants outside the country (see Annex 4). A total of 48 partners and beneficiaries were reached through interviews, of which 26 were female. In addition, 10 UN staff were interviewed (three female).

Interviews were conducted in Bougainville in late May and early June 2020. Two weeks were used for most interviews with partners and beneficiaries. The national consultant travelled to Central and South Bougainville to set up and conduct interviews, in consultation with OHCHR staff. Interviewees that came in to the Arawa UN office were interviewed by the international consultant over Skype; other interviewees were interviewed by the national consultant. The first week of June was used for interviews with ABG staff and beneficiaries in North Bougainville via Skype from the UN office. Interviews were conducted in English via Skype and either English or pidgin in Bougainville. Interviews were used to gather qualitative information from key individuals directly relevant to the purposes of the evaluation. Not all informants were asked all questions, as there were too many questions for an hour to one-and-a-half-hour interview. The introduction was used to explicitly ensure informed consent from all interviewees. All interviewees were assured of anonymity and non-attribution. Any quotations that are included in the report to highlight particular issues thus do not include names or any other detailed descriptive information that could plausibly be used to infer the source of the remarks. Interviews focused on how the project team and RUNOs as well as partners and stakeholders viewed the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and influence on gender equality and human rights of the project and verifying and triangulating data on programme results. Data from project staff, documentation and partner/stakeholder interviews were used to examine relevance and appropriateness, the programme model, its implementation, and sustainability.

The methodologies for the evaluation have some limitations that are common in evaluations, as are the conventional measures that have been used by the evaluator to manage these risks to evaluation processes and the validity and reliability of data collection, analysis, and causal inferences.

Limited Resources: Limited time to conduct the evaluation constrain the distribution and number of interviews in the fieldwork. However, in conjunction with document review,

there was sufficient resources and time to gather adequate data to address the purposes of the evaluation.

Limited Ability to Make Causal Inferences: Major external events have influenced the course of the project's implementation and observed outcomes in peaceful youth participation in the Referendums, which were also influenced by activities of other actors (including other UN and donor-funded projects). The inability to include and/or rule out competing explanation for external influences limits making causal claims about the project's influence on youth participation, as other factors also clearly matter. The evaluation thus examines the contributions of the project to observed outcomes.

Limited Information known by partners and beneficiaries: Many GYPI partners and beneficiaries did not have much information about the project, particularly information relevant to addressing questions about effectiveness and efficiency. The limited engagement of many of these partners and beneficiaries with the project also limited how much and how much detail they could provide about relevance, coherence, impact, other project qualities, and sustainability.

Recall Bias: Respondents did focus on more recent events in interviews and focus groups; the evaluation team asked respondents specifically about earlier activities to gather more information on GYPI engagement in 2018.

Acquiescence Bias: Interviewees may have been tempted to tell the evaluator favourable information. Discussion and questions have asked explicitly about challenges to seek more critical reflection and information in interviews.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis has been done through comparison and the triangulation of data gathered through these different methodologies, from different documents, and from different categories of informants. Findings reported are from numerous documents and interviews. The comparison and triangulation of findings have been done to validate findings, identify lessons learned, and then reach conclusions and recommendations. The referendum demonstrated that the people across Bougainville were united; the evaluation found some of this accord as well, as few differences emerged from different kinds of informants across Bougainville.

The analysed data from document review and interviews has provided findings. The evaluator has triangulated these findings to draw conclusions, identify lessons learned, and make recommendations. UNFPA will manage the review and comment process for RUNOs and IPs on the Draft Evaluation Report to verify the accuracy of the analysis and the utility of lessons learned and recommendations. The analysis is a synthesis of the data drawn from documents, interviews, and focus groups. After the receipt of comments, the evaluator will finalise the report to address all comments and concerns in the final Evaluation Report.

The End of Project Evaluation Report has been structured to identify findings and reach conclusions, as well as identify lessons learned and make recommendations for UNDP using OECD-DAC categories that summarize key questions asked in the evaluation (Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability, Other Project Qualities, Gender Equality and Human Rights). The analysis examines both outcomes and relevant outputs as they are tightly linked together conceptually and since the implementation of the project distributed the activities towards outputs and these two outcomes across multiple partners.

6. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Relevance

Relevance is defined in the revised OECD DAC guidance as “The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.”²

Doing the right things

The referendum was the top priority of the ABG and important to the people of Bougainville as the second pillar of the BPA. Support from the UN for the referendum thus helped with the main priority in peacebuilding in Bougainville. And work towards the referendum also re-invigorated activism of the UN, ABG, and communities on good governance as part of autonomy and for disarmament and weapons disposal, the other two parts of the BPA, as part of referendum readiness. The GoPNG supported the BRC holding of the referendum and UNDP ran a dedicated project to support the BRC as well as a programme to support peacebuilding. GYPI was seen as important and doing the right things in Bougainville because of the importance of women, youth, and PLWD to get large-scale participation in the referendum, the limited outreach to these groups in the past on BPA implementation in general and for the referendum in particular, and the difficult challenges of reaching these groups across Bougainville.

Interviews with UN staff, ABG staff, CSO leaders, and GYPI beneficiaries all asserted that GYPI was doing the right things to support the referendum and the peaceful participation of women, youth, and PLWD.

DPAI in particular noted that women, youth, and PLWD were not adequately included in the plans of the ABG and GoPNG for the referendum. “Then when projects were developed to support the peacebuilding plan and referendum work plan of the ABG and GoPNG, women, youth and PLWD were correspondingly not adequately incorporated.” BPF support through GYPI addressed these lacunae and complemented the other two ongoing UN projects in Bougainville, the “Peacebuilding Fund II (PBF II) and the BRC projects.

One CSO leader summarized this sentiment broadly: “GYPI did the right things to ensure that everybody was involved.” Women’s group leaders stated the project was correct to target women. Youth leaders interviewed felt the project was right to work on youth engagement as well as did the right things in supporting youth participation and leadership. One youth leader from South Bougainville noted “It was a very good program to have youths participate in forums and trainings which changed the youths’ mindsets to have a positive outlook towards the referendum. Youths gained confidence. Earlier on there were many hearsays that the referendum was going to be a failure.” And leaders of organisations for the disabled said it was correct for GYPI to address this constituency, which had typically been left out by government and international programmes. Bougainville Disabled People’s Organisation (BDPO) leaders interviewed felt that the project “did a very wonderful thing in Bougainville especially for PLWDs.”

² See the 2019 revisions to the criteria originally developed in 1991 in “Better Criteria for Better Evaluation Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf> (accessed 1 June 2020)

Appropriateness and relevance of project design, including the theory of change

GYPI was seen as appropriate in its design by UN staff and some key ABG counterparts that were knowledgeable about the whole design. Most ABG partners, the civil society leaders, and beneficiaries interviewed did not have the experience with the project or information on GYPI to address the overall design or theory of change (ToC). Workshops in the development of the project and again at the start of the project reached some key ABG and CSO partners; however, the rotation of staff and the many organisational responsibilities that the staff of these organisations have left the evaluation with unknowledgeable interviewees in its fieldwork.

The project was developed through consultative processes by RUNOs with ABG counterparts and key civil society leaders. The PBF, UNCT, UNFPA, UN Women, and OHCHR used conventional policies and procedures to validate the relevance of the project in the process of developing the ProDoc, being approved for PBF funding, in reporting to the PBF biannually during implementation of the project, in the request for no-cost extensions, and in making revisions to the project. A comprehensive mapping of peacebuilding activities and gaps was done in the process of developing the GYPI and included in the ProDoc. This and UN agency and IP interviews validated that the GYPI project was relevant because it focused on addressing critical risks that had limited support other than the project. The signing the ProDoc by the RC, and PBSO confirmed the relevance of the project for the UN, GoPNG and ABG, UNFPA, UN Women, OHCHR, and PBSO. Funding through the PBF confirmed that the PBSO found the project not only relevant but a priority for their engagement in the PNG and Bougainville.

The Project document made a compelling case for the appropriateness of the project, supported by data and detailed analysis of the challenges, possibilities, and potential for the GYPI project to address these challenges by using these possibilities to support peaceful participation of women, youth and PLWD in important ways. GYPI then followed through as it provided funding to key peacebuilding partners to address key bottlenecks and supported networking these partners through project resources. The revision in June 2019 that extended the project for six months reconfirmed the appropriateness and relevance as was signed by all of the same organisations again. Interviews with the PBF, UNFPA, UN Women, OHCHR and partners and stakeholders found that all agreed that the project was relevant, but some UN staff felt that the project was overambitious based on the small staff of the GYPI project, the limited time for the project, the limited capacity of IPs and the challenging conditions for implementing projects in Bougainville.

Other CSO leaders, ABG staff, and beneficiaries too found the support of the project relevant. These interviewees assessed GYPI as relevant because the activities the project engaged them in were relevant to their needs and situation, described in summary as empowering women, youth, and PLWD to participate in the referendum and more broadly in community life, including at the level of the ABG.

Several beneficiaries however criticized the design for not working in a comprehensive way with communities. These interviewees argued projects should consult in a comprehensive way with whole communities. They sought training that reached whole communities rather than an approach that focused on women or youth or PLWD.

The ToC used in the development of the project was developed and affirmed in the development of the ProDoc. The ToC was not brought up in discussions by UN agencies or IPs in fieldwork – but was well understood and implicit in the presentation of the project by staff of the UN agencies as they explained the

logic behind the project, its goal, outcomes and outputs, and how the activities contributed to these objectives. UN staff did not seek to use the ToC explicitly; as one quipped, “it is a theory for a reason.”

Appropriateness and relevance with given the context, threats and opportunities over the project life cycle

Interviews with the PBF, UNFPA, UN Women, OHCHR, ABG and CSOs affirmed that the amount and accuracy of information about the referendum and the engagement of women, youth, and PLWD with the processes around the referendum – as well as keeping these processes peaceful – were concerns that persisted throughout project implementation in 2018 and 2019. The postponements of the referendum data led to extension of the project so that GYPI could continue to provide the needed support given this change. The importance of continued outreach to the youth was particularly seen as critical; one key ABG counterpart noted that in the run up to the referendum, “if we leave the youth out, they will be the ones to start the fire.”

Did the project make a difference in terms of peacebuilding?

Interviews with the PBF, UNFPA, UN Women, OHCHR, ABG and CSOs felt that the project had made a difference in peacebuilding. The project was seen to have made a difference through its effects on women, youth, and PLWD via activities that reached these beneficiaries, strengthened organisations and the leadership of these organisations in civil society, and in engaging them with better-informed ABG counterparts and ward leaders in community government.

UN Women noted the project had remobilized the Women, Peace and Security Working Group in a sustainable way, for example discouraging the need for funds to hire a venue and order refreshments for a regular meeting that should last up to two hours. UN Women also noted, how workshops on gender and peacebuilding were delivered in a way that allowed women to feel where women felt that they could talk openly about sensitive issues in their communities and Bougainville.

Interviewees attested to making a difference among the youth. A CSO youth leader noted that the project “changed the mindset of youths.” In addition, the project also provided others with “confidence on youths and clear mind on what youths were intending.” A key ABG Department leader noted that “bringing youths into the process [of discussions to raise awareness and for participation in the referendum itself] was a major achievement.” The situation in preparation for the referendum in 2019 was now seen as different from earlier “during the conflict the when elders made the decisions and the youth were just relegated to fighting.”

GYPI was seen as having engaged key ABG institutions and CSOs to address the areas within their mandates where these organisations had substantial capacity and experience that could be brought to bear to mitigate risks of violence and take advantages of opportunities to engage youth positively. Furthermore, interviews noted that these risks and opportunities were not being adequately addressed or supported by other existing support.

The difference one CSO leader noted was that “With the skills we learnt we were able to take part in organizing and planning reconciliations between the former Bougainville Revolutionary Army and Bougainville Resistance Forces. We were confident and not afraid because we also knew who we are and what our rights are through the project. This was very good for the women.”

Individual women, youth, and PLWD that had benefitted from trainings, workshops, and events also asserted that participating in project had been helpful for them.

Relevance vis-à-vis conflict causes/factors and peacebuilding priorities of the two Governments and beneficiary communities

Holding the Referendum peacefully with extensive participation of the population was a priority for the ABG. The ABG recognized that women and youth were critical to getting large turnout for the referendum, as a majority of the potential voting population in the youthful region. This made the project also a priority for the ABG. The engagement of ABG leaders the development of the project and work with them by the project, demonstrated that the project was relevant to them. The project was thus aligned with ABG priorities. Women CSO leaders noted that the project was aligned with DCD priorities on women. Youth CSO leaders affirmed that the project “fit well” into DCD priorities; they particularly noted the value of the support for setting up the BYF from the project and building up its capacity and ties so it was no longer operating in isolation.

The evaluation fieldwork focused on the ARoB. No interviewees focused on what the GoPNG priorities on peacebuilding or conflict prevention were in the project. Three activities that connected PNG with the ARoB were identified, of which only the JSB roadshow on the referendum explicitly included GoPNG actors. Engagements with civil society from Bougainville reached the leading umbrella women’s organisation and the leading youth organisation in PNG with women and youth from the ARoB.

Beneficiaries from communities asserted that they prioritised women’s and youth engagement in their communities. The project thus targeted important areas for them. Disability was noted as central in civil society by the Disabled People’s Organisation (BDPO), the organisation that represents these interests in the ARoB, and noted as important by ABG interviewees that focused on human rights (HR).

Coherence

Coherence is “the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.”

Compatibility with other interventions in Bougainville

UN staff noted that the project was designed to complement other UN initiatives, particularly the Bougainville Referendum Support Project (BRSP) implemented by UNDP that provided support for the implementation of the referendum itself. ABG partners recognized that the UN had multiple projects in Bougainville and counted on the UN to keep these aligned. ABG partners noted that they were consulted in the development of the project; consultation was to ensure that project activities were compatible with the ABG’s goals and programming. CSO leaders interviewed across the three regions of Bougainville recognized that there were other programs complementing GYPI that as one youth leader noted “all ran together advocating a free, fair and violence-free referendum.” Youth leaders noted complementarities with the initiatives of DCD, as did women’s organisation leaders; these complementarities were that DCD and GYPI both sought to enhance the participation and leadership of women and youth – the DCD broadly and GYPI with a focus on referendum participation. CSOs in disability also asserted that GYPI was aligned to the plans of the ABG. One CSO interviewee summed up this compatibility as follows: “you cannot operate without the legal stamp of the government of Bougainville. I saw that when the government approved the entry of the project according to the Bougainville Peace Agreement, the project stayed on course with the

government priority which was referendum readiness.” Validation of this compatibility for some interviewees was that in every project activity, there were always government officials present.

Continuous validity of objectives or were adjustments made?

UN staff noted that the objectives of GYPI remained valid throughout implementation. UN Women revised their GYPI plans after a slow start to their activities meant the implementation of planned activities was no longer realistic or feasible. This revision changed the activities to support stronger implementation and to ensure the project objectives were able to be achieved; as such it did not change the objectives or overall outcomes of the project.

Beneficiaries from CSOs and communities that addressed this question, those that felt they knew the objectives of the project, did not see any adjustments in the objectives of GYPI; they noted instead that the GYPI activities continued to target increasing the peaceful participation of women, youth and PLWD in the referendum as designed throughout the period of implementation. Adjustments made to extend the project fit with the objectives; as the dates of the referendum were pushed back twice, the project too needed to have a longer duration to extend through these dates.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is “The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.” IPs have reported on achievements to UNFPA, UN Women, and OHCHR, and the RUNOs have reported on achievements in through project reporting to the PBSO, noting that almost all results under the outputs have been achieved. However, the project was revised and a few activities originally envisioned in the ProDoc were conducted differently by UN Women following the revision of their workplan.

Most beneficiaries, CSO partners, and ABG partners limited their discussion of effectiveness to the activities that they directly participated in. Only a few non-UN interviewees from the ABG were able to address more than the effectiveness of programme implementation in the activities that they themselves participated - and in general terms only. UN staff knew and contribute more information to addressing these questions in interviews.

Achievement of objectives

The GYPI was seen as an effective project in its support for enhancing peaceful women’s, youth and PLWD participation in the referendum, albeit one with problems with efficiency and an overly ambitious design that required adjustment. GYPI reporting and interviews with UN staff, ABG staff, CSO leaders and beneficiaries all considered that the objectives of the project had been achieved as women, youth, and PLWD were seen as having participated in the referendum in large numbers peacefully. This participation was also seen as contributing to their capacity to participate in political and social life peacefully in the future, including through engagement with ABG institutions at the ward, constituency (BHOR), and Bougainville levels. To varying extents, interviewees were then able to discuss the achievement of the outputs and outcomes that contributed to this achievement, and the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of these objectives.

The GYPI project was effective in contributing to the high turnout and peaceful conduct of the Referendum through its support for peaceful participation of women and youth. Documents noted activities and interviews emphasized that the project's activities under Outcomes 1 and 2 made important contributions to the extent of women and youth participation in the Referendum and the peacefulness of this participation. Participation of PLWD was also notable and noted in communities and by DCD.

Violence was not noted in the fortnight when the Referendum was conducted or in the aftermath by national observation missions, which also commended women and youth on turning out in substantial numbers and the ABG for facilitating the participation of PLWD.

UN Women revised key, outputs, and activities under its second project manager after the entity had challenges in implementing key activities under its first project manager UN Volunteer under GYPI. The revisions made under the successor UN Women consultant project manager, changed the anticipated reach of the project plans to reach all wards through the district governance structure of Bougainville by cutting the planned ToT for DCG community government chairs, deputy chairs and executive coordinators at the regional level, which were expected to cascade down to the wards level. This was viewed as unrealistic given the remaining timeframe and the loss of a key government partner in the Department of Community Government to the Bougainville Referendum Commission.³ Despite UN Women's attempts to engage the Department via multiple avenues, they were unresponsive and therefore UN Women had to develop an alternative plan of action to ensure the project remained on track.⁴ This activity was replaced with PBSO approval through the revision of the ProDoc with activities that targeted the same project outcomes in ways that were feasible to implement in the remaining months (September to December 2019). The substitute activities were workshops on gender and peacebuilding with CSOs and ABG departments, a gender assessment of the BRC, in partnership with UNDP, a radio programme with UNDP and UNFPA on referendum awareness, and the dissemination of gender and inclusive voting awareness materials through the BRC.

Outputs and key activities implemented towards the outcome of the project included the following.

Outcome 1: ABG institutions are increasingly accountable to women and youth for a free and fair Referendum

*Towards Output 1.1: Responsible institutions have strengthened accountability to the rights of women and youth in the Referendum process (Or...Responsible institutions have strengthened accountability to the rights of women, youth and persons with disabilities in the Referendum process)*⁵, GYPI staff did a baseline survey with partners to have some sense of existing ABG institution accountability mechanism for Youth and Women. The survey, conducted by the PNG NRI in July 2018, noted the lack of clear and well-defined linkages between the different tiers of government in implementing policy directives on women and youth empowerment, which was partly to do with the severe financial

³ This had ambitiously planned in the ProDoc to reach all Wards in Bougainville through two outputs: 1. Elected ward representatives (888 men and women) receive training on gender and peacebuilding to support a violence-free referendum; and 2. Women and men at the local level (minimum 2,240) engaged, via ward representatives, in community conversations on gender and peacebuilding to support a violence-free referendum.

⁴ This had ambitiously planned in the ProDoc to reach all Wards in Bougainville through two outputs: 1. Elected ward representatives (888 men and women) receive training on gender and peacebuilding to support a violence-free referendum; and 2. Women and men at the local level (minimum 2,240) engaged, via ward representatives, in community conversations on gender and peacebuilding to support a violence-free referendum.

⁵ The Output was phrased in these two different ways in various documents.

and other resource constraints on the ABG.

Towards key activity *1.1a) Support the establishment and effective functioning of accountability systems and mechanisms such as committees and task forces, to enable Referendum related institutions meaningfully engage women, youth and persons with disabilities* [Revised to *Support the establishment and effective functioning of accountability systems and mechanisms such as committees and task forces, watch dog groups, dialogues, radio phone-in to facilitate enhanced accountability to women, youth, and persons with disabilities, and promote their access to information and the right to vote*], GYPI RUNOs supported the baseline survey and then set up and facilitated dialogues that brought staff of ABG institutions together with the women's and youth network. UN Women also worked with the UNDP BRSP to do a gender assessment of the BRC, supported the provision and distribution of awareness materials focused on women's right to participate in the referendum, and supported induction training on checklist forms with DPAI to CG members in preparation of Referendum readiness activities

On 1.1b) Facilitate participation of women and youth networks in task forces and committees established by responsible institutions, to strengthen representation of the views of women and youth and people with disabilities in the Referendum process and decision making. To do so, UNFPA organized awareness referendum workshops for youth leaders, awareness workshops with district and urban youth associations, provided support to youth/theatre drama groups for Referendum awareness, hosted the Bougainville Youth Forum, and supported the development of a new AROB Youth Policy as well as the model youth parliament. UN Women organized and ran workshops on gender and peacebuilding as well and worked with UNFPA and UNDP on the radio programmes. UNFPA collaborated with OHCHR on a workshop with wide participation to commemorate the International Day of Persons with Disabilities on 10 December 2018. UN Women, through technical support to the WPS WG and advocacy with ABG leaders, supported the nomination and participation of two Bougainvillean women representatives to the Joint Ministerial Post-Referendum Planning Taskforce.

For 1.1c) Provide technical assistance for the integration and implementation of Human Rights standards for institutions involved in the Referendum process, OHCHR provided technical assistance to support the expansion and establishment of the parliamentary committee on gender to also encompass human rights and training for ABG departments, including the Bougainville Police Service on incorporating human rights into their work.

Towards *Output 1.2: Responsible institutions have enhanced capacity to enable women and youth to effectively engage in the Referendum process,* GYPI measured the number of institutional mechanisms in place which support the engagement of women and youth in the Referendum and with the revision of the UN women programme added an indicator developed as part of UN Women's alternative plan of activities on gender in the BRC.

Key activities towards this output included *1.2a) Support the integration of the voice of women and youth, including persons with disabilities, in the development and implementation of the official ABG communication and outreach strategy for the Referendum, and facilitate their engagement with existing networks in the roll-out of the strategy.* To do so, UNFPA provided support to DCG to develop communication strategy for Referendum readiness awareness, OHCHR supported the integration of human

rights and rights of persons with disabilities, including women and youth with disabilities, into the DCG communication strategy for Referendum readiness awareness as well as provided assistance to roll out and implement this communications strategy. CSO Workshop on Referendum Messaging [(Key Activity) 1.2a: Support the integration of the voice of women and youth, including persons with disabilities, in the development and implementation of the official ABG communication and outreach strategy for the Referendum, and facilitate their engagement with existing networks in the roll-out of the strategy.

With the second GYPI Project Coordinator in place, UN Women led the development of the CSO Workshop on Referendum Messaging with the support of UNFPA and OHCHR in what some GYPI staff described as the first “true collaboration” of the GYPI RUNO’s. Discussions regarding this activity began in April/May following her appointment; the workshop was held in July 2019.

UN Women’s plans for *1.2b) Provide technical assistance to ABG institutions to localize UN Resolution 1325 and UN Resolution 2250 in all aspects of the Referendum process, including the implementation of the Women and Peacebuilding Strategy* evolved into supporting the Office of Gender Equality.

UN women’s ambitious plans for *1.2c) Support the 24 elected women community government representatives at the community ward level, to carry out gender responsive Referendum awareness and peace building outreach initiatives at the community level. They will in turn sensitize over 400 women elected at Ward level to raise awareness on the Referendum and peace related to referendum outcomes* which was initially revised to have even more demanding targets as *1.2c) Support the 94 elected community government representatives at the community government level, to carry out gender responsive Referendum awareness and peace building outreach initiatives at the community level. They will in turn sensitize over 888 elected representatives at Ward level to raise awareness on the Referendum and peace related to referendum outcomes* were revised with PBSO concurrence as UN Women were unable to engage with DCG due to the loss of a key partner and sufficient time had not been allocated to the preparatory work required for the effective implementation of this activity. However, UN women did develop, train, and work with DCG and civil society through BYF at the ward level through the referendum checklist.

UN Women put modest resources to *Output 1.3 Increased knowledge of gender, inclusive voting and peacebuilding among key BRC staff* in conjunction with the revision of the workplan, largely through UN Women staff collaboration with BRC staff.

Outcome 2: Women and youth effectively participate in delivering a violence-free Referendum in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville

Towards this Outcome, UN Women and UNFPA developed key activities towards *Output 2.1: Strengthened capacity of women and youth to foster unity and reduce triggers of conflict for a violence-free Referendum*.

Key activities under *2.1a) Reinvigorate existing platforms for women as referendum-readiness watchdogs to strengthen dialogue between Government institutions, and women and young women networks on Referendum-related action*, included consultation with key churches (Catholic, United Church, SDA) in AROB on their contribution towards Referendum readiness, in July to September 2018 and work incorporating Churches into awareness raising and Referendum readiness activities. One UN Women

activity worked with the PNG Council of Churches and Women's groups from Bougainville together to share information about the BPA and the referendum with the rest of PNG. UNFPA supported youth inclusion through subnational trainings on awareness raising for youth, particularly targeting young people living in remote areas, and weekly radio Youth Talk-Back shows on - New Dawn FM. Trainings were also held with young people were conducted to build their knowledge and capacity on conflict resolution to maintain social cohesion

Under 2.1b) Strengthen the roll-out of the AROB Youth Peace Foundation Network action plan for disenfranchised and out-of-school youth (female and male) to participate in dialogue, decision-making, and other community programmes relating to Referendum and peace building, UNFPA worked with DCD through by the Media Bureau, on the development of a Youth Website. The website was envisaged to be tailored to promote the activities of the Bougainville Youth Federation & the DYAs/UYAs. The processes of discussion and engagement were too slow for the project to complete this development in the term of the GYPI project. Youth Radio Talk Back - New Dawn FM was contracted through a Service Agreement to host and broadcast the programme on Wednesday every week, from 13 February until June 14, 2019.

UN Women revised 2.1c) *Support strengthened cooperation between the Bougainville Women's Federation and women's groups and 224/448 elected and women leaders at the community ward level, to carry out Referendum awareness and peace outreach programme* to instead to make this key activity *Support strengthened cooperation between the Bougainville Women's Federation, women's group, church leaders and ABG actors to carry out Referendum awareness outreach*. UN Women was able to work to provide training towards Referendum readiness and support meetings, including coordination supporting a Referendum awareness exchange forum between BWF and the PNG-wide National Council of Women in June 2018.

Towards 2.1d) *Support the annual simulated Youth Parliament to strengthen engagement with the Bougainville House of Representatives to provide a platform for engagement of youth with the ABG leaders on the Referendum*, UNFPA supported holding the Mock Youth Parliament – in December 2018 and March 2019. The key activity Strengthened engagements between the Bougainville Youth Foundation (BYF), District and Urban Youth Associations (DYA/UYA) and the ABG and BHOR.

OHCHR implemented activities towards 2.1e) *Develop and deliver manuals and training for civil society on monitoring Human Rights violations during the Referendum, including the rights of persons with disabilities*. OHCHR supported training for Human Rights Defenders and supported the development and use of HR checklists for monitoring and reporting on Human Rights violations during the Referendum, including with the the Nazareth Center for Rehabilitation, Bougainville Women's Federation, the Bougainville Disabled People Organization, women's groups, and youth and human rights defenders. OHCHR also held a workshop on UNSCR 2250 on youth.

Output 2.2: Increased opportunities and incentives for women and youth to support social cohesion and peacebuilding efforts in the Referendum process was a focus of UNFPA and UN Women.

Under key activity 2.2a) *Conduct youth leadership training on peacebuilding to enhance youth-led Referendum awareness-raising and serving as agents of peace*, UNFPA organized Leadership trainings, awareness raising events, and a series of three self-management trainings.

UNFPA and UN Women worked towards 2.2b) *Support the use of Youth Resource Centre as a central hub for information dissemination on the referendum* through UNFPA support for capacity strengthening of the youth resources centres and UN Women activities to build skills and facilitate the active participation of women leaders in referendum dialogues, meetings, and forums.

Key activity 2.2b was implemented by UNFPA. To *Support the use of Youth Resource Centre as a central hub for information dissemination on the referendum*, GYPI worked with DCD and the ABG Department of Education to support competitions on key referendum messages and awareness. Capacity strengthening of the Youth Resource Centres was intended to leverage past UNDP support from PBF1 for the three centres, where outstanding technical issues in their construction have meant the centres are not complete and delayed the handover of the three to the DCD. One centre in North Bougainville was eventually handing over to the ABG Department for Community Development towards the end of the no-cost extension phase of GYPI.

Under 2.2c) *Train women and young people to drive youth- and women-led, transformational activities to minimize triggers of conflict and young person's resorting to arms*, UNFPA supported some local peace initiatives by community-based youth associations.

UN Women designed key activity 2.2d) *Support women's increased engagement in District Peace Committees to strengthen social cohesion and peacebuilding*. As part of the redesign, these activities that were not developed in 2018 due to changes in Department of Community Government plans were rolled into related GYPI capacity building activities.

The RUNOs contributed to 2.2e) *Facilitate referendum awareness-raising among women, youth, and persons with disabilities leaders on the joint referendum key messages for dissemination among their communities*. The joint UN Women-UNFPA-OHCHR workshop for civil society was delivered to provide participants with more information on the joint referendum key messages, with presentations from the BRC, the ABG Media Bureau and the Department for Peace Agreement Implementation, and time for participants to develop their own awareness-raising plans.

Finally, UN Women developed and implemented what became key activity 2.2f) *Sensitize women in their capacity as voters to engage effectively in the referendum process*. This activity was changed in the revision of the ProDoc from its original formulation that had targeted ward representatives. The budget line was used to contribute to the trainings and meetings for DCG, BWF, and women Church leaders.

Document review and interviews found that the project's overall targeting approach to be justified and effective. GYPI identified key youth, both women and men, and IPs that could reach them effectively towards enhancing their peaceful participation in electoral processes, particularly after revisions by UN Women revised activities that had proven no longer feasible. GYPI reporting noted meeting the outputs and thus the outcomes of the project through the activities and the contributions of partners in reports to PBSO.

Despite the challenges to effectiveness and the revisions to the project noted above, GYPI was seen by all interviewees as having made important contributions to the successes of the Referendum. Interviews with PBSO, and UNFPA noted the importance of project contributions to the outcome – and that Bougainville had had a peaceful Referendum. ABG, CSO, and GYPI beneficiaries all were proud of the peaceful conduct, high turnout, and overwhelming consensus expressed in the referendum by the people of Bougainville – and felt that the GYPI project’s activities had made important contributions to all three of these characteristics.

Failures and their causes

UN staff interviewed and project documentation noted challenges in their own capacity to implement the project as well as challenges in working with IPs to ensure that activities were implemented as planned and on time. UN Women’s first project manager came in five months after the project began and was reportedly not able to develop the relationships with IPs and with UN agencies, including with her own agency, to effectively develop and implement UN Women activities – or to coordinate more broadly across GYPI with UNFPA and OHCHR. She was not seen as being in a position to lead, not provided with the support to lead by UN Women or her GYPI colleagues. UN Women was not able to address these leadership and management problems with the implementation of the project during this time. This contributed to the most ambitious UN Women programming not being implemented, which some UN Women staff felt was a major failure. Instead, UN Women changed staff and UN Women’s GYPI activities were revised under her successor project manager. The initial plans of UN Women were seen by some UN interviewees as overly ambitious given the logistical, communications, and implementation challenges of working across Bougainville. In addition, some UN staff felt UN Women’s implementation was hampered by the hiring of a UNV and subsequently a consultant - neither of whom were able to access key administrative and financial systems that are only for UN staff. Having a project coordinator with responsibility for budget implementation, but no ways to oversee the budget was a considerable challenge and slowed implementation.

Key UN staff noted that the project in its design was overly ambitious, with three agencies and so many discrete activities for each, as well as in the way the activities of more than one RUNO were meant to come together towards outputs.

UN staff interviewed noted that there are not electronic systems to facilitate the sharing of data, knowledge, and planning across UN agencies. This lacuna made it hard to share and work together, and impeded handovers between staff. It should be noted that this is a broader issue within the UN Common System.

IP challenges particularly affected UNFPA activities involving the District and Urban Youth Associations (DYAs/UYAs). The main issues that impeded implementation were operational relating to procurement processes, coordination in the BYF between central, regional, and district organisations and between the various ABG development partners engaging with the BYF. Project reporting and staff also attested to challenges dealing with UN agency country offices for the timely engagement of national consultants, which at times led to postponements and delayed implementation of key activities; including policy level activities involving ABG IPs.

Interviews with UN staff and project reporting also noted that some activities were postponed or cancelled due to the inability of ABG or CSO IPs to mobilise the relevant resources – including the right participants – activities on time or due to a lack of funding for the ABG’s contributions.

Some CSO partners, saw the challenges of their UN partners and ABG IPs. One said: “I think the project itself was success, but I think the challenges are with some of the individuals that the project engaged with.” Another CSO interviewee felt that the limitations were more the individual Bougainvillian beneficiaries of the project: “I think depending on what the background of the stakeholders was, each person was challenged in understanding the trainings or workshops project at their own level.” A third CSO beneficiary attributed problems to the characteristics of the beneficiaries as well, noting “I think some people were suited to implement the messages and the selection of trainees was sometimes not done too well. For example, for advocates they have to be very active or pro-active. However, there were some participants that were not able to implement what they had learnt in the communities, because they were too quiet.” Finally, two beneficiaries characterized the project’s failures as its limited number of beneficiaries. The problem they identified was that the project benefitted only some youths, while Bougainville has a large youth population. More support was thus needed to reach them all.

Programme management factors

UN staff interviewed emphasised that Bougainville is a difficult, expensive environment for programme implementation. UN staff noted that UN procedures were difficult to implement in an environment with so few competitive service providers, either firms or consultants – plus the difficult logistics of transportation and communications. The isolation of the AROB was seen to make it difficult to staff with national consultants from outside the AROB or internationals. And the legacy of the conflict in Bougainville has continued to leave the number of well-qualified, experienced, professional managers in the AROB a small one.

The first UN Women project coordinator proved unable to coordinate the project or effectively implement the UN women activities. The UN Women team in Buka appears to not have been able to work together effectively; combining the strengths of the international UN Volunteer as a manager with the detailed knowledge and experience of the long-time UN Women national staff did not work in practice. UN Women did not manage to address this dysfunctional situation which impeded implementation. UN Women initially envisioned implementing many activities through national implementation modalities (NIM). This proved infeasible, but the turn to direct implementation (DIM) instead was slow and difficult, as the set of UN Women GYPI staff in Buka did not have the needed set of qualifications and experience to manage DIM at first. The first project coordinator was not able to develop the approach of working as a team on GYPI with UNFPA and OHCHR GYPI staff. UN Women in PNG was not able to provide effective support to address this problem, which also went unaddressed by the other two RUNOs whose staff focused on implementing “their” activities.

UN staff noted different challenges in working with their agencies, in managing a joint programme and working with IPs, including:

- Conflicting schedules between RUNO’s during project implementation.
- Different priorities and requirements between RUNOs implementing GYPI.
- Limited willingness of IPs to collaborate with other stakeholders, including of ABG Departments to work with other ABG departments.

- Delays in implementation due to lack of ABG department capacity to operationalize activities or delay service provider payments.
- Delays at RUNO Country Office levels in procuring consultants, leading to activity delays and postponements or cancellations.
- Lack of sustainability and government follow up for GYPI activities.

The change of staff by UN Women led to addressing many of these issues to some degree, the revision of key UN women activities, and better coordination and collaboration across the three RUNOS.

UN Staff also noted challenges in working with their main ABG and CSO partners. Partner organisations are small, with a few key individuals central to action. In some cases, RUNO staff noted that their partners did not have the capacity to manage activities or had too many priorities to be able to manage them all (while also being unwilling to delegate them to staff). Communication proved challenging with some key ABG counterparts, who appeared to prioritise other things over GYPI and were sometimes found unresponsive to GYPI staff.

Some ABG partners, CSO partners, and individual beneficiaries noted problems with the delivery of the project, particularly in providing daily subsistence allowances and transportation funding for participants for particular activities. Some of these interviewees noted that DSA was still outstanding for participants in some activities. Other participants noted that service providers that supported GYPI events had trouble being paid for their services by GYPI. UN Staff interviewed noted that there were problems with payments both from RUNOs and from their ABG counterparts. Different activities had different distributions of roles and responsibilities for transportation and DSA, with different rules and procedures as well as different amounts for reimbursement. These differences – and a lack of clear division about which rules and procedures applied for different activities – contributed to problems in implementing the activities themselves and beneficiary dissatisfaction with the logistical arrangements - especially if they have not been reimbursed for transportation or received DSA RUNOs had to consistently reiterate to project beneficiaries that the UN does not provide ‘sitting allowances’ (an allowance paid to participants for simply attending a workshop), which sometimes accounted for dissatisfaction among project beneficiaries.. UNFPA reported running an orientation for DCD focal point on procurement process and compliance with UNFPA procurement and financial policies as well as procedures and regulations; UNFPA found that they had to train and retrain IPs in these aspects of working with the UN more than once. IPs needed to have these practices reinforced as their implementation became problematic, including due to personnel change.

Collaboration and complementarity with other PBF and other relevant projects

GYPI documents suggest that there were, at least at times, weekly GYPI internal coordination meetings held between UNFPA, UNW, OHCHR in the Buka UN Office. There were also fortnightly PBF2-GYPI coordination meetings. Staff noted that there were other GYPI and UN meetings as needed to address issues as well as daily consultations on areas of collaboration among GYPI staff. Nevertheless, the project team found issues of overlap and scheduling difficult to address, interviews noted, as the RUNOs had similar or the same key CSO and ABG counterparts, plus some overlapping beneficiaries. Coordination was worse under the first UN Women project manager than under the second one, who was better able to facilitate engagements across agencies.

Efficiency

The OECD defines this criterion as the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

Implementation of the UNFPA component of the GYPI began in July 2018 and ran mainly through 31 December 2019, although implementation was supposed to begin in December of 2017. To fast track implementation after a slow start, an acceleration plan was established to ensure that all activities started implementation by June 2019 and the key UN Women activities were revised. With the extension that followed the pushing back of the dates for the referendum, the project was able to implement all of its main activities by December 31 2019. The revision of the UN Women activities was also key as it became apparent that the original plans of the ProDoc were overly ambitious and not feasible for implementation in the time remaining after the slow start of UN Women's programming.

Use, implementation, and adaptation of plans

For the development of the project, the three RUNOs discussed potential project activities in developing the ProDoc and enlisting ABG support for the proposal for funding which was then submitted to PBF. After the award was announced in December, the RUNOs immediately were challenged by the need to have staff to implement the GYPI in Bougainville. Advertising for, evaluating, and hiring staff takes substantial time for all three RUNOs, who address this staffing challenge in different ways (consultants for UNFPA and OHCHR and identifying a UN Volunteer for UN Women). The delay in starting implementation meant that plans had to be revised with implementation accelerated. Plans continued to be challenged by capacity limits of the Implementing Partners (IPs), which made it difficult to implement activities on time, particularly activities involving the District Youth Associations (DYAs) and Urban Youth Associations (UYAs) for UNFPA and the ward-level work for UN Women, which later is dropped in the revision.

Use of overall work plan

UNFPA and OHCHR staff emphasized that they had used and fulfilled the work plan. UN Women interviews emphasized that the work plan had been fulfilled, but first UN Women had to revise the workplan to change activities, outputs, based on the challenges they had had in getting started with GYPI implementation, difficulties getting ABGABG cooperation, and concerns about potential duplication. Few IPs had detailed information or remembered the work plan. Some key partners asserted that the work plan was used "from start to finish." The work plan was revised to change key activities, particularly but not exclusively the UN Women activities.

Percentage delivery of activities in work plan

RUNOs noted complete delivery of plans from the revised work plan. Few IPs had the information to address to this question. However, some key IPs took this opportunity to praise the delivery of the project. One gave it a ranking of 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being best.

Financial expenditures in line with activity plan

Limited financial data was made available for the evaluation; the budget lines for the project were drawn up and utilized to connect activities in the work plan. Some UN Women personnel felt that the budget allocated to particularly ambitious activities was insufficient; this sense also contributed to the revision to make activities align with the budget. IPs reported that they managed their activities under the project with

attention to efficiency criteria. IPs described the ways the project worked to be efficient in implementation by reaching more people than expected under their plans as well as through implementation modalities that had low financial costs but were expected to be – and were – able to reach expected goals. Some IPs also noted that they “achieved things extra beyond the scale of the funding – so we achieved more above the expectations of the funding allocation.” Project reporting and evaluation methods did not produce precise estimates of the number of beneficiaries reached.

Monitoring data collection and use

The ProDoc developed a comprehensive M&E plan and allocated approximately 8% of the project budget to implement it. These budget lines, starting with a baseline survey to identify baseline data undertaken in August 2018, were incorporated into the 2018 budget spreadsheet. RUNOs systematically monitored the project according to the joint M&E plan, with UNFPA designated as the M&E focal point. The division of responsibilities under which UN Women took the lead for coordination (which had its problems) and UNFPA took the lead for M&E was seen as problematic by RUNOs for M&E. The baseline survey came substantially after program implementation had started, and some M&E activities were not delivered.

Not all M&E activities were carried out, or carried out as frequently as planned in the ProDoc. Instead of joint quarterly monitoring, the RUNOs carried out two joint monitoring missions together in February 2019 and October 2019. The planned mid-term review was not done. M&E ends with this independent end-line evaluation, procured at much lower cost than budgeted for. M&E systems were used for RUNO and joint monitoring and reporting to PBSO through bi-annual and annual progress reports, as well as the final end of project narrative report. While joint monitoring was seen as a good practice, some reports were not finalized or shared from these missions.

Even when components of the GYPI program were struggling in implementation, the monitoring missions delivered stories of how project activities had changed the lives of beneficiaries. Some UN staff interviews noted that this knowledge from monitoring inspired staff and partners to do better in implementation.

A one-day retreat for on-the-ground project staff, and the members of the monitoring mission, was also conducted in February 2019 to evaluate the progress of the project to date, and jointly identify solutions to address challenges.

Several IPs spoke to M&E. One felt that “there was continuous assessment and evaluation that fed into progress.” Another thought M&E feedback was provided to partners through GYPI “So we knew exactly what we were doing, what we were doing right, what could be done, including areas where extra effort was needed.”

Value for money (vfm)

The high costs of operating in Bougainville are well known by RUNOs and PBSO. The difficult geography and limited infrastructure lead to high costs for transportation and logistics, and the limited number of quality IPs and vendors – for both materials and expertise – make for high costs in programme implementation. The evaluation methods used in this exercise and project implementers do not have the comparative data to or provide for the evaluation to make a rigorous assessment of vfm.

ABG IPs felt that the project had delivered value for money, although they did not have clear metrics for or information on vfm. ABG departments noted that they also put ABG resources into implementation; these costs were planned for before the programme began to support the partnership. This also helps deliver vfm for the UN. Some CSO leaders noted community contributions, which boosted vfm. This was also seen as desirable in increasing community ownership of these processes.

Economic use of resources in delivery

UN staff and ABG partners were able to speak more to efficiency criteria for the evaluation than CSOs and beneficiaries that had less knowledge and information on programme delivery. Everyone was more comfortable discussing the economic use of resources compared to vfm as an area where evidence was more apparent and no rigorous methodologies are needed to discuss whether a project is attentive to keeping costs low and benefits large. Specific practices were identified by beneficiaries as showing attention to costs, as well as working better. Bringing workshops to the regions was seen by several regional youth beneficiaries as a choice that was more economical than bringing them to Buka, as well as more effective. Another noted implementing in rural areas to reach rural youth was commendable rather than just catering to urban youth; this was seen as economic as well as the right thing to do. Holding Central and South regional trainings in Arawa was also done to save costs, as participants that were within the vicinity of the training attended trainings from their homes with support from the partners, while only those from further away were provided with accommodations. IPs noted that savings were used to have more participants from further away in remote areas attend the training.

The additional work to support IP delivery and planning had resource costs; however, these resource costs were seen as an economical use of resources. For example, the UNFPA team had to accelerate delivery of the project and to do so needed to strengthen the capacity of the DCD. UNFPA provided capacity building training for the DCD from UNFPA staff in July 2018, November 2018, February 2019 and May 2019, and reported that staff consistently held weekly meetings with the IP, while the IP organised internal coordination meetings with its development partners from DYAs and UYAs to strengthen the efficiency of implementation.

The project had to balance incentives to have longer trainings for women with the challenges some females reported with their spouses or other family members who objected to the timing or duration of the workshop, based on prevailing cultural beliefs that women should not be away from their families for long.

A few beneficiaries and CSOs expressed concerns that GYPI choose to “call on the same selected few participants” for activities. The consequence they noted of this perception was “As a result some people isolated themselves from the project.” While selection may have been intentional for follow up workshops that need same participants, these critics noted that GYPI did not address and rebut these challenges when questions were raised. Often times, RUNOs relied on CSO and government partners to select relevant participants for trainings and/or workshops, as such greater attention should be given when discussing participant selection with CSO and government partners.

Cost implications for scaling up impact

The environment in Bougainville is not conducive to scaling up, as there are few alternative sources of funding and a dearth of capable IPs to scale up GYPI activities. IPs have not qualified for NIM funding; projects are implemented through DIM modalities and in partnership with the ABG, using their mechanisms

for their share of joint activities. No interviewees expressed confidence that the ABG could scale up GYPI activities. Some youth CSO leaders argued that replication and increased numbers of trainings could be done at lower cost through a focus on rural youth; others interviewees suggested a focus on replication would have scaled up impact at lower cost but did not have detailed ideas for what well qualified organisation could manage this implementation.

Potential savings that could have been made without compromising delivery

Delivery would have been improved with earlier staffing of the project, particularly through a project manager at the start of the project, with the skills, tools, experience, and support to coordinate the RUNOs. Investing more resources in management and coordination at the start was seen by UN staff as a way that implementation would have been much stronger. Some UN staff also suggested that better coordinated joint programming could have been developed which would have lowered costs. Stronger coordination between ABG departments could also lower costs. However, both of these potential opportunities are clearly difficult to realize, as limited coordination between RUNOs and between ABG departments were precisely some of the main challenges that impeded effectiveness and efficiency in GYPI implementation. No other potential savings were noted in documents of project or in interviews with UN and IP staff. Some beneficiaries suggested that replication was underutilized, and that replicating activities would have made a larger impact.

Impact

OECD/DAC criteria define impact as “the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.” Note that impact addresses the ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of the intervention; this way of thinking about the effects of the project is larger and longer-term than focusing on effectiveness in reaching the outcomes sought in the project.

While few ABG, CSO, or beneficiaries interviewed had the detailed knowledge of GYPI to be able to assess effectiveness in reaching specific outcomes and outputs in detail, all interviewees were comfortable speaking to the broader impacts of GYPI based on their experience with the project.

Evidence for good impact for many beneficiaries was the high percentage of the population that voted in the referendum – including large numbers of women and youth as well as the participation of PLWD, the peaceful conduct of the referendum, and the overwhelming support for independence. One ABG Department leader credited the project with more than that, noting that “the processes of reconciliation, weapons disposal and unification, is a result of the GYPI taking on board the remaining stakeholders who were left out of the process.” This department leader went on to note that “the impact was a good one in voter turn-out. Without GYPI, the final effort would have been a large struggle.”

Other positive results noted by CSOs were that women were visible as participants in discussions on the referendum and in participation in voting. Women CSO leaders emphasized that GYPI had positive results in two different ways – “in terms of the changes in the attitudes of women towards leadership and in changing the attitude of men towards women’s roles in decision making through this project.” Other UN, ABG, and women CSO leaders emphasized that inclusion of two women representatives on the Post-Referendum Planning Taskforce was a big achievement that came about as a result of consistent advocacy from UN Women and the support for awareness and capacity building of GYPI.

Youth felt that confidence building among the youth, as well as awareness raising, was significant and generated positive results. In Buin, youth specifically cited the music festival as a “great achievement that brought everyone together.”

DPLO leaders noted “now even the President and the Bougainville Parliamentarians know who we are. Before this project we were just a voice in the wilderness.” BDPO noted that “our linkage with the government is stronger. In other arenas we are now more recognizable and people and organisations now know more about us.” And bridging the gap back to the impact on individuals, DPLO leaders interviewed noted that “I for one have been empowered to practice and exercise my rights.”

Differences made by GYPI

UN staff, ABG staff, CSO leaders, and beneficiaries pointed to differences made by the project. Differences fell into two categories: beneficial effects on individuals and benefits to communities or institutions. In benefits for institutions, DPAI emphasised the value of GYPI in bringing all “stakeholders and beneficiaries who were “left out” into the process – youth, PLWDs, neglected ex-combatants – everyone was brought together. While evidence of limited effectiveness from some activities was apparent, broad impact of overall activities was clear. UN staff, ABG department leaders, women, youth, and disability CSO leaders shared this perspective – that GYPI had made a positive difference.

Unforeseen impacts or unintended consequences

One of the main impacts attributed to the project, the placement of two women on the post-referendum Task Force which came about as a direct result of UN Women’s technical support to the Women, Peace and Security Working Group, was seen by most UN Women staff and management as unintended. Although documents reviewed and UN and IP interviews identified problems with collaboration and communication among RUNOs, some beneficiaries felt the example of collaboration across agencies was nevertheless valuable for Bougainville and a major unintended benefit of the project as a positive example. As one beneficiary said, “I think the level of collaboration that GYPI brought in, firstly at the UN’s own level through UN Women, UNFPA and OHCHR, which then filtered then down to the collaboration between Women, Youth, PLWDs, Human Rights Defenders, and the ABG from the Headquarter to our Wards and Community Government is very unique in Bougainville. We are normally mostly operating in isolation, but this project has taught us the value of working together and networking as a family.” Some CSO leaders also attested to positive consequences in communities that involving marijuana and homebrew users had had in reducing these behaviours in their communities.

Sustainability

Sustainability assesses whether the benefits last - the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue.

Lasting benefits?

UN staff noted that the capacity-building for ABG institutions through GYPI was limited, but the benefits to key civil society beneficiaries were expected to last and continue to support the activism of these individual leaders and organisations in Bougainville. Key ABG partners felt that the project’s support to

involve youth and persons with disabilities in the preparation and conduct of the referendum would carry over into greater youth and PLWD participation in community and Bougainville affairs.

Another way lasting benefits of GYPI was perceived was through the contribution of the project to the high turnout, peaceful conduct, and overwhelming support for independence in the referendum. One ABG department leader emphasized this aspect of sustainability, noting “the decision at the referendum was owned by the people and they have stood by that decision and protect it to ensure that there is no relapse into conflict.” ABG, CSO, and individual beneficiaries that emphasized the benefit that the project had helped demonstrated that the population was united in their aspirations for independence saw this expression of unity as providing lasting benefits as Bougainville took the next steps with the GoPNG towards independence.

Supporting the incorporation of the BDPO was seen as supporting sustainability, as registering has given the CSO a firm foundation to work from in the future.

Some youth beneficiaries interviewed were sceptical about how sustainable the project had been. These beneficiaries stressed the importance of providing training that reached whole communities instead of emphasizing youth or women or PLWD within communities and the importance of leaving trainees with ToT skills, tools and materials to extend and sustain this learning among the broader community.

Key factors affecting sustainability

UN Women, UNFPA, and OHCHR designed GYPI to build on existing partnerships with the ABG and CSO partners to support sustainability. UNFPA built on existing partnerships with the statutory national youth organisations and some of the most capable existing CSOs. UN Women worked with the statutory women’s organisation and the more capable CSOs. And OHCHR too provided support to sustainability by working with ABG partners. All three RUNOs partnered with the ABG Department for Community Development, the Department of Community Government, and the Department for Peace Agreement Implementation (DPAI). The plan and working style of GYPI was to foster relationships both at the political and senior management staff as well as technical staff to ensure a better understanding of their commitments to the project, obligations in implementation and build collaborative relationships between CSOs, the people of Bougainville (particularly women, youth, and PLWD) and the ABG. This strategy was seen as successful as UN staff, ABG staff, CSO leaders, and beneficiary interviews asserted, for example that “there are now more collaborations between all parties and stakeholders.” Interviewees felt that the continued collaboration showed that GYPI experience had carried over now six months after most of project implementation has concluded.

The high-level impacts of the project were seen as contributing to sustainability. The inclusion of two women representatives on the Post-Referendum Planning Taskforce was seen as helping to assure attention to women in the next steps towards realizing the results of the referendum.

The way GYPI project components worked with government counterparts were seen to support sustainability and as good practices. Some CSO and ABG interviewees felt that OHCHR had used local capacity in programme implementation less than UN Women and UNFPA had done, with corresponding challenges for capacity building and sustainability. An ABG Department head felt that the project GYPI adjusted appropriately in the ways the project was jointly implemented” rather than just UN partners exclusively taking charge of everything. This really worked given the lack of capacity and challenges of the

ABG in the area of financial and administrative accountability.” However, ABG Department leaders noted that “no one department in the ABG has the capacity that the UN has” and that this means that “the work has not ended.” Some BYF beneficiaries noted that plans to replicate GYPI workshops through UNFPA or DCD funding to the BYF had not come through “as promised.”

Organisations that could continue project activities

All interviews called for the UN to variously extend the project or develop a new project to support women, youth, and PLWD in Bougainville. ABG departments and key CSOs were seen as the partners that could to some extent continue GYPI initiatives.

ABG leaders noted that their departments had some capacity and plans to continue in areas where they were supported by GYPI; however they emphasized that funding was limited and that uncertainties about funding from the GoPNG for the ABG limits what they are able to do to continue working in the areas where they had been supported by GYPI. The DCD noted that they have drafted a Policy Submission to the Bougainville Executive to fund the completion of the youth centres – a request for K1 million- and that three full-time regional Youth Coordinators have been identified (one for each centre). Stronger women’s and youth associations after GYPI support are now better able to partner with other donors through the Australian-led Bougainville Partnership Programme. The DCG noted that they make staff available to work with the partners of GYPI after the project ended and put some funding to activities in the wards through these GYPI beneficiaries. CSOs sought additional funding to carry on and extend GYPI approaches with women, youth, and PLWD.

Evidence for copying, scaling up or replicating project activities

The constrained financial situation of the ABG and its CSO partners and their operational limits constrain their ability to extend GYPI activities. However, relationships encouraged or established by the project were strengthened by the experience of implementing GYPI and remain and have continued to some extent. The maintenance of these relationships supports extending project activities and results should funding be made available.

Actions to take to make the results of the project more sustainable now

All interviews felt that additional project was crucial for Bougainville; this was the way CSO beneficiaries immediately noted was needed to make the results of the project to date more sustainable. The emphasis in how Bougainvilleans expressed this sentiment varied, in whether the focus was on the need for more UN support to engage women, youth, and PLWD broadly or to engage the communities in more specific, targeted ways on peacebuilding, social issues, or small-scale economic development. Leadership development was seen as a critical aspect of all future activities, with more training through UN projects needed. The question for one ABG Department leader next was “how do we ensure that the human resource that has been trained is not wasted or isolated.” Some youth leaders emphasized the need to reach the rural areas for sustainability. Some CSO leaders phrased this as an imperative: “that the UN must continue to support funding youth activities it has started.”

The DPLO’s work on an ABG disabilities policy with DCD was seen as working towards making the results of GYPI in this area more sustainable in the future.

Future priorities for Bougainville

What UN staff, ABG staff, CSO leaders, and beneficiaries of the project prioritised for future project support varied somewhat. All emphasized the need for support; interviewees tended to prioritise their areas for engagement. Beneficiaries from communities often emphasized the need for projects that led to job skills and employment as well as economic activities that could provide for families in the villages. ABG leaders noted the importance of maintaining unity and process-type activities to support awareness, engagement, and leadership.

ABG leaders noted that the UN in particular is the organisation that “we need at this time to help us through to make sure that we as Bougainville accept that we are members of the wider community that is a coherent community that is supposed to be respecting human rights and working in partnership with all the different stakeholders.”

Other project qualities

GYPI role in any further financing for peacebuilding in Bougainville

Financing for peacebuilding in Bougainville remains constrained, based on limited GoPNG resources and a limited set of donors. PBF funding is seen by ABG partners and UN staff as critical to their ability to work together to sustain and extend the peace in inclusive ways. UN Women reported that the engagement of the second project coordinator with the Australian Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade staff in Buka helped in securing additional funding being allocated to ARoB under the Women Make the Change programme, in order to continue some of the work conducted as part of the GYPI. Interviews and document review did not turn up other examples where GYPI funding and support had catalyzed other support for UN agencies, ABG departments or CSOs in Bougainville.

Toleration and management of risk

The ProDoc considered risks, which were to be managed mainly by ensuring ABG ownership, commitment, and support for the project; and by operating within the broader One UN model. A risk management matrix was developed in the ProDoc, which identified high risks at a high likelihood of referendum postponement, capacity limitations of local partners, weak rule of law and high crime prevalence, and challenges with timely recruitment of skilled staff based on the dearth of local capacity in PNG and other risks. All of these risks were realized. A lack of political will or support for the project was considered of medium likelihood – but would have a high impact on the project if realized. Finally limits to quality information and informed political discourse at the community level and pervasive exclusion of women and youth was seen as of high likelihood, but medium risk of impact – as this was what the project was all about. Mitigating strategies were identified for these risks. GYPI staff interviewed noted monitoring and reporting on these risks.

UN agency managers in PNG were concerned and continued to monitor risks in Bougainville and in GYPI implementation. At this level, managers continued to see the environment around the referendum as risky and were concerned about the implications for their Agencies about problems in implementing GYPI. Requesting and getting the no-cost extension and making the revisions to the UN Women programme were seen as important measures in managing and reducing implementation risks.

Timeliness in responding to peacebuilding windows of opportunity

GYPI was recognized as timely by UN staff, ABG staff, and civil society partners and beneficiaries. GYPI was developed and implemented around the opportunity to take advantage of a peacebuilding windows of opportunity: the Referendum on the future status of Bougainville. RUNOs and PBSO saw the opportunity to support awareness raising of women, youth, and PLWD on the referendum as a broader opportunity to also build the capacity of women, youth, and PLWD and organisations that represent their interests as well as their interaction with ABG institutions to increase the engagement of these marginalized groups more broadly in governance and peacebuilding in Bougainville. Some key UN staff noted that partners were more engaged and interested – and implementation was stronger for the project as a consequence – as the referendum grew closer.

Gender Equality and Human Rights

Integration of gender equality into design and implementation

The GYPI Project was designed with a focus on gender equality and has been implemented with this focus, particularly in UN Women outreach to women. ABG departments affirmed the importance of gender for project design and implementation. Some beneficiary CSO leaders from youth organisations saw the involvement of both male and female youth as what was done for GE.

Did attention to gender equality advance the project's work, impact and relationships with partners and stakeholders

Gender equality was seen as a plus in the project's work for UN Women's work with the ABG, BWF, and other CSO partners. Working on GE was also used to conduct the gender assessment of the BRC's implementation of the referendum and better incorporate women in this plan. One key ABG counterpart credited the project with changing the definition of veteran in key areas of Bougainville. In Panguna, as a result of the empowerment of women that the project provided, veteran has come to include both males and females and not only actual fighters "as the women shed tears for the land and the men took up arms." This broader recognition was seen as restoring the original conception in communities in Bougainville that "men and women were partners. Along the way, this went missing and mutual respect went missing - until GYPI supported the effort to bring back respect between men and women."

Gender equality is recognized to be a large on-going need in Bougainville. While the project encouraged GE, as one youth CSO leader noted, "most of the time in B GE is not practiced. Despite these advances supported by the project, there remains tremendous amount of work to do.

Integration of human rights into the design and implementation

The GYPI Project was designed with a focus on human rights and has been implemented with this focus, particularly in support of PLWD by OHCHR. ABG partners noted that the UN is associated with understanding and supporting human rights, and that Bougainvilleans had a lot to learn about rights. Some

key staff also noted that human rights can be misinterpreted; this needs to be avoided. One ABG counterpart asserted that “by respecting human rights, we accord respect to each other and eventually we will succeed with most of the agendas and challenges we have.” This approach, they noted began to reach out beyond the ABG through the Bougainville referendum dialogue, including through GYPI. Youth CSO leaders also noted this attention to rights in the project – women’s rights as well as individual rights for young people and PLWD. Knowledge sharing was seen as how GYPI supported HR.

Did attention to human rights advance the project’s work, impact and relationships with partners and stakeholders

OHCHR, which was instrumental in developing in BDPO in Bougainville, used the approach to strengthen the organisation and reach more disabled persons. Human rights were recognized more broadly by beneficiaries interviewed. For example, leaders interviewed recognized that the Project encouraged a human rights approach of doing things in promoting participation, individual rights, political rights to vote and gender balance. Most women leaders interviewed maintained a focus on GE rather than a broader one on HR. One ABG department leader asserted that “as a result of the project there was increased respect accorded by ex-combatants for human rights, although some have still had challenges.” DPLO leaders noted the attention to the rights of the disabled worked to support them through this rights-based approach.

7. LESSONS LEARNED

Sustained UN engagement and partnerships through successive mechanisms and projects builds relationships with key partners in Bougainville that can effectively support shared goals through PBF funding.

The UN has been engaged in peacebuilding in Bougainville continuously through different mechanisms for almost twenty years. Partnerships with the UN are critical to ABG Departments and CSOs that see multilateral funding as critical as alternatives to the few bilateral diplomatic and development partners that work in Bougainville in an environment where these organisations have uncertain funding from the GoPNG and few other resources.

UN Agencies and their partners in Bougainville have processes, products, and relationships that can effectively reach women, youth and PLWD to support awareness, engagement, and participation in community and ARoB affairs.

GYPI support was effective in activating approaches that worked to reach women, youth and PLWD in Bougainville to encourage their peaceful participation in discussion and debate on the key issue in the region – the December 2019 Referendum on autonomy or independence. Engagement at the local community level worked to also produce engagement in the regional referendum that encompassed all Bougainville.

Long-lead times are important for successful project implementation and results in Bougainville.

RUNOs applied for funding from the PBF in late 2017, with the target date for the referendum more than 18 months off. PBF funding thus came with sufficient time to staff up, implement, and adjust as needed in the challenging context of Bougainville which makes the implementation of project particularly difficult because of the limited number of partners, limited capacity of these partners, and limited funding that they and others can contribute to inclusive participation as well as the challenging geography and limited set of potential service providers in Bougainville. The processes required for hiring international staff for project implementation are lengthy and led to delays in startup of implementation.

The limited number of key partners in Bougainville can be overburdened by UN and other development partner priorities and partnerships to the detriment of project implementation.

Bougainville is a small, post-conflict, under-developed archipelago, with consequently a limited number of professional managers in the ABG and civil society that are well equipped to work with UN projects. The ABG is also limited in its ability to coordinate and communicate across and within departments. All development partners working in Bougainville wind up turning to the same small set of people that lead key CSOs or government departments. While there are few donor programmes in Bougainville, there are still more than these key partners can smoothly cooperate with in the development and implementation of activities. The spread of GYPI activities across different institutional ABG partners and the limited number of busy key ABG leaders that were essential in project implementation impeded project execution and quality.

UN agency-developed products are valued by government partners, but partners may not be able to continue these approaches and develop follow-on products in current conditions in Bougainville.

The limited number of key ABG counterpart staff, the ways the institutional set up of the ABG divides up work with women, youth, the disabled, peace, community government, and community development, and extremely limited financing for the ABG makes it difficult for ABG partners to continue GYPI approaches and programs or to follow up on them with new programming after the project concludes.

Management takes resources; RUNOs should budget for staff to manage projects in their proposals for PBF funding and elaborate processes and procedures to manage joint projects in joint fashion.

RUNOs approached staffing the GYPI in different ways based on assumptions and incomplete understanding of what was possible through the PBF. While PBF materials provide guidance, RUNO leaders did not have a clear understanding or a common understanding about how – and how much – resources from the PBF could appropriately be committed to fund the staff needed for project implementation in the competition for PBF-funding. This staff is particularly important in demanding contexts for implementation like Bougainville. UN agencies should assess how to best distribute international and national staff across RUNOs and work together create an effective combination of staff within the budget available for projects. UN agencies need to determine ways to support integration of programming in joint projects and facilitate working together across agencies.

UN agencies appreciate the support of the PBF for peacebuilding and joint programming.

UN agencies have historically operated largely independently in programming in PNG. The move to joint programming with a One UN approach is challenging for agencies. UN agency staff in Bougainville appreciate the start they can and have made in these areas with PBF-funded projects as well as the support of the DPPA staffer in Bougainville. Support for gender mainstreaming and peacebuilding is crucial, and difficult to come by for Agencies; PBF funding is critical.

Limited coordination amongst UN agencies and implementing partners was challenging and may have limited potential results.

Despite the management structures of the project and working in close quarters together in Buka, project staff reported that coordination between UN agencies as well as between IPs was limited in GYPI in ways that made it harder for ABG departments and the project's main CSO partners to plan and implement activities. Better coordination has the potential to amplify project results.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

UN agencies and the PBF should continue to support peacebuilding work in Bougainville particularly engagement between the ABG and GoPNG on the steps that follow the referendum's endorsement of independence by Bougainvilleans.

Successful conduct of the referendum may have been one of the more straightforward challenges for inclusive participation in Bougainville. Elections of the ABG president and members of the BHOR are more competitive than the binary choice at the Bougainville level on autonomy or independence offered in the referendum. Social tensions may grow with potential frustrations over unmet expectations in the wake of the referendum and continued tensions over limited GoPNG funding for the ABG in the difficult economic situation in the country, now aggravated further by COVID-19. With continued budget constraints, the GoPNG may not fulfill its commitments to the ABG, keeping budgets tight. This could limit the financing for the ABG elections, particularly for awareness raising for women, youth, and PLWD in remote communities – which also may be some of the areas and social groups at higher risks of violence around the competition for office. This may include violence against women, perhaps especially for women contestants for open seats that some men and youth reportedly consider different from the three seats reserved for women.

Lessons and experience from the GYPI project should be used to raise awareness on the importance of inclusive participation of women, youth and PLWD in post-referendum discussions and the 2020 ABG elections.

GYPI activities demonstrated that UN agencies could capably work with ABG departments and civil society to raise awareness via trainings and community dialogues. With face to face methods apparently preferred by project beneficiaries, UN agencies should consider using these methods going forward to ensure that participation is inclusive of women, youth and PLWD.

UN agencies and the PBF should continue to focus on supporting sustainable capacity development of ABG departments, the BHOR, and CSOs in Bougainville.

Supporting the people of Bougainville on their rights, roles and responsibilities as citizens and developing accountability structures is a long-term endeavor, and challenging in the context of weak, underfunded GoPNG and ABG institutions, a complex and fragmented post-conflict human geography, difficult physical geography, and a limited set of international donors. There is little evidence that people across the archipelago, especially women, young people, and the disabled, are getting the information, education and acculturation that makes them aware of their rights, roles and responsibilities or that they have access to inclusive ways to effectively exercise these rights in their communities and the ARoB absent UN support. Accountability mechanisms for government departments are seldom discussed. UN agencies should work to develop longer-term ways and more sustainable approaches that spread information and awareness about civic engagement and activism. UN agencies should continue developing approaches to support civic engagement in longer-term ways that emphasize sustainability through ABG institutions and civil society organisations. And UN organisations should step up work with ABG institutions not only on ways to work with citizens but how to be accountable to citizens.

The PBF should consider developing funding instruments with longer time frames – or making it clear that a sequence of awards is envisioned - as peacebuilding problems and opportunities in Bougainville are not of short duration.

The main peacebuilding challenges in Bougainville are longstanding. Sustained, long-term support is needed to assist ABG institutions, civil society organisations, and the people of Bougainville to address them. Although PBF instruments are short term by design, the PBF has adjusted by contributing a sequence of successive projects to peacebuilding in Bougainville. UN agencies, GoPNG and ABG partners, and CSOs recognize that they would benefit from longer-term more consistent funding for initiatives in these areas that remain long-term peacebuilding priorities in Bougainville today. Longer-term projects – or assurances that the PBF will likely support two sequential short-term projects towards a goal – may be called for.

RUNOs should develop ways to strengthen activity implementation in Bougainville by systematically planning realistic activities in a comprehensive way with all stakeholders and then ensuring that all partners carry out their roles effectively.

Although UN staff, implementing partners in the ABG and from CSOs, and beneficiaries of GYPI praised the project, many noted how problems in the implementation of the project hampered efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. RUNOs should develop ways to improve implementation to avoid logistical problems that affected many activities – from challenges with transportation or reimbursements, issues with participant mobilisation, challenges paying vendors and DSA, and targeting similar participants for effective programming. RUNOs need to work with IPs to ensure that the activities are realistic and that plans are comprehensive and understood by all stakeholders. IPs need to know and be capable of delivering on all of their responsibilities. RUNOs need ways to mobilise staff more quickly for Bougainville and facilitate their effective start up in the ARoB.

RUNOs should develop management structures to strengthen joint programming and the overall integration and implementation of joint programming.

GYPI as designed had more than one RUNO contributing to many discrete key activities and outputs; however, it seems the collaboration in the project was limited to late in implementation and examples surfaced where limited communication hampered GYPI engagements of different RUNOs with the same limited set of key ABG partners. RUNOs should consider developing and institutionalizing more effective management and coordination, perhaps through a lead person from one agency with a dual reporting system for other agencies (where staff would report to the lead in the ARoB as well as to the Agency in Port Moresby). The complicated framework of the joint project demanded greater attention to coordination and joint program implementation than was provided during much of the GYPI.

The PBF should continue to fund joint projects and should consider providing additional support for UN Country Teams – as well as make the support that is already available more widely known - to support the joint development, management, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting of projects that have more than one RUNO. This support is even more valuable when project implementation is distant from the UNCT as in Bougainville.

UN agencies are used to working independently on projects to support their missions and mandates. Joint operations are more challenging. And peacebuilding is already a challenging area for UN Agencies. PBF joint projects are thus challenging for RUNOs because they are joint as well as operation in the difficult technical area of peacebuilding. Bougainville projects have an added layer of difficulty due to the remoteness from Agency headquarters' in Port Moresby. PBF funds can support UNCTs to bring additional staff into in the development, implementation, reporting, and monitoring of joint projects in peacebuilding to strengthen the ability of RUNOs to work jointly and to support peacebuilding in consistent, joint ways. PBF needs to make these resources known to UNCTs and RUNOs, who do not seem to know that PBF already can provides support for UNCTs through a Design, Monitoring & Evaluation support project, including a Programme Support Roster of peacebuilding experts can aid project development, monitoring and evaluation.

To enhance the independence, evaluation governance, and support robust financing of evaluations, PBSO should consider funding evaluation of PBF-funded projects through PBSO rather than through RUNOs that manage PBF-funded projects and playing a larger role in the development of evaluation TORs and inception reports.

PBSO are key consumers and users of evaluations of PBF-funded projects. To support robust, independent evaluation across the portfolio of PBF-funded projects, PBSO should consider investing the evaluation funding and function within the PBF. This would increase the independence of evaluators from RUNOs, make it clear that evaluations are not only for individual agencies, enhance the consistency of PBF evaluations, and may make it more likely that evaluations are conducted with the kinds of robust evaluation governance that the PBSO prefers. PBSO funding could also ensure that evaluations are funded at levels adequate to produce high-quality findings, conclusions, lessons, and recommendations based on robust fieldwork and participatory evaluation methods. Greater PBSO engagement in the development of evaluation TORs and inception reports can increase the utility of evaluations for PBSO

and strengthen the consistency of the evaluations of PBF-funded projects. A larger role for PBSO may be particularly important and useful for evaluations of joint projects. Evaluations will still require substantial collaboration and cooperation with RUNOs to be carried out fairly and successfully.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy: End of Project Evaluation Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative: PBF/IRF-204: Empower women and youth for a free, fair, transparent and violence-free Referendum

Location:	Bougainville (with travel to other locations in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville), Papua New Guinea
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract (IC)
Project:	Peacebuilding Fund project
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date:	3 rd February, 2020
Duration of Initial Contract:	1 st February to 3 rd March (30 working days)

1. BACKGROUND

AROB's autonomous status was established out of a decade long armed conflict fought from 1988 to 1998 between Papua New Guinea (PNG) and the Bougainville Revolutionary Army, for Bougainville's independence from PNG. The Bougainville Conflict, the largest conflict in Oceania since the end of World War II, resulted in a death toll of approximately 20,000 people and over 70,000 people displaced. The armed conflict ended with the signing of the Bougainville Peace Agreement (BPA) in 2001. The BPA consists of three pillars: 1) Autonomy, 2) Referendum, and 3) Modalities for disarmament and weapons disposal.

The Referendum, which will include an option for independence was held on 23 November 2019, with the 97% of the Bougainvilleans opting for independence. The post Referendum era still poses potential threat for renewed conflict with tensions rising around renewed talks to open the Panguna Copper Mine (PCM). The PCM was a critical trigger to the Bougainville conflict. PCM is one of the largest copper reserves in the world, having estimated reserves of 1 billion tonnes of ore (graded at 35%) and 12 million oz. of gold. The mine has remained closed since 1989 because of the conflict; at that time, PCM, alone, generated over 40 per cent of PNG's GDP.

Women and youth, comprising approximately 67% of the population, represent a significant proportion of the voting population in Bougainville, but there is no systematic approach on how to engage them. Real and effective engagement of women and youth during the preparations for the Referendum is critical to sustained peace in Bougainville. During community consultations undertaken by UN Women, UNFPA, and OHCHR in April 2017 for this project proposal, it was revealed that the majority of Bougainville's youth of today were not yet born or were very young during the conflict, and thus have no recollection of it. Limited access to quality education, high levels of adolescent pregnancies, high unemployment rates, and lack of engagement in political forums, leaves a large majority of Bougainville's youth feeling disenfranchised, voiceless, and disconnected to political processes, including the upcoming Referendum. Access to information on the status of the implementation of the BPA is very limited amongst the public with limited information effectively communicated by officials. Consultations with youth advocates revealed that young Bougainvilleans had a low understanding on processes related to the Referendum, and the implications of the result of the Referendum.

This is a PBF project and it is one of several PBF projects. This project's focus on strengthening the engagement of women and youth in the Referendum process directly corresponds with key

recommendations by the Electoral Needs Assessment Mission (NAM) in February 2015 to AROB, which was deployed by the UN at the request of the National Government. These key recommendations included: prioritizing Referendum preparation, and including women, youth, and persons with disabilities in all key discussions on the Referendum.

(i) GYPI Rationale

Aligned with the BPA, the proposed Project aimed to support inclusive participation, preparation, and institutional readiness to realize a successful Referendum, by focusing on the engagement of women and youth in this process, a significant gap which remains overlooked. Women and youth (more specifically described below) make-up a significant proportion of the population eligible to vote in the Referendum, and this project aims to build on and go beyond the achievements and interventions of other PBF-funded projects in the region, by focusing efforts directly on women and youth, to ensure social cohesion through their active involvement and ownership in the Referendum process.

In the context of the Project, social cohesion means increased inclusion and participation of women and youth at the community level, including in leadership and conflict management roles. This is to address the limited effective representation of women and youth in community governance structures. When women and youth understand their human rights and their role as Rights Holders in relation to peacebuilding and the Referendum, a conducive environment will help translate their understanding and beliefs to exercise their civic duties and human rights, to contribute to peacebuilding in the pre and post Referendum period. The project provided the opportunities and incentives to support social cohesion, through leadership training, use of established networks and community conversations for increased engagement of women and youth to bring about increased participation in the Referendum.

By focusing interventions in Central and South Bougainville, two of lesser-developed regions of Bougainville, this project seeks to reach the most disenfranchised women and youth in AROB and support their participation in the Referendum. Within those groups, women and youth networks, to engage with the most disenfranchised women and youth, including those with disabilities and those unemployed, out-of-school, and on the fringes of society.

(ii) Project Outcomes

With the above in mind, there were two key outcomes to which the project was designed to contribute:

Outcome 1

ABG institutions are increasingly accountable to women and youth for a free and fair Referendum.

Outcome 2

Women and youth effectively participate in delivering a violence-free Referendum in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The overall purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative in Bougainville in order to determine how the impact aligned with the project outcomes. The evaluation will examine who benefited, how resources were utilised and how partnerships contributed to the project.

The findings from the evaluation will be used by UN Women, UNFPA and OHCHR to inform future programme planning and implementation.

Joint monitoring was conducted at different intervals to assess the project's level of progress. In June 2018, a baseline study was conducted to establish official baseline data for the project. No midterm evaluation was conducted due to the short timeframe of the project. Instead, the midterm evaluation was substituted with periodic monitoring missions and a project retreat in February 2019 to review the project progress.

(i) Evaluation Objectives

- i. Assess the relevance of each RUNO's contribution to the intervention in context of the post conflict situation in Bougainville relating to the referendum. Further alignment with international agreements and conventions on GEWE and youth participation in peacebuilding.
- ii. Assess effectiveness and organizational in progressing towards the achievement of GEWE and youth empowerment results as defined in the intervention.
- iii. Assess efficiency and organizational in progressing towards the achievement of GEWE and youth empowerment results as defined in the intervention.
- iv. Assess the sustainability of the intervention in achieving sustained GEWE and youth empowerment.
- v. Determine the impact of the intervention with respect to GEWE and youth empowerment.
- vi. Analyze how human rights approach and gender equality principles are integrated in implementation.
- vii. Identify and validate lessons learned, good practices, examples, and innovations of efforts that support gender equality, human rights and youth empowerment.
- viii. Provide actionable recommendations for UN Women, UNFPA and OHCHR with respect to each agency's work in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville.

(ii) Scope

The evaluation will be conducted at the end of the project and will cover the entire cycle of the project. It will take into consideration activities conducted across the entire region (Autonomous Region of Bougainville), evaluating the reach of the project in the process.

The Autonomous Region of Bougainville has (3), regions, (13) districts 33 constituencies and over 450 Wards. Decision on the specific locations for the evaluation will be proposed by the by the project RUNOs and agreed with the PBF Secretariat based on the methodology and the proposed sample size. The GYPI Project envisages representation of the three regions for this exercise, as well as a specific focus on Buka, and the ABG and its respective departments.

In accordance with the evaluation objectives and guided by the OECD DAC Evaluation Criteria, the following key areas will be examined as indicated below:

- 1. Relevance:** Is the GYPI Project intervention doing the right things? The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries 'of the Bougainville pre

referendum context and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change Further assess the following:

Quality and Relevance of Design:

- Assess the appropriateness and relevance of the project design to the project outcome and deliverables. This will include an examination of the theory of change, and testing the hypotheses that informed it
- The project context, threats and opportunities over the life cycle of the project.
- Did the project make a difference in terms of peacebuilding and did its interventions lead to peace-relevant changes and how?
- is the project relevant vis-à-vis the conflict causes/factors and the peacebuilding priorities of the two Governments and the beneficiary communities?

2. **Coherence:** How well does the intervention fit. The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a Bougainville context in the various social sector or and the relevant ABG government strategies

- Assess whether the objectives remained valid over the course of the project, and whether adjustments were made.
- Assess the theory of change of the project, and further testing the hypotheses of the project that informed it.

3. **Effectiveness:** Is the intervention achieving its objectives? The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. Furthermore, assess the major achievements of the project in relation to its stated objectives and intended results. As far as possible, this should be a systematic assessment of progress based on monitoring data, including:

- Higher-level results.
- Key achievements and their importance/relevance.
- Include qualitative evidence where possible, i.e. opinions on the project's effectiveness based on interviews with key partners and beneficiaries.
- Describe any major failures of the project and why they may have occurred.
- Assess other programme management factors important for delivery, such as:
- Capacity gaps (these could be in the project team, other internal functions such as HR or Finance, or external organisations as appropriate).
- Working relationships within the team.
- Working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors.
- Learning processes such as self-evaluation, coordination and exchange with related projects.
- Internal and external communication.
- What is the project level of collaboration and complementarity with the other PBF project in Bougainville as well as any other relevant peacebuilding related projects, including the UN Electoral project?

4. **Efficiency:** How well are resources being used? Efficiency of planning and implementation.

Were plans used, implemented and adapted as necessary? For example:

- Was the overall project work plan used?
- What percentage of activities in the work plan were delivered?

- Were project financial expenditures in line with the activity plan?
 - Was monitoring data being collected as planned, stored and used to inform plans? If not, why? If yes, how?
 - Assess whether the project can be considered as delivering value for money for its present scope/ scale of impact:
 - To what extent were resources used economically to deliver the project?
 - What are the cost implications for scaling up impact?
 - Are there savings that could have been made without compromising delivery?
5. **Impact:** What difference does the intervention make? The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.
- Describe any unforeseen impacts or unintended consequences (whether positive or negative).
 - Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted e.g. case-studies, stories, best practice.
6. **Sustainability:** The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue. Potential for sustainability, replication and expansion? Will the benefits last? Assess the key factors affecting sustainability of the project, such as:
- The social and political environment/ acceptance and subnational ownership of the project.
 - Has/will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organisations could/ will ensure continuity of project activities in the project area?
 - Is there evidence of organisations/partners/communities that have copied, up scaled or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area? Is such replication or magnification likely?
 - Assess and make recommendations on the key strategic options for the future of the project i.e. exit strategy, replication, scale-up, continuation.
 - Comment on any existing plans
 - Make additional recommendations, including broader recommendations on each UN agencies presence and work in the region.
7. **Other project qualities.** Furthermore, the evaluations will assess the evaluation should also look at to what extent the project leveraged the specific role of the PBF as a donor, including:
- To what extent was the project catalytic of further financing or of peacebuilding processes?
 - To what extent was the project risk-tolerant?
 - To what extent was the project timely in responding to peacebuilding windows of opportunity?
8. **Gender equality and human rights.** The evaluation will also further assess gender equality and human rights:
- To what extent were gender and human rights integrated into the project design and implementation?

- How did attention to gender equality and human rights advance the project's work, impact and relationships with partners/stakeholders?

(iii) Evaluation design

The evaluation will utilise a non-experimental design, which examines the efficacy of the project and makes forward looking recommendations for UN Women, UNDP and OHCHR implementation in AROB. Data collection will include a review of project documents, key informant interviews and, where possible and deemed relevant, focus group discussions (FGDs).

Clear ethical guidelines should be followed and implemented, obtaining consent from any individuals interviewed or included in FGDs. The evaluation should be gender and youth responsive, as outlined in the evaluation objectives, using a participatory methodology where possible/relevant. Any limitations in the design should be clearly stated and data should be triangulated to enhance the robustness of the data.

(iv) Stakeholder Participation

- The evaluator will work with the project team, including other agencies: UN Head of Office in Bougainville (Political Liaison Officer) to conduct a stakeholder analysis, which will include project staff, beneficiaries and partners across all three RUNOs project deliverables. PBSO team will be consulted and provide inputs into the evaluation deliverables.

(v) Deliverables

Activities and Responsibilities

The evaluator will work with UNFPA to execute the following tasks:

a) Preparations

- Conduct a desk review of past reports, the project results framework, project activity documentation produced by RUNOs and other documents including the baseline and the monitoring mission reports.
- Develop a methodology for the evaluation, evaluation matrix and data collection tools.
- Develop relevant qualitative and quantitative data collection tools.
- Conduct an inception workshop/consultation with key project stakeholders.

b) Data Collection

- Data Collection
- Clean and compile raw data

c) Analyse & Report

- Data analysis
- Develop a report outlining the methodology, key findings and recommendations

The consultancy is estimated to take 30 days, but there may be some flexibility in the duration depending on submitted proposals and suggested methodologies.

(vi) Documentation available for the analysis:

- GYPI ProDoc

- Baseline Evaluation Report
- Monitoring reports x 3
- Monthly reports
- Mission and Activity reports
- PBF 6 monthly and annual reports
- PBF End of project report
- GYPI monitoring and evaluation Plan and Results Framework

(vii) Evaluation Management

(i) Supervision

The End-of-Project Evaluation will be executed under the direct supervision of the UNFPA GYPI focal point with on the ground support from available RUNO (UN Women and OHCHR) PBF focal point. Further support will be given by the Port Moresby Technical team where necessary support though the duration of the evaluation. The UNFPA AROB focal point Officer will provide further information on project activities and stakeholders, and will facilitate liaison with implementing partners and beneficiaries.

(ii) Reporting

The evaluator hired will report directly to the UNFPA GYPI focal point through the UNFPA AROB focal point in Bougainville. They will report progress on a weekly basis and will work in close liaison with the UNFPA GYPI focal point throughout the evaluation.

(viii) Duration of work

The consultancy is estimated to take 30 days over a period of 6 weeks for the IC consultant and for their team (2x local consultant to be arranged by UNFPA. although the exact number of days and team composition may be proposed by the bid and in accordance with the deliverables in these TORs). The work schedule proposes the duration of work within this timeframe immediately after the contract is signed. The work is estimated to commence no later than February 2020.

Timing of roles and responsibilities

Results	Weeks after signing contract
Preparations including the submission of the inception report	Week 1
Data Collection	Week 2 – 3 (14 Days)
Analysis	Week 4
Reporting	Week 4 - 5
Any final amendments following feedback from stakeholders	Week 5 – 6 (7 days)

(ix) Evaluation team composition, skills and experience

(i) Structure

The evaluation team will be composed of a lead evaluator (identified through this TOR) and two local consultants who will act as research assistants. The lead evaluator will have experience evaluating peacebuilding projects, with a particular focus on gender, youth and governance. Field experience in crisis or post-conflict settings with strong networks in Bougainville and the ability to assemble a field team quickly in the region are preferable (with support from UNFPA, who will provide a list of possible local team members).

(ii) Qualification and Experience Required

Experience:

- Should have at least a minimum of 5 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation and research, including survey design and conduct, data analysis and report writing.
- Should have solid experience in gender and youth-responsive analysis.

Education:

- Hold a university degree (Bachelor), preferably in social sciences, statistics, demography, political science, law, international relations, public administration or economics and a thorough knowledge of qualitative methodologies.

Competencies:

- Good understanding of peacebuilding, gender and human rights issues, particularly in conflict settings and governance, and experience in Bougainville, are highly desirable.
- High level planning, organizational and time management skills, including flexibility, attention to detail and the ability to work under pressure to meet challenging deadlines.
- Excellent interpersonal skills, including ability to establish strong cooperative relationships with senior government officials, civil society and donors.
- Ability to quickly adapt to change, and to remain calm under pressure.
- Proven cross-cultural communication and the ability to function effectively in an international, multicultural environment.

(x) Ethical Code of Conduct

The evaluator and the team are required to abide the by the UNFPA PSEA code of conduct and other UNEG guidelines and UN system codes of conduct throughout the duration of the assignment.

(xi) Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The contract price is a fixed price based on the results, with the length of service being approximate.

The budget submission should include all costs to allow the implementation of activities provided for in Sections C and F, such as professional fees for team members, travel expenses, attachments, multiplication of survey questionnaires, etc.

The payment schedule will be directly related to the deliverable submissions, progress report after the baseline report is completed, and certification by the UNFPA GYPI focal point is done.

Activities/Weeks/Days	Duration	Amount	Weeks (%)
Tr 1			
Preparations (Desk Review and development of methodology and	Week 1	Tr 1	30%

submission of Inception report,)			
Data Collection	Week 2	Tr 2	20%
Analysis & Submission of Final Report	Week 6	Tr 3	50%
TOTAL	100%		
			100%

3. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weighting; 70%

* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

Criteria	Points	Percentage
Qualification		15%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold a university degree (Bachelor), preferably in social sciences, statistics, demography, political science, law, international relations, public administration or economics and a thorough knowledge of qualitative methodologies. 	15	
Experience		30%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should have at least a minimum of 7 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation and research, including survey design and conduct, data analysis and report writing. 	30	
Competencies		25%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good understanding of issues on peacebuilding and governance and experience in Bougainville are highly desirable. High level planning, organizational and time management skills, including flexibility, attention to 	5 5 5	

detail and the ability to work under pressure to meet challenging deadlines; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent interpersonal skills, including ability to establish strong cooperative relationships with senior government officials, civil society and donors; ▪ Ability to quickly adapt to change, and to remain calm under pressure; and ▪ Proven cross-cultural communication and the ability to function effectively in an international, multicultural environment. 	5 5	
Technical Criteria Total		70%
**If necessary, interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.		
Financial Criteria – Lowest Price from a best candidate		30%
Total -Technical and Financial		100%

Documents to be included when submitting Consultancy Proposals

The following documents may be requested:

- Duly executed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNFPA.
- Signed Curriculum vitae** indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment. Highlights of the relevant expertise and understanding of the TORs.

Once short listed the Incumbent will be required to provide a detail of approach and a draft methodology proposed for the overall data collection based on the evaluation questions and work plan outline with composition of the proposed team.

Financial Proposal short listed incumbent will be required to provide financial proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

Lump-sum contracts

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump-sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump-sum amount (including travel, living expenses, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNFPA should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket; should the IC wish to travel on a higher class, they should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging, and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

ANNEX 2: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

United Nations (UN) Documents

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). June 2010. *Quality Checklist for Evaluation ToR and Inception Report*. New York: UN. <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/608>

UNEG. June 2016. *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*. New York: UN. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

UNEG. August 2014. *UNEG Handbook for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Perspectives in Evaluations*. New York: UN. <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

UNEG. June 2010. *UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports*. New York: UN. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/608>

UNDP. December 2017. Project Document: Papua New Guinea – Project Title - Bougainville Referendum Support Project. Port Moresby: UNDP. <https://info.undp.org/docs/pdc/Documents/PNG/Bougainville%20Referendum%20Support%20-%20Project%20Document%20-%20SIGNED%2019Dec2017.pdf>

GYPI Documents

PBF Project Progress Report, Final, Country Papua New Guinea, February 2020

Financial Report, February 2020

PBF Project Progress Report, Annual, Country Papua New Guinea, 15 November 2019

Financial Report, November 2019

PBF Project Progress Report, Semi-Annual, Country Papua New Guinea, 15 June 2019

Financial Report, June 2019

Annual Work Plan, 2018

Bougainville Peacebuilding Fund Programme, Monthly/Quarterly Staff Progress Reports

IRF Revised Project Document, United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)/Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), Project Title: Enhancing Youth Participation in the 2017 Legislative and Presidential Electoral Process

IRF Project Document, United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)/Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), Project Title:

Baseline Assessment

Self-Management Clinic Training Reports

Monitoring Mission reports

Youth Policy Review paper

End-line assessment

Other training reports

Workshop reports

UN Women Justification for Adaptation of Activities and Results Framework 2019

ANNEX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

UN Organisations

UNFPA

Steven Paniu, Assistant Representative
Emmanuel-Carlos Kaetavara

UN Women

Gabrielle John, former Consultant, former Program Coordinator
June Su, former UN Volunteer former Program Coordinator
Susan Jane Ferguson, Country Representative
Adekemi Ndieli, former Deputy Country Representative

OHCHR

Alithia Barampataz, Human Rights officer
Stewart Kotsin Human Rights Analyst
Kedar Poudyal, Human Rights Adviser to the UN Country Team

Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)

Jelena Zelenovic, Peacebuilding Officer, UN Peacebuilding Fund
Anna-Lena Schluchter, Associate Peacebuilding Officer, UN Peacebuilding Fund

Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA)

Rui Flores, Peacebuilding Coordinator, Bougainville

ABG, CSO, and GYPI Beneficiaries in Bougainville

Sister Lorraine Garasu, Founder, NCFR, Selau, North Bougainville
Janice Rade, Secretary, Wakunai District Youth Association (DYA), Wakunai, Central Bougainville
Alphonse Ovi, President Wakunai District Youth Association, Wakunai, Central Bougainville
Christine Simiha, Executive, Bougainville Women's Federation Kieta, Central Bougainville
Stephanie Salas, Youth Representative, Arawa Urban Youth Association, Kieta, Central Bougainville
Isabel Neriema, Former Bougainville Vice President Bougainville Disabled Persons Organisation, Kieta, Central Bougainville
Sergeant Herman Birenka, Central Regional Commander, Bougainville Police Service, Arawa, Central Bougainville
Lucy Madoi, Bougainville Women's Federation/Bougainville Disabled Persons Organisation Representative, Kieta, Central Bougainville
Gwen Kauva, District Community Development Officer (ABG Department for Community Development), Kieta, Central Bougainville
Samuel Disin, Equal Playing (NGO), Bougainville Office, Kieta, Central Bougainville
Dennis Kuiai, Former Acting Secretary, [ABG Department of Peace Agreement Implementation], , Buka, North Bougainville
John Sipure, Community Government Officer, Siwai South Bougainville
Donald Komoiki, Regional District Management Services (ABG Department for Community Development) , Siwai, South Bougainville
Augustine Teboro, President, Bougainville Youth Federation Buin, South Bougainville
Clarence Vinoko, Executive Buin Urban Youth Association , Buin, South Bougainville
Anasthacia Diou, Youth Representative, Buin Urban Youth Association Buin, South Bougainville
Nicholas Makei, Youth Representative, Buin District Youth Association, Buin, South Bougainville

Joyceanne Tuga, Youth Representative, Buin District Youth Association, Buin, South Bougainville
Albert Kareba, Nazereth Center for Rehabilitation Community Counsellor [Human Rights/Male Advocate], Buin, South Bougainville
Hon. Isabel Peta, Regional Member for South Bougainville Women, Bougainville House of Representatives, Buin, South Bougainville
John Nomokreke, District Community Development Officer (ABG Department for Community Development), Buin District Administration, South Bougainville
Joanne Malamo, Community Counsellor [Women Human Rights Defender], Buin South Bougainville
Laura Ampa, Community Counsellor [Women Human Rights Defender], Buin Safe House, South Bougainville
Bernard Kopana, Youth Representative, Kieta District Youth Association, Kieta, Central Bougainville
Gerard Tarcussyy, District Community Development Officer (ABG Department for Community Development)/ Acting Panguna District Administrator. Panguna, Central Bougainville
Jerome Nohu, President, Selau District Youth Association, Selau, North Bougainville
Freda Basse, Youth Executive Selau District Youth Association, Selau, North Bougainville
Jacklyne Bitom, District Community Development Officer (ABG Department for Community Development), Selau, North Bougainville
Tevaru Poroa, Youth Executive, Atolls District Youth Association, Atolls, North Bougainville
Sione Atua, President BDPO, Buka, North Bougainville
Joanita Lesi, Buka Young Women's Association, Buka, North Bougainville
Jericho Kenauts, Youth Executive Torokina Distract Youth Association, Torokina, South Bougainville
Martin Nakara, President United Bougainville Youth Federation (Independent youth NGO), Kieta Central Bougainville
Douglas Pisi, Acting Director ABG Directorate of Referendum [ABG Department of Peace Agreement Implementation], Buka, North Bougainville
Therese Kaetavara, Women Human Rights Defender, Bana, South Bougainville
Robert Tapi, Clerk, Bougainville House of Representatives, Buka, North Bougainville
Rev. Abraham Toroi, Bishop United Church, Buka, North Bougainville
Maggie Thompson, Bougainville Pentecostal Women, Buka, North Bougainville
Geraldine Valei, Secretarty, Bougainville Women's Federation, Buka, North Bougainville
Celestine Tommie, Bougainville Women's Federation President North Bougainville, Buka
Rachel Tsien, President Bougainville Women's Federation, Buka, North Bougainville
Rose Pihei, Bougainville Women's Federation, Buka, North Bougainville
Catherine Pukena, Gender Officer ABG Department for Community Development, Buka, North Bougainville
Donavan Tami, Welfare Officer [Human Rights Focal Point] (ABG Department for Community Development), Buka, North Bougainville
Tanya Lahies, ABG Directorate for Public Relations, Media and Communications, Buka
Lyn Gegera, ABG Directorate for Public Relations, Media and Communications, Buka
Hon. Simon Pentanu, Speaker, Bougainville House of Representatives

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Document review protocol

The evaluator has reviewed project produced and partner produced materials for qualitative and quantitative data directly useful for answering the evaluation questions and fulfilling the purposes of the evaluation. The review looked for evidence to fit the following categories:

Relevance

- Responsiveness to needs of beneficiaries
- Responsiveness to needs of partners
- Appropriateness of project design
- Threats and opportunities over the life cycle of the project
- Lead to peace-relevant changes in context?
- Relevance to conflict factors

Coherence

- Fit of intervention in context of other interventions
- Continued relevance of objectives?
- Theory of change fits?

Effectiveness

- Achievement of intended outcomes
- Achievement of outputs
- Any failures identified
- Programme management factors
- Collaboration/complementarity with other projects

Efficiency

- Economical use of resources
- Use of work plan
- Percentage delivery
- Financial delivery in line with activity plan
- Monitoring
- Value for money
- Potential to scale up
- Potential savings without compromising delivery

Impact

- Significant higher-level effects

Sustainability

- Continued benefits from intervention
- Acceptance and ownership
- Scale up
- Future implications

Other project qualities

Any catalytic effects

Risk tolerance

Timeliness

Gender equality and human rights

Extent integrated into design and implementation

Attention to advances of the project

Introduction and informed consent

Thank you for talking with me.

Tenk yu long toktok wantaim mi.

My name is _____. I am working independently for the United Nations to conduct an evaluation of the work conducted by UNFPA, UN Women, OHCHR and its partners through the project “Empower women and youth for a free, fair, transparent and violence-free Referendum,” known as the GYPI project.

Nem bilong mi _____. Mi ino wokman bilong United Nations tasol mi wok halivim United Nations long mekim wanpela wok painim aut igo insait long wanpela projek wok ol i kolim long “Empower women and youth for a free, fair, transparent and violence-free Referendum”, o GYPI. Dispela projek em i wanpela wok bung wantaim UNFPA, UN Women, OHCHR na ol patna bilong ol.

The goal of the review is to learn about what has been accomplished by the project, what has worked well, and what has not worked as well. Lessons from this review will be used to help the UN and their partners in future work here and around the world.

As tingting bilong dispela wok painim aut em bilong save long wanem ol samting dispela projek i bin mekim kamap, wanem ol samting i bin wok gut, na wanem ol samting ino bin wok gut tumas. Ol dispela tingting bai i halivim UN na ol patnas bilong em long kamapim ol wok long hia na long narapela hap tu.

The information collected today will only be used for the review. I will not use this information in a way that identifies you as an individual in the report.

Ol tingting mi kisim long yu tete em bai mi usim bilong dispela wok painim aut tasol. Mi nonap long kolim nem bilong yu na nogat man bai inap long luksave tu olsem yu bin givim ol dispela tingting.

This interview is entirely voluntary; you have the right to stop answering at any point without consequence. I hope to learn from your knowledge and experience with the project and its activities. Please answer Yes if you willing to participate in this study? [Ensure that participant(s) verbally agree to participate]

Dispela wok painim aut em i stap long laik bilong yu. Sapos yu no laik long toktok wantaim mi, yu ken tokaut na bai mi lusim yu or sapos yu hamamas long toktok wantaim mi, yu i gat rait long stopim mi taim u pilim olsem yu no laik moa long toktok. Ol tingting na wok bung bilong yu wantaim dispela projek bai i halivim mi tru long save moa long strong bilong projeck. [ol patisipant i mas tok aut klia olsem ol i wanbel long toktok insait long dispela wok painim aut]

Do you have any questions for me before I begin with a short list of questions to learn about the ways that you engaged with or know about the activities of the GYPI project?

Yu gat sampela askim long askim mi pastaim long umi tupela stori long tingting na luksave bilong yu wantaim dispela projek?

Semi-structured interview guide and questions

QUESTIONS FOR RUNOS AND OTHER UN INFORMANTS

Introduction

Please tell me about your experience with the project. How did you learn about the GYPI project and begin to work with the project or its activities?

Please answer our questions and discuss the project based on your specific experience with the project and its activities. We want to know about what you know, think and did with the project and its activities, as well as what your organisation did with the GYPI project.

Relevance

Do you think the project did the right things to respond to the needs of beneficiaries of the Bougainville in the pre-referendum context?

Do you think the project did the right things to respond to and partner institution needs, policies, and priorities?

Do you think the project was appropriate and relevant? Why or why not

Do you know the theory of change of the project? IF YES

How relevant was the theory of change to the design and delivery of the project? Was the theory of change used in implementation? Was the theory of change tested as data was gathered in implementation?

Did the project adjust to change in the project context and threats and opportunities over the life cycle of the project?

Did the project make a difference in terms of peacebuilding? How?

Was project relevant to addressing the causes of conflict in Bougainville and the peacebuilding priorities of the two Governments and beneficiary communities?

Coherence:

How well did GYPI's activities fit with other projects and the ABG's strategies and programmes in Bougainville?

Did objectives of the project remain valid over the course of implementation?

Were adjustments made in implementation? If so, what changes were made?

Effectiveness

Did the project achieve its objectives? Why or why not?

What do you see as the main achievements of the project based on the project's objectives?

What do you see as the key achievements of the project? What is their importance and relevance?

Were there any major failures of the project? If so, why did these failures happen?

Were there gaps in implementation that limited what the project was able to achieve? If so, what were these gaps?

Based on your experience with the Project, how were working relationships within the team?

Based on your experience with the Project, how were working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors?

Based on your experience, how effective was the project in its use of learning processes such as self-evaluation, coordination and exchange with related projects?

Based on your experience, how effective was the project in internal and external communications?

How did the project complement the other PBF project in Bougainville and other peacebuilding related projects, including the Bougainville Referendum Support Project?

Efficiency:

Were plans used, implemented and adapted as necessary?

Was the overall project work plan used?

What percentage of activities in the work plan were delivered?

Were project financial expenditures in line with the activity plan?

Was monitoring data collected and used to inform plans? If not, why not? If yes, how?

Based on your experience, do you think the project delivered value for money given its scope and scale of impact?

What did the GYPI project do to towards delivering the project with attention to the economical use of resources, such as having low costs or reaching more beneficiaries at the same cost?

What do you think it would cost to scale up the impact of GYPI in Bougainville?

In your opinion, were there savings that could have been made without compromising the delivery of GYPI? If so, what were these potential savings?

Impact:

What difference did GYPI make in Bougainville?

Did GYPI generate significant positive or negative results in Bougainville? If so, what effects do you see? If not, why not?

Were there any unforeseen impacts or unintended consequences - positive or negative – from GYPI. If so, what unintended effects do you see?

Can you identify and describe any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted from your experience with GYPI as good practices to be replicated? If so, what are these good practices?

Sustainability:

Do you think GYPI has had lasting benefits? If so, what are these benefits? Why have they been sustained?

What organisations do you think could continue project activities? Why do you think they could continue these approaches?

Do you have any evidence that organisations, partners, or communities have copied, up scaled or replicated project activities? If so, what is this evidence?

Do you think replication or magnification in the future is likely? Why or why not?

What do you think should be done to make the results of the project more sustainable now?

Based on your experience with the project, what do you prioritise for Bougainville?

What do you recommend as priorities for UNFPA in Bougainville in the future?

What do you recommend as priorities for UN Women in Bougainville in the future?

What do you recommend as priorities for OHCHR in Bougainville in the future?

Other project qualities:

Has the project led to further financing of peacebuilding in Bougainville? If so, how?

To what extent did the project tolerate and manage risk? How did the project manage risks?

Would you say the project was timely in responding to peacebuilding windows of opportunity? Why or why not?

Gender equality and human rights:

To what extent was gender equality integrated into the project's design and implementation?

How did attention to gender equality advance the project's work, impact and relationships with partners and stakeholders?

To what extent were human rights integrated into the project's design and implementation?

How did attention human rights advance the project's work, impact and relationships with partners and stakeholders?

QUESTIONS FOR KEY PARTNERS AND STAKEHOLDERS

Introduction

Please tell me about your experience with the project. How did you learn about the GYPI project and begin to work with the project or its activities?

Please answer our questions and discuss the project based on your specific experience with the project and its activities. We want to know about what you know, think and did with the project and its activities, as well as what your organisation did with the GYPI project.

Relevance

Do you think the project did the right things to respond to the needs of beneficiaries of the Bougainville in the pre-referendum context?

Do you think the project did the right things to respond to and partner institution needs, policies, and priorities?

Do you think the project was appropriate and relevant? Why or why not

Do you know the theory of change of the project? IF YES

How relevant was the theory of change to the design and delivery of the project? Was the theory of change used in implementation? Was the theory of change tested as data was gathered in implementation?

Did the project adjust to change in the project context and threats and opportunities over the life cycle of the project?

Did the project make a difference in terms of peacebuilding? How?

Was project relevant to addressing the causes of conflict in Bougainville and the peacebuilding priorities of the two Governments and beneficiary communities?

Coherence:

How well did GYPI's activities fit with other projects and the ABG's strategies and programmes in Bougainville?

Did objectives of the project remain valid over the course of implementation?

Were adjustments made in implementation? If so, what changes were made?

Effectiveness

Did the project achieve its objectives? Why or why not?

What do you see as the main achievements of the project based on the project's objectives?

What do you see as the key achievements of the project? What is their importance and relevance?

Were there any major failures of the project? If so, why did these failures happen?

Were there gaps in implementation that limited what the project was able to achieve? If so, what were these gaps?

Based on your experience with the Project, how were working relationships within the team?

Based on your experience with the Project, how were working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors?

Based on your experience, how effective was the project in its use of learning processes such as self-evaluation, coordination and exchange with related projects?

Based on your experience, how effective was the project in internal and external communications?

How did the project complement the other PBF project in Bougainville and other peacebuilding related projects, including the Bougainville Referendum Support Project?

Efficiency:

Were plans used, implemented and adapted as necessary?

Was the overall project work plan used?

What percentage of activities in the work plan were delivered?

Were project financial expenditures in line with the activity plan?

Was monitoring data collected and used to inform plans? If not, why not? If yes, how?

Based on your experience, do you think the project delivered value for money given its scope and scale of impact?

What did the GYPI project do to towards delivering the project with attention to the economical use of resources, such as having low costs or reaching more beneficiaries at the same cost?

What do you think it would cost to scale up the impact of GYPI in Bougainville?

In your opinion, were there savings that could have been made without compromising the delivery of GYPI? If so, what were these potential savings?

Impact:

What difference did GYPI make in Bougainville?

Did GYPI generate significant positive or negative results in Bougainville? If so, what effects do you see? If not, why not?

Were there any unforeseen impacts or unintended consequences - positive or negative – from GYPI. If so, what unintended effects do you see?

Can you identify and describe any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted from your experience with GYPI as good practices to be replicated? If so, what are these good practices?

Sustainability:

Do you think GYPI has had lasting benefits? If so, what are these benefits? Why have they been sustained?

What organisations do you think could continue project activities? Why do you think they could continue these approaches?

Do you have any evidence that organisations, partners, or communities have copied, up scaled or replicated project activities? If so, what is this evidence?

Do you think replication or magnification in the future is likely? Why or why not?

What do you think should be done to make the results of the project more sustainable now?

Based on your experience with the project, what do you prioritise for UN support to Bougainville?

Other project qualities:

Has the project led to further financing of peacebuilding in Bougainville? If so, how?

Would you say the project was timely in responding to peacebuilding windows of opportunity? Why or why not?

Gender equality and human rights:

How did attention to gender equality advance the project's work, impact and relationships with partners and stakeholders?

How did attention human rights advance the project's work, impact and relationships with partners and stakeholders?

QUESTIONS FOR PARTNERS, BENEFICIARIES, AND STAKEHOLDERS – IN PERSON

Introduction

How did you learn about the GYPI project and begin to work with it?

Wanem rot tru yu bin kam save long dispela projek na yu stat long wantaim projek?

Please answer questions and discuss the project based on your specific experience

Tokaut bihainim luksave bilong yu wantaim projek

Relevance

Do you think the project did the right things to respond to the needs of beneficiaries of the Bougainville in the pre-referendum context?

Yu ting projek i mekim stretpela samting long luksave na mekim kamap wok bilong stretim tingting na wari bilong ol manmeri projek i wok wantaim, insait long Bougainville long taim Bougainville iwok long rere long go long referendum?

Do you think the project did the right things to respond to and partner institution needs, policies, and priorities?

Yu ting projek i mekim stretpela samting long luksave na mekim kamap wok bilong stretim tingting na wari bilong ol patnas wer projek i wok wantaim?

Did the project adjust to change in the project context and threats and opportunities?

Taim project i wok long go het, Projek i bin mekim sampela senis tu long taim em i luksave long sampela senis ikamap long pasin na rot bilong wok?

Did the project make a difference in terms of peacebuilding? How?

Projek i mekim senis long sait bilong mekim kamap bel isi insait long ples? Long wanem kain rot tru?

Coherence:

How well did GYPI's activities fit with other projects and the ABG's strategies and programmes in Bougainville?

Wanem ol rot Projek i bihainim long wok gut tru wantaim ol narapela projek na wantaim ol plan na as tingting bilong ABG?

Effectiveness

What do you see as the key achievements of the project?

Long ai bilong yu, wanem em ol gutpela wok kamap projek i bin kamapim?

Were there any major failures? If so, why did these failures happen?

Wanem em ol sampela wok kamap projek i bin kamapim tasol ino bin kamap gut? Na wanem as tru na dispela ol wok ino bin kamap gut?

Were there gaps in implementation that limited what the project was able to achieve? If so, what were these gaps?

I bin gat ol sampela samting i bin banisim projek long mekim kamap ol wok projek i sapos long mekim?

Based on your experience with the Project, how were working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors?

Long luksave bilong yu wantaim projek, projek i gat gutpela wok bung wantaim ol patnas, ol manmeri na donors tu?

Efficiency:

Based on your experience, do you think the project delivered value for money given its scope and scale of impact?

Long luksave bilong yu wantaim projek, yu ting projek i mekim kamap wok makim moni mak projek i kisim?

What did the GYPI project do towards delivering the project with attention to the economical use of resources, such as having low costs or reaching more beneficiaries at the same cost?

Wanem ol rot tru projek i bin bihainim long mekim wok igo het wantaim liklik moni tasol projek ibin inap long halivim planti moa manmeri?

In your opinion, were there savings that could have been made without compromising the delivery of GYPI? If so, what were these potential savings?

Long tingting bilong yu, ibin gat sampela rot projek iken bihainim long savim sampela moni tasol ol iken halivim planti moa manmeri?

Impact:

Did GYPI generate significant positive or negative results in Bougainville? If so, what effects do you see? If not, why not?

Projek ibin kamapim sampela ol gutpela na nogut kaikai bilong wok tu? Wanem ol dispela kaikai bilong wok?

Were there any unforeseen impacts or unintended consequences - positive or negative – from GYPI. If so, what unintended effects do you see?

Wanem ol sampela gutpela na nogut samting projek ino bin lukim olsem bai ikamap tasol ibin kamap taim projek ibin wok? Em ol wanem samting tru?

Can you identify and describe any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted from your experience with GYPI as good practices to be replicated? If so, what are these good practices?

Inap yu luksave na tokaut long ol gutpela wok wer projek in bin memkim kamap na imas kamap moa yet? Wanem ol dispela gutpela wok kamap?

Sustainability:

Do you think GYPI has had lasting benefits? If so, what are these benefits? Why have they been sustained?

Yu ting GYPI igat ol gutpela bilong em wer bai istap longpela taim ikam? Sapos igat, wane mol dispela gutpela bilong projek? Long wanem rot tru ol dispela gutpela samting projek i mekim bai ken stap longpela taim ikam?

What do you think should be done to make the results of the project more sustainable now?

Wanem samting yu ting imas kamap long mekim ol gutpela senis projek ikapim pinis long stap olsem longpela taim?

Based on your experience with the project, what do you prioritise for UN support to Bougainville?

Long luksave bilong yu wantaim projek, wanem kain wok bai yu putim igo pas aninit long sapot bilong UN igo long Bougainville?

Other project qualities:

Would you say the project was timely in responding to peacebuilding windows of opportunity? Why or why not?

Yu ting yu ken tok olsem projek i bin makim kamap wok bilong kamapim bel isi long taim dispela kain wok imas kamap?

sGender equality and human rights:

How did attention to gender equality advance the project's work, impact and relationships with partners and stakeholders?

Long wanem rot tru projek taim i givim luksave long gat wankain luksave long man na meri, i halivim projek long wok bilong em na wok bung bilong em wantaim ol patnas?

How did attention to human rights advance the project's work, impact and relationships with partners and stakeholders?

Long wanem rot tru projek taim i givim luksave long human rights, i halivim projek long wok bilong em na wok bung bilong em wantaim ol patnas?