

FINAL REPORT

End of Project Evaluation

Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative: PBF/IRF-255:

Strengthening the Role of Women and Youth as Peace Builders
to Improve Development in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea

United Nations Population Fund

Dr Lawrence Robertson

Dr Pamela Kamya

Mr Lyndel Toidalema

Independent Contractors/Evaluators

June 2021

DISCLAIMER

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

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Executive summary	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. Background and Context	1
2.1 <i>Background</i>	1
2.2 <i>Context</i>	2
3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives	3
3.1 <i>Scope</i>	3
3.2 <i>Objectives</i>	4
4. Evaluation Approach and Methods	5
4.1 <i>Stakeholder Analysis and Sampling Approach</i>	5
4.2 <i>Data collection</i>	5
4.3 <i>Limitations and their Management</i>	6
4.4 <i>Ethics</i>	7
5. Data Analysis	7
6. Findings and Conclusions	8
6.1 <i>Relevance</i>	8
6.2 <i>Coherence</i>	13
6.3 <i>Effectiveness</i>	16
6.4 <i>Efficiency</i>	27
6.5 <i>Impact</i>	31
6.6 <i>Sustainability</i>	36
6.7 <i>Gender Equality and Human Rights</i>	37
6. Lessons Learned	39
7. Recommendations	43
Annex 1: Terms of Reference (TOR)	48
Annex 2: List of Documents Consulted	59
Annex 3: List of Sites Visited, Interviews and Focus Groups	61
Annex 4: Evaluation Instruments	63

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CA	Coordinating Agency
CFT	Community Facilitation Team
CM	Community Mobiliser
CPDP	Community Peace for Development Plan
CSCM	Centre for Social and Creative Media
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DISP	District Services Improvement Program
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ET	Evaluation Team
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GBV	Gender-based Violence
GEWE	Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment
GoPNG	Government of Papua New Guinea
GPAT	Grassroot Peace Action Team
GYPI	Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative
HCPR	Highlands Centre for Peace and Reconciliation
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IP	Implementing Partner
IRF	Immediate Response Fund
KII	Key Informant Interview
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
LEP	Learning Empowerment and Protection
LLGs	Local Level Governments
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PCW	Provincial Council of Women
PBF	Peacebuilding Fund
PBSO	Peacebuilding Support Office
PCC	Project Coordination Committee
PNG	Papua New Guinea
RUNO	Recipient United Nations Organisation
SARV	Sorcery Accusation-Related Violence
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
SHP	Southern Highlands Province
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
USD	United States Dollar

Acknowledgements

The Evaluation Team would like to thank all of the people from UN agencies (IOM, UN Women and UNFPA), GoPNG, Southern Highlands Provincial Government, Hela Provincial Government, churches, faith-based organisations, civil society organisations, Provincial Council of Women, youth organisations, implementing partners (IPs), and beneficiaries for their participation in the GYPI Project evaluation in Southern Highlands and Hela Province. The Team appreciates their honesty and open sharing of their experiences and insights into the Project.

Executive summary

A team of three independent consultants conducted the final evaluation of the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI) Highlands Project in Papua New Guinea (PNG) from March to May 2021. The USD 1.5 million joint project was funded by the United Nations (UN) Peace Building Fund (PBF) through the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI) competition. The project was implemented by the United Nations (UN) Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The GYPI project was implemented from 20 November 2018 through 31 October 2020 in ten communities in Hela Province and the Southern Highlands Province (SHP). The primary objective of the project was to foster and sustain Women and youth in inclusive peace-building to reduce conflict and improve development. The COVID-19 Pandemic led UN agencies to modify some activities in implementation, by reducing the number of participants attending each training to maintain social distancing and increasing the number of training to reach the targeted numbers expected to be trained.

Background and Context

UN Women, UNFPA, and IOM - the three Recipient UN Organisations (RUNOs) - developed the “Strengthening the Role of Women and Youth as Peace Builders to Improve Development in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea” project based on their experience delivering humanitarian assistance in the Highlands in the wake of the earthquake that devastated the region in 2018. The GYPI Project Baseline Report and conflict map notes that intergroup violence between communities has been endemic in the Highlands, as is the entrenched marginalisation of Women and youth. The project was designed to build UN agency expertise in operating effectively in this environment while developing and securing funding for a wider, longer-term program. As identified in the GYPI Project Baseline Report, the two provinces, although resource rich, are politically unstable and highly volatile due to politically instigated violence, which has negative impacts on development. Accessibility is limited because of the high security risks, making it difficult and expensive to reach, particularly for Port Moresby-based UN Agencies. Most of the 10 communities where the GYPI project worked are remote from the towns and have security issues that hinder access. Due to the context, there were very few organisations that the UN could partner with to reach into the communities. Conflict issues and the lack of development in these traditional communities requires working sensitively with largely illiterate populations that have limited experience beyond their communities. There are few partners in these provinces that can work with the UN. UN security protocols that limit UN staff presence in these 10 communities.

Evaluation Scope and Objectives

PBF policies mandate that projects are evaluated to assess project achievements and to help understand their contributions to peacebuilding. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the impact of the GYPI Highlands Project and to determine how the impact aligned with project outcomes. The evaluation questions were organised through categories of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and gender equality and human rights, in line with OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Approach and Methods

The evaluation team (ET) developed and had an inception report approved. The ET worked with project and UN agency staff to identify and reach a sample of partners, key stakeholders, and beneficiaries for interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs), and reviewed documents. The two national evaluators travelled to the two provinces and all 10 communities where the GYPI project was implemented for interviews and FGDs. Explicit informed consent was solicited and received from all interviewees and focus group participants, and anonymity and non-attribution were promised and assured. A total of 27

interviews and 10 FGDs were conducted, with average attendance of 20 people per FGD. Separate FGDs were held for Women and youth in 6 of the 10 communities, where there were substantial numbers of Women and youth in attendance as well as safe venues. FGD attendance depended on the availability of community members; a convenience sampling method was thus used. Observing COVID 19 restrictions most FGDs were conducted in Community Halls built under the Project which was an open space adequate for social distancing. Validation meetings were held in both provincial capitals and with UN agency staff to gather feedback on draft findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

Data Analysis

The ET developed an evaluation matrix in the inception report and compared and triangulated findings based on different sites and from people with different kinds of engagement with the GYPI project to determine common findings, reach conclusions, and come up with lessons learned and recommendations.

Findings and Conclusions

Relevance: The GYPI project was highly relevant and appropriate in addressing peacebuilding problems faced by Hela Province and SHP. The intervention is aligned with relevant UN frameworks for gender equality and Women's empowerment. The intervention design responded to the needs of beneficiaries in conflict management, although more could be done to improve the project's engagement with sub-national institutions. The project was relevant vis-à-vis the conflict causes and factors identified in the Baseline Report and the peacebuilding priorities of the government and beneficiary communities. The design and theory of change were appropriate, but overambitious given the modest resources and short time frame for GYPI interventions. Particular activities were seen as most relevant by beneficiaries and stakeholders included the Community Peace for Development Plans (CPDPs), the Learning, Empowerment and Protection (LEP) Center Community Mobilisers, and use of the churches as partners in implementation. Beneficiaries, across all 10 communities expressed that training through Churches was effective in driving behavioural change, particularly through mindset trainings run by UNFPA and UNW. FGDs beneficiaries saw the Church as a respectable institutional framework that they felt safe within and noted that trust built by Church has already been effective in negotiating peace in Highlands communities. Women in FGD in Hela from the Provincial Council of Women, and the Southern Highlands United Church Women fellowship shared examples of how they had effectively negotiated for peace as representatives of the Church. KII respondents noted extensive geographic reach of the Church networks and how the accountability, trustworthiness and willingness to work with the UN of Church networks made them important partners in the peace building process.

Coherence: The project grew out of UN agencies' experience with emergency response programming in the Highlands after the 2018 earthquake and fed into the new, post-GYPI PBF-funded Creating Conditions for Peace project. The objectives of the GYPI project remained valid over the course of implementation, although shifts were made in how the project was implemented to use partners to a greater extent than anticipated in the ProDoc and some planned activities were dropped. There were no other UN or donor projects in these two provinces, with the exception of an IOM disaster risk reduction project in SHP. UN Agencies and the governments of the two provinces did not integrate GYPI Project activities with other provincial government plans.

Effectiveness: Interviews and documents provided broad evidence for programmatic effectiveness. However, the project did not achieve some of its objectives or reach some targets. The Project Document (ProDoc) set ambitious goals and targets for the outcomes, outputs, and indicators; the project had limited success in achieving – or in some cases working towards or measuring – all of these targets. One major achievement of the project was the development through inclusive processes of the Community Peace and Development Plans (CPDPs) in SHP. FGDs asserts through the process of drafting DPDPs, communities realized they all (including Women and youth) could contribute to development planning. The

commitment displayed in the development of the plans continued on through community support in building community halls with the support of IOM. FGDs and KIIs found that when community members could see tangible infrastructure, they felt a sense of achievement and ownership; This ownership had led them to take care of this infrastructure. In FGDs, particularly with male youth, youth shared how they had used GYPI Project mindset and behavioural change training to stop engaging in fights that they expected would result in the damage of this infrastructure by other enemy groups. For most of these groups such as Toma in Southern Highlands, the Community Centre is the first real modern infrastructure in the community. “Hard” infrastructure has helped them to take ownership and responsibility to achieve peaceful development, which has been encouraged through the development of “soft” infrastructure like the CPDP. All communities in SHP expressed the need to address other development priorities identified under their respective development plans. Limited coordination and communication were seen as major failures of the project, as was not establishing the Peace Center planned for Mendi, SHP. The experience and accomplishments of the project have been used in the development and implementation of the successor PBF-funded project, Creating Conditions for Peace.

Efficiency: UN Agencies worked towards efficient resource use in GYPI Project implementation by using implementing partners for more activities than originally planned. Plans were reportedly used, implemented, and adapted as needed. The overall work plan, in line with the ProDoc, however was over ambitious, given the costs of conducting major activities in a short period of time, beneficiary targets that were too high (including initially planning to cover the entire two Provinces), and communities that were difficult to reach. The GYPI project could have delivered results with greater efficiency with better communication and collaboration among UN agency partners.. Budgetary changes were made to fit changing plans for implementation. Although the Mendi Peace Center was not constructed, UN WOMEN completed Standard Operating Procedures for a center and consulted with the community leaders to identify and establish a safe communal space for Women and youth in Mendi. Resources were used to develop priorities of community CPDPs. IOM constructed the Community Halls in the 5 communities in SHP, including water tanks for Women and girls to access clean drinking water safely. Some community halls are also used for court mediations - providing some of the intended benefits of the Peace Center. Although Project costs within Hela and Southern Highlands were higher than anticipated, RUNOs identified cost effective measures and adjusted project implementation to deliver value for money within the short timeframe. An example of cost saving measures that ensured value for money shared by RUNOs was the way trainings were conducted, bringing participants from both Provinces to a central location as opposed to going out to individual Provinces to conduct trainings. Partnership with Churches also provided opportunities for ensuring value for money, as Church run facilities used for trainings or meetings were cheaper than commercial venues. This also encouraged participation as participants felt safer in Church facilities. The UN agencies continued to developed ways to implement at lower cost through local Church partners. Capacity gaps in the availability of support for the project in UN agencies and limited capacity among partners and within beneficiaries in communities’ impeded efficiency. Problematic working relationships within the project team were seen as hindrances to implementation, as they impeded collaboration. These internal challenges also negatively affected working relationships with partners and stakeholders.

Impact: Although the GYPI project did not target or reach the overly ambitious goals of the ProDoc, beneficiaries reported transformational changes at the individual and community level and that the UN and its partners were able to successfully build on the GYPI project experience to develop and win PBF funding for a larger, longer area-based programme to extend GYPI project achievements. In an unexpected impact, the project developed a partnership with the Hela Provincial government to support the successor project. The project made a difference in peacebuilding within the 10 communities in which it was implemented. Staff, partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders noted from the interviews and FGDs improvements in attitudes of those who attended the GYPI trainings towards inter-tribal conflict and their use of conflict resolution techniques. Inter-tribal conflicts have reportedly been reduced in the 10

communities, where GYPI beneficiaries have played important roles in peace mediation and community mindset change.

Sustainability: The GYPI project was developed as a catalytic project to build a base for further programs to support peacebuilding in the Highlands. The project provides lessons that can be built on for greater sustainability, replication and expansion.

Gender equality and human rights: Gender sensitivity and human rights were integrated into the project design and implementation, and advanced the project's work, impact and relationships with partners/stakeholders. The ProDoc targeted Women and youth through an approach emphasizing rights, which the RUNOs then operationalized in implementation by working with and through Women and youth leaders to engage community leaders, elders, and the broader community, the selection of Women and youth as community mobilisers, and the mobilization of their peers through the GYPI project.

Lessons Learned

Lessons learned from GYPI include:

- Extensive consultation is necessary for effective delivery of projects in the Highlands to bring together all key partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries – including particularly government stakeholders – to magnify and make impact more sustainable
- UN agencies need to determine ways to support integration of programming in joint projects and facilitate working together across agencies to avoid working in silos
- In jointly implemented projects by UN agencies, effective communication and coordination amongst UN agencies, with Implementing partners and beneficiaries is important for effective and efficient project delivery
- The experiences and exposure of communities determines expectations in these communities; expectations need to be managed effectively in developing and delivering community-based interventions in volatile communities such as in the Southern Highlands and Hela Province
- Risks such as strong traditional cultural gender norms, insecurity, and exposure of Women to other forms of violence need to be mitigated to effectively engage Women in community-level peacebuilding mechanisms to prevent and respond to inter-group conflicts
- Churches are effective sub-national institutions for effective partnerships in sustainable peace building long term
- Delivery of soft outcomes through training that needs cascading are limited by level of literacy, and the capacity to disseminate effectively needs long term monitoring
- Hard tangible long-term outcomes, such as the construction of community centers, strengthen and advance the preliminary soft outcomes, such as training on peacebuilding, that were delivered by the project; hard outcomes in combination with soft assistances creates visibility and trust which is needed in Highlands's context where the UN's peace interventions are still in their early stages
- Community mobilisers conducting peace awareness and advocacy campaigns need to be visible in the community to be effective

Recommendations

The conclusions and lessons learned have been used to generate recommendations in project management, project methodology, and sustainability:

1. RUNOs with support from PBSO should develop management strategies to strengthen the overall integration and implementation of joint programming
2. PBSO should consider greater flexibility in PBF awards for staffing in proposed project budgets to support effective project delivery within short timeframes in challenging environments.
3. The PBF should continue to fund joint projects and should consider providing additional technical support for RUNOs to support the joint development, management, monitoring and evaluation, and

reporting, perhaps through training programs or funds to specifically support the joint development, management, and implementation of joint projects, and budget to project staffing in key areas of coordination and monitoring.

4. RUNOs should develop ways to strengthen activity implementation in Southern Highlands and Hela Province by systematically ensuring greater consultation and collaboration in program design, activity implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting.
5. RUNOs should develop interventions that engage with the instigators of violence; engagement with the instigators who can be identified through consultation with community leaders and elders is requested by government stakeholders and GYPI project beneficiaries.
Develop and support a more structured peace campaign program that is visible throughout Southern Highlands and Hela Province
6. The PBF should consider developing funding instruments with longer time frames to strengthen what has been initiated through the project as violence is still problematic outside the primary GYPI project intervention sites
7. Lessons and experience from the GYPI project should be used to inform longer-term peace building in the Southern Highlands Province and Hela Province as is being done for the new area-based programme in the Highlands.
8. UN agencies and the PBF should continue to focus on supporting sustainable capacity development of the Churches, LEP centers, and other Government recognized sub-national frameworks such as the Provincial Council of Women Network and work with the National Youth Development Authority to use Youth networks
9. Soft outcomes should be supported by hard outcomes for long term sustainability of the peace process

1. Introduction

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) commissioned an independent evaluation of the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI) Highlands Project in Papua New Guinea (PNG). The USD 1.5 million project was funded by the United Nations (UN) Peace Building Fund (PBF). The GYPI Highlands project was a jointly implemented project by three Recipient UN Organisations (RUNOs): The United Nations (UN) Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) which was the convening agency (CA) for the project, UNFPA, and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The project was planned for 18 months; after a five-month no cost extension, GYPI was implemented for a period of 23 months - from 20 November 2018 through 31 October 2020. The primary objective of the joint project was to foster and sustain Women and youth inclusive peace-building in the Highlands region to reduce conflict and improve development.

The independent external evaluation was conducted by an experienced evaluation team (ET) comprised of an international consultant working remotely and two national consultants (one male and one female) who travelled to the two provinces where the project worked, in Hela Province and the Southern Highlands Province (SHP), for fieldwork in April 2021. The evaluation was conducted by fulfilling the terms of reference (TOR) for the evaluation consultancy through best practices in participatory evaluation in March and April 2021, including by following UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards.

2. Background and Context

This section provides a brief description of the “object” of the evaluation: the project “Strengthening the role of Women and Youth as Peace Builders to improve Development in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea”, known as the Gender and Youth Peace Initiative (GYPI) Highlands project.

UN Women, UNFPA, and IOM developed the project during the period when they were delivering humanitarian relief and restoration support in the Highlands in the wake of the 26 February 2018 7.8 magnitude earthquake that devastated the region. This experience showed the UN agencies the extensive needs for support in the Highlands, including in peacebuilding. The three RUNOs developed the project to compete for PBF GYPI funding through the regular Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) call for proposals. The Project Document (ProDoc) was developed in June 2018 by UN Women, UNFPA, IOM and endorsed by these three RUNOs as well as the Government of PNG (GoPNG) and the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) so the proposal could be considered for funding. After PBSO selected the proposal for PBF funding, PBSO signed the ProDoc in October 2018. Based on the approval of PBSO, and as made clear in the revised ProDoc, the formal start date of the project was 20 November 2018; per GYPI parameters, the anticipated length of the project was 18 months.

Under the conditions of the COVID-19 Pandemic, the three RUNOs requested that the project be extended by PBSO at no cost for 5 months, which was accepted. Thus, the end date of the project shifted from 31 May 2020 to 31 October 2020, making the project 23 months long in total.

2.1 Background

Violent conflict in Papua New Guinea’s populous Southern Highlands and Hela Province has had a concerning trajectory over the country’s last 30 years. This trajectory and situation drove the UN agencies to consider engaging in these provinces. As of the end of 2017, there were reportedly 40 separate ongoing conflicts across Hela province; violent conflicts were also endemic to SHP, the neighboring province that Hela split off from when the Hela became its own province in 2012. These violent conflicts have resulted in extensive human rights abuses - including gender-based violence and sorcery accusation-related

violence (SARV) - which caused more than 300 deaths and displaced an estimated 100,000 people over this period; The Highlands also suffer from the entrenched marginalisation of Women and youth.¹ The GYPI ProDoc noted that the Highlands are a “patriarchal region of PNG where traditionally, Women have no voice in public decision making, and the main way young men are involved is as fighters where they are often the key instigators in tribal war in the Highlands of PNG” (p. 3). These problems are exacerbated by weak local governance. The ProDoc noted the “notable absence of Government services (health, education and justice services) and governance structures at all levels are politicised and weak (p. 6). The fragile situation in the Highlands is compounded by the presence of large, lucrative international extractive industry projects, including recently the largest oil and gas (LNG) project in the country. The proliferation of firearms over the last few years has escalated the costs of violence in terms of lives lost. The situation and these conditions thus pose a multi-dimensional challenge to furthering economic and human development. Conditions of patriarchal societies and endemic violence, firearms proliferation, weak governance, and royalty payments from the extraction of natural resources place great pressure on human rights as well as on social stability and development in the two provinces and PNG as a whole. This background was assessed in the development of the project.

The ProDoc noted that recent trends suggested that the volatile situation in the highlands was building towards a crisis, with severe risks for a downward spiral of violence, death and disorder – with particularly detrimental consequences for Women and youth in the highlands. The baseline study for the GYPI Project noted that the total population of Hela Province and the Southern Highlands Province is an estimated 750,000 people; Women are an estimated 49% of the population, and young people between 15 and 24 years old are an estimated 30 % of the population (p. 61, 62, 9).

The three RUNOs thus developed the GYPI project in an effort to not only reduce the risks of increased conflict or the spread of violence, but also to reduce the incidence of violent conflict and support development in the two provinces.

2.2 Context

The Goal of the project was to foster and sustain Women and youth inclusive peace-building in the Highlands to reduce conflict and improve development. The ProDoc noted that the program was developed to continue the UN’s engagement in this conflict-affected area that began with earthquake relief in 2018. The project was designed to build UN agency expertise in operating effectively in this complex operating environment, in anticipation of developing a wider, longer-term program to be designed over the life of the GYPI Project that would then be funded and implemented. The GYPI Highlands project built on a human-rights based approach to peacebuilding and developed a theory of change about how project support would by contribute to the following two outcomes that would lead to the achievement of the overarching goal of the project. The two outcomes were:

1. Targeted government institutions have enhanced capacity to prevent and respond to intergroup conflict through more effective participation of Women and young people.
2. Women and young people are empowered to effectively engage in community-level peacebuilding mechanisms to prevent and respond to inter-group conflict; and men are sensitized to promote the role of Women and youth in building peace within their communities.

The ProDoc developed these two outcomes with indicators, each with outputs and indicators under them:

¹ PBF Project Document, Creating Conditions for Peace in PNG Highlands, October 2020, p. 2.

Outcome 1: Targeted subnational institutions are inclusive of Women and youth to prevent and respond to inter-group conflict

Output 1.1: Knowledge of the benefits of peaceful conflict resolution processes are expanded, including the benefits of including Women and youth in conflict prevention and peace building (knowledge & attitudes)

Output 1.2: Peace building and conflict management mechanisms and structures integrate the voice of Women and youth (practice)

Outcome 2: Women and young people effectively engage in community-level peacebuilding mechanisms to prevent and respond to inter-group conflict

Output 2.1: Change of community attitudes towards greater inclusiveness of Women and youth in conflict prevention and improved social cohesion (knowledge & attitudes)

Output 2.2: Women and youth promote and engage in the development and implementation of community level peace plans and by-laws (practice)

Constrained by PBF rules to an 18-month joint project under the GYPI competition, the RUNOs approached the initiative as a pilot to learn lessons about supporting peacebuilding in the Highlands and how Port Moresby-based UN Agencies could learn to work effectively with partners in the region, which is difficult and expensive to reach. The RUNOs hoped that the GYPI experience could be used for resource mobilization for a larger follow-on peacebuilding project in the region to meet what were recognized to be larger, longer term challenges in the Highlands.

3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives

This section makes the evaluation scope and objectives clear to guide users of the evaluation through two subsections. The scope subsection explains UNFPA's purposes in commissioning the evaluation. The section covers what the evaluation does and does not do and the reasoning behind this scope. The second section, the objectives of the evaluation, explains the specific goals of the evaluation, including the intended use and users of the evaluation.

3.1 Scope

In accordance with PBF policies, every project is required to undertake an evaluation within 3 months of completion of implementation. The evaluation has provided an opportunity to assess the PBF-funded project achievements in an inclusive way and to help understand its contribution to peacebuilding within the Highlands. Per UNFPA's Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation, the evaluation has assessed the overall progress of the GYPI Highlands project against its intended goals and objectives, utilizing Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria. The evaluation aims to not only help to better understand the progress the PBF-funded project has made towards its intended outcomes, but also help explain why the project has had these effects as well as contribute to potential future PBF engagements and other projects in PNG and other countries.

UNFPA took the lead in the joint project on monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Thus, UNFPA has led the management of the final evaluation. The TOR for the International Evaluator, provided as Annex 1, notes that the purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the GYPI Highlands Project in Hela and SHP

in order to determine how the impact aligned with project outcomes. The evaluation has thus examined project reach, how resources were utilised, coordination of activities and the challenges faced in implementing the project. UN Women, UNFPA and IOM and the UN Country Team (CT) anticipate using the findings from the evaluation more broadly to inform future programme planning and implementation, including for the larger PBF-funded joint project, Creating Conditions for Peace in PNG Highlands, that began in November 2020.

The RUNOs reportedly intend to use the evaluation to contribute to accountability, learning and decision-making, in particular through the use of practical recommendations to inform the management and coordination of programme implementation for subsequent projects. Conclusions and recommendations may also be useful for key programme partners, PBSO, as well as for UNFPA, UN Women, and IOM for the development and management of other projects, particularly in the highlands of PNG.

3.2 Objectives

The specific objectives of the evaluation, as listed in the TOR for the International Evaluator, were to:

- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project to responding to the context of the inter-tribal conflict in Hela and the SHP. Also, assess project alignment with international agreements and conventions on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) and youth participation in peacebuilding.
- Assess the effectiveness of the project intervention towards achieving project outcomes (with a special focus on effectiveness concerning Women and youth empowerment).
- Assess efficiency and value for money in project interventions and the achievement of project results as defined in the intervention.
- Assess the sustainability of the project intervention results, especially relating to Women and youth empowerment.
- Determine the overall impact of the intervention with respect to GEWE and youth empowerment.
- Analyse how human rights approach and gender equality principles have been integrated in project design, implementation and monitoring.
- Identify and validate lessons learned, good practices, challenges, examples, and innovations of efforts that support gender equality, human rights and youth empowerment.
- Assess how approaches and strategies used have affected outcomes; Provide actionable recommendations for UN Women, UNFPA and IOM with respect to each agency's work in SHP and Hela Province.

The evaluation approach, and the fieldwork to collect valid and reliable data to analyze in the evaluation, was designed with these goals and objectives in mind.

The TOR also listed specific evaluation questions for the ET to address; these questions were organised using the seven OECD DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and gender equality and human rights. The ET has used these categories and the specific questions under each category to organize the fieldwork and then the evaluation report's findings and conclusions below.

4. Evaluation Approach and Methods

This section first discusses the processes and methodologies – the approach - used in conducting the evaluation, followed by four subsections that cover stakeholder analysis and sampling, data collection; limitations and their management; and evaluation ethics.

Independent evaluation consultants Dr. Lawrence Robertson (international), Dr Pamela Kamya (national) and Lyndel Toidalema (national) worked as a team to conduct the evaluation. The evaluation began with a comprehensive inception report outlining the ET's plans and methods to be used for the evaluation. This stage was supported by Dr. Simon Kenema, who subsequently left PNG and was replaced on the team by Lyndel Toidalema. Once the inception report was reviewed, revised, and approved by UNFPA following consultations and discussions with all RUNOs and PBSO, the ET followed the plans in the approved inception report to collect data, analyze these data, and prepare this draft evaluation report. The ET has made presentations on the draft towards validating findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations to partners and stakeholders at validation workshops in Hela and the SHP to solicit more feedback on the draft and will also make a presentation on the draft to RUNOs in Port Moresby. After the receipt of comments from these meetings and other feedback on the draft report, including from PBSO, the ET has revised and finalized this Evaluation Report.

4.1 Stakeholder Analysis and Sampling Approach

Stakeholder analysis was done as the ET worked with the RUNO staff and documents from the project to identify partners, key stakeholders, and beneficiaries suitable for interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs). The ET used purposive sampling to select the most knowledgeable, informed staff from RUNOs and partner/stakeholder organisations as the most appropriate and valuable informants for interviews. The ET identified the following groups to participate in in-person Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) in Port Moresby and the Highlands:

- RUNO representatives
- Government steering committee representative (s)
- Duty Bearers
- Implementing partners

The ET also worked with project staff to mobilise beneficiaries in the 10 communities where GYPI worked for focus group discussions (FGDs).

4.2 Data collection

Four methodologies were used to collect valid and reliable data to analyze and evaluate the project: document review, observation, key informant interviews and FGDs. The ET focused these four data collection methodologies on the most relevant information: documents useful in addressing the evaluation questions, observation of project sites in communities in Hela and the SHP, interviews with key informants have substantial engagement and knowledge of the project, and focus group discussions with beneficiaries in communities where the project worked.

Document review

The ET reviewed the main documents produced by the project: the ProDoc, work plans, semiannual and annual reports, other studies) and materials of RUNOs and project partners, such as reports on activities and agreements (see Annex 2: List of Documents). The ET has assessed these materials in order to gather relevant data to answer the evaluation questions. The ET reviewed these materials using the questions from the document review template framework developed in the inception report to organize these data

towards answering the evaluation questions. The review of documents has been complemented by data from observations, key informant interviews and FGDs.

Observations

As was clear in the inception report, under COVID-19 conditions, the international evaluator would not travel to PNG for in-person fieldwork. The two national evaluation team members travelled to project sites in Hela and the Southern Highlands Province. As part of field visits, the consultants observed what the project had done in the 10 communities where GYPI worked. Observation included viewing project-provided infrastructure (e.g., community centers) and the extent to which beneficiaries showed their capacity in peacebuilding through their actions in interviews and FGDs, as well as observed their engagement with each other and stakeholders.

Key Informant Interviews

The extensive set of questions from the TOR was used to develop interview questions for interviews with key informants (see Annex 3: List of Interviews) in the inception report – through the evaluation matrix developed within it. The two national consultants used these questions for interviews in Port Moresby and the two Highlands provinces in April 2021.

From the RUNOs, staff were selected from national country offices and field representatives. A total of 8 current and former project staff were interviewed; Two IOM, three UNFPA and four UN Women staff were interviewed. One representative from each of the four implementing partners was interviewed. For Duty bearers, six representatives across various Government sectors were interviewed, as particularly for Hela Province, the national evaluators were unable to get government representatives to attend a combined FGD.

The national evaluators conducted interviews independently, using the interview guide developed in the inception report (see Annex 5: Data Collection Instruments). In each interview, the ET asked specific questions from this longer list of all interview questions based on the experience of the key informant with the project and their responses to previous questions.

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

FGDs were held in communities in Hela and the Southern Highlands. The national evaluators, with the support of the former project coordinators of GYPI for the mobilization of beneficiaries, held discussions with beneficiaries in all ten communities where GYPI was implemented (a 11th community was envisioned in the ProDoc, but dropped as inaccessible early in implementation). The two national evaluators, while complying with all PNG regulations to prevent the spread of COVID-19, faced no challenges in conducted FGDs in all of the 10 LEP centers per the fieldwork plan of the evaluation; Focus groups were attended by average 20 participants. Although a full attendance list could not be kept as community members kept moving at various intervals, photographic evidence is provided in annex in the final report. Focus groups were also held with church, Women's and youth groups.

Document review, observation, key informant interviews and FGDs have generated more than enough valid and reliable data to analyse to answer all of the evaluation questions from the TOR.

4.3 Limitations and their Management

The evaluation has conventional evaluation limitations. Limitations include:

- Assessing contribution rather than attribution–Limited baseline data is available for GYPI communities and the evaluators have limited ability to gather data and examine other

potential factors that may have influenced and contributed to the changes identified in project outputs and impact.

- A large number of evaluation questions – development projects have many potentially useful, interesting, and valuable questions that could be asked in an evaluation. The TOR used the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and GEWE as categories to organize questions. The TOR took these seven categories and generated a list of 45 questions from these seven categories through the evaluation matrix in the Inception Report.
- Limited time- A limited amount of information can be gained from any one interview or focus group. Only a limited number of the 45 questions could feasibly be asked and followed-up upon in any meeting - as diminishing returns were apparent after 60 to 90 minutes.
- Limited engagement of interviewees with the project – Some stakeholders and beneficiaries had limited engagement with the project; while their perspectives were invaluable, they were sometimes only relevant to parts of the project and/or some of the evaluation questions. The limited number of key project staff and partners also limited the extent of relevant data gathering.

The evaluators managed these limitations and minimize the impact of these challenges on data collection, data analysis, and the quality of the evaluation by:

- assessing the contributions of the project to changes in outputs and impact to date;
- focusing the evaluation on key evaluation questions,
- using a smaller number of key interview and focus group discussion questions in each KII or FGD to focus on the areas where staff, beneficiaries and stakeholders were expected to provide the most value and asking specific questions relevant to their experience with the project, and
- focusing the review of documents on the key evaluation questions.

4.4 Ethics

The evaluation designed the fieldwork around two ethical principles that are conventional best practices in evaluation: anonymity and non-attribution. For all interviews and focus groups, the evaluators assured informants that their responses would not be associated with them personally, and that no data in the evaluation would be attributed to them personally. Explicit informed consent was solicited and received from all interviewees and focus group participants for them to participate in the evaluation under these conditions (see Annex 5). The ET has maintained anonymity and non-attribution in the report. These principles are even more important in conflict-affected areas where it is imperative that the evaluation's fieldwork does no harm.

5. Data Analysis

The evaluation matrix in the inception report developed how the ET would conduct data analysis through comparison and triangulation to identify and organize findings, reach conclusions, draw lessons learned, and make recommendations. The evaluation team has shared document review notes and KII notes systematically through an Excel spreadsheet and collaborated in data analysis through discussing these data and their implications and commenting on written findings and conclusions in successive draft analyses where the team identified data that addressed the evaluation questions, pulled these findings together, and drew conclusions based on accumulated findings. Comparison has been through trend analysis of change over time from documents as well as what KIIs and FGDs report has changed - plus qualitative assessment of the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the project's assistance and relevance to gender equality and human rights. Triangulation has checked the compatibility of data and findings from different data sources and across different collection methods

(across different observations from different project sites, from different staff, partners, and stakeholders in KIIs, from FGDs with different communities in the two provinces, and from different documents). In addition, the evaluators will next validate findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned through a series of validation workshops with RUNOs as well as with partners and stakeholders in Hela and the Southern Highlands Province. Based on the information available, the evaluators have made and supported judgments on the value and extent to which project processes and activities contributed to the achievement of intended outputs.

6. Findings and Conclusions

6.1 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 This general definition of relevance is then applied in the evaluation based on the goals and objectives of the GYPI Highlands project and the evaluation questions below.

Is the GYPI Project intervention appropriate in addressing the peacebuilding problems faced by Hela Province and the Southern Highlands Province?

The focus of the intervention on Women and youths as key actors to incorporate into peacebuilding as captured in the ProDoc was seen as highly relevant. Respective UN Agency and former project staff provided feedback on the relevance of activities implemented and how they contributed to the peacebuilding process in the community. Beneficiaries raised in FGDs that disenfranchised young men participate in inter-group conflict within Southern Highlands and Hela Provinces, so targeting of youths in peacebuilding interventions was appropriate. Women also raised in separate FGDs that they have the power to influence the men that they marry and the sons that they gave birth to not to take part in inter-group conflict, and are thus relevant to reach in peacebuilding. Women explained, and men confirmed, the many ways Women have been able to negotiate for peace to the ET in fieldwork. Particularly in Hela, Women in FGDs also noted that Women can be a challenge for peacebuilding. Women also instigate fights by wearing traditional fighting face paint and cry to provoke men to fight. The intervention worked towards changing the mindsets of Women to use their power to build peace instead of provoking violence makes these interventions appropriate. Church and government stakeholders noted that the focus of the design that involves Women and youth was really relevant in addressing peace building problems in the Highlands. Validation workshops with Hela and SHP partners and stakeholders confirmed these findings. The assumptions above key features of the project design in the ProDoc, including in the Theory of Change.

The GYPI project is thus highly appropriate in addressing the peacebuilding problems of both provinces.

To what extent is the intervention aligned with relevant national, regional and international normative frameworks for gender equality and Women’s empowerment?

The ProDoc notes that the GYPI Highlands project was designed to support the implementation of the obligations and aspirations that PNG was founded on (by including them in the Constitution), in

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 April 2021)

international agreements that PNG is a signatory to (such as CEDAW), and national legislation and plans developed to realize these plans (such as national plans to realize the Beijing Declaration and the Gender and Women's Empowerment Policy). UN agency and former project staff noted that the project was in alignment with the SDGs and the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda (UNSCR 1325 and subsequent resolutions).

The ET thus concludes that the GYPI is well aligned to Universal Human Rights, the WPS agenda and more particularly the CEDAW instruments that cascade down through PNG's constitutional and legislative frameworks (the National goals and directive principles of Constitution that provide for equal rights of Women and men).

Assess the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries' (especially those of Women and young people) needs and priorities in the area of prevention of inter-group conflict in SHP and Hela Province, as well as to partner institution needs and priorities

UN agency and former project staff noted that the design meet beneficiary needs. Using the Community-based Planning (CPDP) methodology, meant IOM would identify and respond to beneficiary needs, particularly those of Women and young people, through the development of the CPDPs in the 5 sites in Southern Highlands Province. Men were also trained and explicitly involved and engaged in the CPDP processes. IOM thus ensured that needs and priorities were collectively identified by the beneficiaries and that beneficiaries contributed to the implementation of some of the priorities of the plan by supporting IOM with material, labour and other resources to build community halls in SHP. Women and young people in all of the sites in SHP confirmed in FGD, that all groups in the community equally participated in the identification of their needs and priorities and worked together with IOM to build community halls as an outcome of the community peace planning. They explained that the community hall is now able to respond to some of their other peace building needs including Women's safe access to water available at the community hall, a community meeting area to discuss and resolve community issues, a neutral area for land mediation as a trigger for intergroup conflict, and access to justice through village courts and peace and good order committees that hold hearings within the community halls.

UN Agency and former staff and community volunteers as duty bearers noted there was effective use of the LEP centres and the community mobiliser network through which the CPDPs were developed. Other key interventions were effectively channeled through this network. Implementation partners, under the Church and Faith based organisations like the Melanesian Institute expressed that they used the LEP center network and shared some evidence of notable behavioural change stories. However, the ET noted there is still a gap in working key subnational institutions such as the National and Provincial Council of Women and Government established youth institutions recognized by the National Youth Development Authority (NYDA) as key partner institutions during FGD with these particular groups. UN staff raised the challenge of working with sub national institutions including Provincial Council of Women as these Government recognized institutions were nonexistent in Southern Highlands and a lack of governance from two factions under the same Council of Women in Hela Province.

Was the project relevant vis-à-vis the conflict causes/factors and the peacebuilding priorities of the government and beneficiary communities?

Beneficiaries in FGDs and Government partners and stakeholders in KIIs asserted that they were committed to peace building and mediation. High level commitment was particularly evident in Hela Province with the engagement and support the Provincial Governor for UN peacebuilding programming,. Hela beneficiaries in FGDs noted the commitment in terms of the funding allocations by the Hela Provincial Government towards peace building as affirming of relevance. UN agency staff and former project staff noted that the same level of commitment was lacking in SHP - even though they have

developed peace and development plans. Former project staff raised that not adequately covering intergroup conflict instigators was a problem that made the project less relevant. Some government stakeholders in Hela also noted this problem and asserted that reaching instigators ought to be a priority in peacebuilding. Beneficiary communities raised through FGDs and again through the validation workshop that there is a need for the expansion of GYPI so interventions cover both sides of warring communities.

Assess the appropriateness and relevance of the project design to the project outcome and deliverables, including an examination of the theory of change, and testing the hypotheses that informed it

The ProDoc aligns project objectives to the peacebuilding challenges identified in the highlands in its context as identified in the Baseline study of the GYPI project. UN Agency and former project staff noted that the project design and outcome was appropriate and relevant but was over ambitious. This was because the theory of change design is centric to societal behavioural changes that would not have been adequately measured through the 18-month period of the project. The Government and institutions were the major drivers in the ToC. Understanding the highly political influences in the Provinces as identified in the baseline, indicating the Government systems in both Provinces were weak to some extent, partnerships with Government and related institutional structures within the Province would have been a risk, not captured in the Project Design. The ET noted an example of this was in Hela there were two fractions of the Nationally recognized Women's institutional framework, the National Council of Women, one of which was politically appointed. Working with this recognized Women's institute to drive the ToC would have been ambitious. Government stakeholders who noted while they were included in meetings, they knew little of the design, expected outcomes and deliverables, therefore could not adequately provide feedback on appropriateness. The chair of the Government stakeholder committee in Hela Province, was of the assumption that all activities in the design were completed because he was not well informed by the UN partners when the Project ended what was achieved. UN Women staff noted that strong government leadership and effective subnational government structure were crucial for effective coordination and alignment with relevant subnational government divisions; however, these were absent most of the times. Church partners saw appropriateness and relevance as the Church and UN share values to support integral human development. Church partners expressed that it was too soon to see real behavioural change that is long lasting; to do so, efforts in peace building need to be expanded. Beneficiaries who attended training shared the transformational changes that many had made since the training and felt that that the project thus had clear relevance, which needed to be expanded upon and replicated. In a KII, one District Manager in Hela Province, shared that he attended the UNSCR 2250 training under GYPI in Mt Hagen with the intention of establishing contacts there to purchase guns for his protection. He shared that at the end of the training, his views on peace had changed, stating that "Guns are not the solution." Post training, he continues to volunteer in conflict resolution. Based on this experience, he called for more people in Hela to receive behavioural change training.

The Theory of Change (ToC) was elaborate, capturing a long complex causal chain by which project interventions would have the potential to impact peacebuilding in the highlands.

IF Women, men and youth affected by tribal conflict and disasters can engage with each other in their communities, and with local government structures to provide for citizens' needs and give voice to marginalized populations;

IF Women and youth are actively engaged in community peace building mechanisms about inter-group conflict;

IF the peace dividends of including Women and youth are evident and promoted through advocacy and reiterated by behavioural change campaigns, community members (including representatives from local institutions) will experience cognitive dissonance when faced with key spoilers (i.e., male combatants);

IF community members including representatives from local institutions) experience cognitive dissonance when faced with key spoilers (i.e., male combatants) they have the know-how and institutional support to choose opportunities that reinforce peace and social cohesion;

THEN the potential for future outbreaks of violence will be mitigated and ongoing conflicts can be resolved; Community cohesion will be enhanced, leading to safer, more equal and prosperous societies; and Government institutions will begin to understand the importance of peace for development.

BECAUSE:

- Inclusive sub-national structures and mechanisms for peace are in place and sustained (Outcome 1).

- Women and youth (rights holders) hold duty bearers to account for peace (Outcome 2)

- Community members change behaviours to be more resilient, inclusive, tolerant, and cooperative to promote peaceful co-existence (Outcome 2)

- Government stakeholders begin to understand how they can effectively contribute to peace building. (Outcome 1)

Few interviews identified anyone knowledgeable of the ToC. In implementation, project components frequently were only loosely linked to key elements of the ToC, such as local government engagement and use of institutions as major drivers in the theory of change along with community members. UN agencies found it difficult to use the ToC. Staff, partners and stakeholders reported that measuring a ToC based on behavioural change and social cohesion was difficult, particularly with the short time frame for the GYPI. The ToC was not tested. Due to the gaps in project partners, such as not having formal government partners in implementation, it would be difficult to link project outcomes to theory of change. Community mobilisers, although part of the LEP centers, were not linked to any institutional support in peace building.

The ET concludes that although the project design and outcome was appropriate and relevant, they were over ambitious given the effectiveness and efficiency challenges UN agencies faced working with partners and beneficiaries in the highlands discussed later in the report. The ToC was complex, but the project design and implementation did not adequately connect with key actors in the ToC - the local governments as partners.

Relevance - Overall Conclusions

The GYPI was identified by RUNOs, Government representatives, stakeholders, and beneficiaries as highly relevant to meeting the peace building needs of the people in Southern Highlands and Hela Province who were largely affected by inter-tribal conflict for decades before the wake of the 2018 7.8 magnitude earthquake that further devastated both Provinces.

The RUNOs and Government representatives have also identified GYPI to have been relevant as a catalytic project in establishing a platform for future investment of the UN in both Provinces. Government stakeholders and beneficiaries in communities, in noting the relevance of the interventions of GYPI, stressed that a long and sustainable partnership with the UN would be welcomed and embraced in both Provinces.

From the KIIs and FGDs, three critical interventions were identified as most relevant to meeting the peace building needs in the Southern Highlands and Hela Province.

GYPI Interventions Identified as Most Relevant to Peace Building Needs

1. Development of the Community Peace for Development Plans

The interventions of the GYPI Project through the development of the Community Peace for Development Plans (CPDPs) were most relevant in response to the needs of the beneficiaries because there was a more intense community process undertaken for them to be largely involved in identifying community peace and development needs and contributing together towards addressing those needs.

The CPDPs identified that a safe communal space and WASH or the safe accessibility to water for Women and girls was relevant to meeting the needs of the community. In Southern Highlands, the major impact was notably from the five (5) Community halls built by equal effort from IOM and community contributions in Pimaga, Kumin, Topa, Semin and Pombreal. IOM staff and community members interviewed reported that as planned, community halls were built with 50% cost sharing through inputs by the community, largely through providing raw material and labour. Youths particularly provided most labour while Women and girls cooked to provide meals for the young men building the community halls. Peace building efforts are strengthened through use of the community hall. The community halls are utilised for Village Court hearings, by the peace and good order committee to mediate peace and land access as one of the major drivers of violence identified in Southern Highlands and Hela Provinces through the GYPI baseline. The community halls provide a safe place for Women and youth to convene to collectively discuss and resolve community issues affecting them. While at the community halls, Women and young girls can also access safe drinking water supported by IOM WASH interventions through the setup of tanks and/or water supply. In Topa Women and girls shared through the FGDs that they felt more safe accessing water at the Community Hall. In Pimaga, Kutubu District, Women use the community hall as a village savings club, where they meet every fortnight Friday to deposit money into the village savings club. The Women use the community halls as a safe space for their village savings transactions to meet some personal development needs such as school fees or hospital fees for their children. Women being more engaged and equally contributing to development could now speak up and make decisions on meeting peace and development needs.

These cascading impacts from the CPDPs noted from FGD are indicators of GEWE and youth participation in peacebuilding and the empowerment of rural Women also captured contributes to Conventions of the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

2. Learning, Empowerment and Protection Center Community Mobiliser Network

Use of the Learning, Empowerment, and Protection (LEP) Centers established by the UN as an entry to deliver behavior change campaigns to reduce violence run has also been identified as a relevant approach to reaching beneficiaries. Capacitating of the ten established LEP center network was highly relevant in effecting the theory of change of the GYPI.

Direct beneficiaries of the training were the established Community Mobilisers. The community mobilisers were capacitated through targeted training to lead peace campaigns and provide the channel for peace dividends to reach the community. The community mobilisers as direct beneficiaries to the training indicated that the content was relevant to the context of peace building in the Southern Highlands and Hela Province and brought about some successful mindset and behavioural changes not only to themselves but to other Women, youths, and men and Women they were able to cascade the advocacy for peace within their families and their respective communities. Through the LEP network large peace campaigns were organised as noted in FGD. The Hoiyabia LEP center network was able to organise a peace march in October 2020 in Tari, Hela Province. Members of the LEP notably held key positions of trust in the community such as village magistrates, chairmen of peace and good order committees, clinicians, church leaders, or village counselors and were able use their status in society to practically apply cognitive dissonance to instigators of intergroup fighting whilst performing their own roles, which they expressed was enhanced through the trainings received. In Pureni, Hela Province, it was noted members of the community mobiliser network after receiving training used this status they have in the

community as peace and good order committee members in the village court to negotiate the return of State-owned guns stolen from the Police, this was observed in a video produced by the LEP center network of the arms surrender ceremony witness by UN Country representative and Government representatives in 2020. There was also the notable use of some cognitive dissonance by a health worker within the LEP center network in Purení to negotiate for peace to a notable instigator of intergroup fighting who came to the hospital with a sick child. The nurse notably told the known instigator that if you want your child to get better and be healthy you have to stop fighting so your wife and children do not keep running away from the village where they have access to good food and water that gives them nutrition that keeps them healthy.

3. Church as a subnational partner Network

The use of the Church as an implementing partner network was the most relevant approach highlighted by respondents in KIIs and FGDs. Under the GYPI, UNFPA has been able to establish a strong partnership with Catholic Church network. KIIs with the Catholic Church leadership indicated a successful partnership with the UN through shared and aligned priorities of inclusive integral human development. Other denominations from mainline church groups who participated in FGDs highlighted the potential of the combined Church network to expand the outreach capacity already established by GYPI. And a few LEP centers are also located within Church facilities.

The Church has focused on health and education priorities within the Provinces to drive integral human development. The Church, with its far-reaching network and large community presence, has built community trust over decades and continues to drive transformational change of people and communities into more peaceful communities.

6.2 Coherence

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

Assess the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the Highlands (Hela, SHP) context in the various social sector and/or the relevant provincial government strategies?

UN Agency and former project staff noted that the project grew out of their experience with emergency response programming in the highlands after the 2018 earthquake and fed into the new, post-GYPI PBF-funded Creating Conditions for Peace project. RUNO staff also noted that building peace was necessary as intergroup conflict continued during and after the earthquake emergency response. Government stakeholders noted that the GYPI has really addressed the bottom-up ward level development planning strategies of the Government. Government partners expressed gratitude that the development of CPDPs had met this Government priority successfully in SHP. In SHP, the Community Development Officer has reportedly worked closely with IOM to open ward development accounts to access Government funds for the priorities identified through CPDPs. Church partners stated that they appreciated that the UN through the GYPI had identified the Church as a key institutional partner and that their partnership is strengthened by their common values. Women volunteers under the Church, engaged through UN Women in GYPI, noted that they have been able to incorporate awareness programs and information from GYPI into existing Church outreach programs. Beneficiaries however felt that GYPI engagement with the Government was lacking.

In conclusion, the CPDPs developed through the GYPI in Southern Highlands directly met Government plans to develop Ward development plans. However, there is still a need to link this with the Government funding framework through the District Services Improvement Program (DSIP). The project in design is

also aligned to relevant Government agencies mandates including those of the Community Development Division, which encompasses Women and youth. CPDPs were not developed in Hela Province as IOM did not operate in Hela under GYPI.

Assess whether the objectives remained valid over the course of the project, and whether adjustments were made?

Project reports do not show any change to the objectives of the project laid out in the ProDoc. UN Agency and former project staff noted and confirmed through the validation workshops that the objectives of the GYPI remained valid over the course of the project. Partners, beneficiaries, and stakeholders asserted that they had limited knowledge of the objectives of the highlands project and thus were able to speak to these objectives in only a general manner. They were not able to address whether the project changed over the almost two-year period of implementation to a larger extent. UN agency and project staff noted adjusting to better focus on the objectives of their respective activity and not on the GYPI overall. Adjustments were made in implementation rather than in the objectives to adjust to the high costs of operating in these two provinces, which were higher than expected in project development, and the limitations on movement the government imposed to limit the spread of COVID 19. Other adjustments were also made to approaches when major items such as the Peace Center in Mendi in the SHP could not be achieved. Government stakeholders noted they were confused as to the objectives of the GYPI; although they were involved with respective RUNOs, they were not aware that the Project was jointly implemented. Church partners also stated that whilst there were adjustments made to implementation, the objectives for their specific activities under the project remained the same. Beneficiaries felt confused as to them, each RUNO seemed to have their own objectives and not collectively be contributing to a joint objective. This confusion was again shared during validation workshops in Hela and SHP.

The ET concludes that the objectives of the project remained the same over the course of the project and continued through a no cost extension due to COVID 19 pandemic. Notable adjustments were made in the implementation and delivery, particularly not building the planned peace center and instead constructing community halls in five LEP Center communities.

Coherence - Overall Conclusions

RUNOs, Government representatives, stakeholders, and beneficiaries indicated there was a lack of coherence between UN and Government priorities under GYPI in both Southern Highlands and Hela Province.

Coherence in Southern Highlands:

RUNOs engaged with the SHP authorities in the development of the project and briefed the provincial government at the outset of the project. Nevertheless, in a FGD with the Government stakeholder steering committee established under the GYPI in Southern Highlands it was notable that Government stakeholders were not aware of the objectives of the GYPI. Government stakeholders indicated that they were only involved in meetings and not engaged in implementation to have enough knowledge on the GYPI. The Government stakeholders could not indicate that there was any alignment with Government priorities in their respective sectors. Youth coordinators under the Community Development Division in the Province also could not identify how the priorities of Government mandate also aligned with the GYPI priorities for youth but raised that they have an established youth network that should have been engaged. The Women's coordinator under the Community Development Division also indicated there was a lack of awareness of what interventions were from GYPI because of the lack of communication and coordination from UN Women representatives who scheduled meetings. Only one Community Development Division officer was well aware and engaged in Southern Highlands with IOM on the development of the CPDPs and building the community halls. This one officer was also aware of training

conducted by UNFPA and UN Women. In a separate interview, the officer indicated that even though the objectives particularly on Government ward development planning and the CPDPs under the GYPI were aligned, Government partnership was weak in the Southern Highlands and there was no commitment to support the CPDPs. Chairman of the Steering committee also agreed there was alignment in ward development priorities however lacking Government engagement and commitment for expansion.

Coherence in Hela Province:

From a FGD with the Government stakeholder steering committee established under the GYPI in Hela Province Government stakeholders also indicated that they were only involved in meetings and not engaged in implementation to have enough knowledge on the objectives of GYPI. The Community Development Hela also confirmed that they heard of the GYPI and attended meetings, but as the mandated Government agency responsible for youth, Women, and community development, they were not involved in implementation to see priority alignment.

UN agency staff noted that while they could share information and consult with provincial and district authorities, they do not have the ability to ensure that these government staff retain, share, and use this knowledge. The limited responsiveness of government authorities was recognized, but not addressed, by UN agencies under GYPI. The design of the project was to be a short-lived catalytic initiative building on the earthquake relief and response project towards future longer-term, larger UN investment into the Highlands of Papua New Guinea left the goals of establishing institutional systems and strengthening social structures for the follow-on. The design of the GYPI, given the complexity of the nature of the challenges, was complex. IOM was seen as more successful in partnering with the Government in SHP the development of the Community Peace and Development Plans (CPDPs) which provide a framework for greater community engagement with the Provincial Government and the potential for the authorities to resource and fund community priorities. Development of CPDPs was identified as significant achievements in Southern Highlands Province. However, there was no further commitment by the Provincial Government to fund or resource the plans. The ProDoc noted that these the CPDPs were to be used to solicit support from Government, including under the DSIP. IOM however had limited engagements with the Government towards to soliciting resources or funds for further support of CPDPs. Community members interviewed stated that there had been no further involvement, connection, or commitment by government authorities since the end of the GYPI project. The lack of Government engagement created gaps in the coherence of the GYPI with Government priorities. The lack of Government commitment or engagement was not an identified risk in the ProDoc – which did identify limited capacity as a constraint. The lack of provincial government engagement not adequately mitigated by the RUNOs. Provincial and local government and engagement was largely limited to involvement in meetings where Project activities and outcomes were reported as well as ribbon cuttings - not when Project objectives were determined or identify ways to link the interventions of GYPI with government priorities at these levels. Efforts to address this gap, through RUNOs holding meetings and making presentations to provincial administrations on community needs and funding gaps did not lead to funding from government for these needs at the community level, UN agency staff reported. Provincial government units, for example the Southern Highlands Province IOM to Deputy Administration for Business and Corporate Affairs, reported at an IOM meeting that the province lacked adequate funding to address the needs it prioritised for infrastructure such as roads, bridges and sorting facilities under the current budget and funds available.

Coherence from Beneficiaries views:

The GYPI was seen by beneficiaries solely as a UN led initiative implemented in parallel and not in partnership with the Government as the Project progressed. Communities expressed they had no support from the Government. There was also distrust in the Government and the partnership with the UN given

the experiences they had during the earthquake relief and humanitarian assistance. The beneficiaries expressed that since earthquake relief assistance by the UN, what was provided to the Government to distribute did not reach the communities to benefit affected communities. Community members expressed there was a lot of corruption and mismanagement of relief supplies. What was reported by the Government was purportedly a fair distribution of relief supplies. The Community urged that the UN work directly with communities. When supplies were directly distributed by the UN like dignity kits this benefitted the communities largely and were appreciated. The larger items like water tanks were allegedly sold or provided to the relatives of the Provincial bureaucrats. Despite the lack of commitment by the Provincial Governments, Communities understood that it was important for sustainability and expressed that the UN should work on effective strategies to engage with the Provincial Government more. Communities identified that greater physical presence of the UN through an established office was necessary to strengthen Government coherence, particularly for Southern Highlands Province.

Gaps with Coherence:

Lack of coherence with the Government was identified by partners as a direct spillover from the lack of coordination and communication between RUNOs and the Government. Partners and stakeholders characterized communication and coordination between the GYPI Program coordinator and Government stakeholders as poor. The lack of shared reporting led to the assumption by Government representatives that all activities were completed and needed no further input from Government. Particularly in the Southern Highlands, the Government stakeholders that attended the steering committee were reportedly confused and not really aware of what was achieved by the GYPI. Regular meetings were not conducted, and for the few meetings that were held, minutes taken by UN WOMEN staff could not be located for the evaluation. Government partners also expressed that not enough notice was provided to them when there was a high-level UN engagement such as when visits from top management to the Province were scheduled. UN staff also noted that provincial government staff were difficult to reach, often in Port Moresby rather than Hela or SHP, and that frequently these governments sent different staff to meetings that were unaware of the GYPI.

6.3 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.”

Most partners, beneficiaries, and stakeholders limited their discussion of effectiveness to the activities that they directly participated in. Only a few non-UN interviewees 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 contributed more information to addressing these questions in interviews. Interviews provided broad evidence for programmatic effectiveness, mainly from project staff, IP representatives, and a few stakeholder interviewees.

Achievement of objectives:

Did the intervention achieve its objectives?

Interviews provided broad evidence for programmatic effectiveness, as UN staff, former project staff, partners, and beneficiary and stakeholder interviewees noted that the GYPI project had only achieved 50-60% success in achieving objectives.

The results-based management structure and outcomes, outputs, and indicators for the project set out ambitious goals and targets; the project had limited success in achieving – or in some cases working towards or measuring - many of the indicator targets. Outputs and key activities implemented towards the outcome of the project included the following.

Outcome 1: Targeted subnational institutions are inclusive of Women and youth to prevent and respond to inter-group conflict

This outcome was to be measured through two outcome indicators in the ProDoc: 1a, percentage increase in the proportion of female representatives in local dialogue, conflict resolution and peacebuilding processes – with no set baseline or target, and 1b: the proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex and age, with a baseline asserted to be 0% and a target of 10%. These indicators did not directly measure the inclusion of Women and youth in institutions, as dialogues and peacebuilding can be community based or done through individuals . And the final report did not report on these two outcome indicators. The ET did not attempt to measure these indicators, which the project did not explicitly seem to focus on or manage towards.

Output 1.1 Knowledge of the benefits of peaceful conflict resolution processes are expanded, including the benefits of including Women and youth in conflict prevention and peace building (knowledge & attitudes)

Output Indicator 1.1.1 was the number of Women men and young people participating in community awareness process and training programmes, with a baseline of 0 and a target of 50,000.

Then Output Indicator 1.1.2 was the number of Women and men (including young men and Women) trained on inclusive peace building processes, with a baseline of 0 and a target of 28,500 (7,500 Women, 5,000 men and 16,000 youth, of which up to 50% are young Women).

Towards outcome 1 and output 1.1, the project supported awareness raising for behavior change. GYPI worked with the Centre for Social and Creative Media (CSCM) to develop videos to raise awareness about the cost of tribal fights. Output Indicator 1.1.3a was the number of communities in which short videos are developed and disseminated for engagement of men and youth. The project targeted developing and disseminating videos in 11 communities; operational challenges led to achieving this outcome only in 5 communities.

UNFPA through GYPI supported two training and workshops for Provincial, LLG and community leaders on SCR2250. The ProDoc for Output indicator 1.1.3b set a target of reaching 5,000 officials, which was recognized to be unrealistic; that would have been 100% coverage of officials in both provinces, although the project planned to work in 11 targeted communities. The final report notes reaching 100 provincial and community leaders, 5% of the target. This was the population of the leaders for the 10 communities where GYPI worked - not all officials across the two Provinces.

Output 1.2 Peace building and conflict management mechanisms and structures integrate the voice of Women and youth (practice)

Towards this output, GYPI supported awareness raising for community peace advocates and other peace actors to effectively engage Women and youth in conflict mediation. The ProDoc did not set a target for Output indicator for 1.2.1, % increase in the proportion of female mediators who participate in formal and informal peace negotiations, as they did not have a baseline to use at the outset. To report on progress, feedback from FGD or KII in all locations in both Southern Highlands and Hela, from Women, men, and

youths from the community indicated that Women continued to be drivers in peace building and conflict management. However, most Women peace mediators expressed that the reach of Women was limited to informal peace negotiations using inroads through young men and particularly to home visits and small markets due to the security risk of Women. Many Women also faced criticism from the Community who were of the assumption that they were paid by the UN to do this work. In Hela, while more Women can speak up in the peace negotiation process, Women have still raised that they are told not to speak in more formal peace negotiations in larger public forums, which is male dominated.

GYPI did set a target for output indicator 1.2.2, the number of male advocates trained and participating in inclusive peace building processes, with an ambitious planned target of 15,500 (including 8,000 young men). The final project report did not report a final number reached for this indicator

GYPI supported the development, launching and functioning of a conflict mapping tool. Indicator 1.2.2 was the number of conflicts reported in the crowdsourced conflict mapping tool, with a target of 5. This target was overachieved, with 7 reported in the final report.

The ProDoc envisioned that the GYPI Project would support the establishment and running of Highlands Centre for Peace and Reconciliation (HCPR) to promote peace and reconciliation within and between communities through analysis, learning and facilitated dialogue. The reason that this target was not met as provided by UN WOMEN was that costs in setting up the infrastructure became too high and particularly land ownership issues which prevented the acquiring of State land for infrastructure to be built. UN WOMEN however in addressing this indirectly, completed the peace center SOP and consulted with the community leaders to identify and establish a safe communal space for Women and youths as an output. Although it is noted that IOM also built 5 Community halls that also provided these safe communal spaces for Women and youths in the same beneficiary communities, IOM has clarified that this came out of the CPDPs and not an initially and not adaptive to fill in the gap of the Peace Centre. The ET assess that this synergy although unintended should have been optimized by the two RUNOs for greater output that was not achieved directly through the Peace Center establishment in Mendi.

The ProDoc also included Indicator 1.2.3b: Successful delivery of end-of-project Peace Conference led by Women and young people. No peace conference was held however; instead GYPI held an end of project reflection workshop which was conducted by UN WOMEN implementing partner.

Output 1.2.4 of the project was strengthening Women mediators' capacity to perform mediation roles at community level, working with church leaders to facilitate participation of Women mediators in peace processes. The ProDoc envisioned measuring progress in this through Indicator 1.2.4, the proportion of Women and youth in decision making roles participating in justice and security sector mechanisms in conflict-affected/prone communities. This was recognized as a rough way to capture the quality of Women's and youth participation. The target was set as 5%. The final report's table asserted 5%, noting that there was increased involvement of Women in decision making particularly in mediation, conflict negotiation. This was verified in FGDs with Church leaders from the Catholic Archdiocese and the United Church, where Women were engaged through the Church Women's fellowship groups at community level to mediate for peace, following training by UN Women. Women representatives shared that they were able to use the training by UN Women to create more peace mediation awareness at community level.

Finally, under this outcome, the ProDoc had Indicator 1.2.3, the percentage of D-LOC, district/village courts equipped to respond to conflicts, address cases of violations of Women's and girls' human rights, with due attention to survivor's security. The target was 50%; the final report reports 20% without

explanation. The ET found little evidence of strengthening of the court system, although UN Women reported strengthening existing Bi laws through the project.

Outcome 2: Women and young people effectively engage in community-level peace-building mechanisms to prevent and respond to inter-group conflict

Four outcome indicators were developed for this outcome. Indicator 2.a, the percentage of conflicts mediated with participation of Women and young people as mediators; the GYPI final report reported 15% based on mediation and LEP reports. The low percentage as asserted from FGD was due to the security of Women to effectively engage in community level peace building mechanisms. Indicator 2.b, the proportion of population satisfied with inclusive mediation processes, has not been measured. Although the report asserted “this will be measured in the end of project evaluation”, the evaluators had no way to measure the proportion of the population. Indicator 2.c, the number of active conflicts reported, cumulative over the course of the project, was reported as 10. Finally, Indicator 2.d was the number of new conflicts, annual; the final report reported 5. It is not clear how to evaluate whether and how these indicators, without baselines or further discussion, demonstrate progress or regression in the highlands or the results of the GYPI project that worked in targeted communities.

The narrative for the main summary noted the capacity increase in individuals as a result of GYPI in the Highlands - that “a critical mass of peace champions (237 peace advocates in total, 134 males and 103 females) spreading the message of ‘peace for development’ have created a momentum for maintaining peace in the Highlands. Of these 24 (11 females, 13 males) are now certified as peacebuilding trainers. This has been achieved through training in advocacy skills, completion of training of trainers, and sensitization on normative frameworks such as UNSCR1325 and UNSCR2250.” Plus, that “the trainers further recruited and trained 86 community mobilizers and carried community peace awareness activities and mediated conflicts.”

Output 2.1 Change of community attitudes towards greater inclusiveness of Women and youth in conflict prevention and improved social cohesion (knowledge & attitudes)

The output was measured through Indicator 2.1.1, the number of youth (young Women and young men) in community youth network engaged in conflict prevention and social cohesion activities, by sex and age. The final report reported 4,485, without sex and age disaggregation.

Output indicator 2.1.2, the number of trained youth leaders playing the role of peace advocates within their communities, by sex and age. The final report reported 100 (50 males, 50 females).

Output Indicator 2.1.3, the proportion of “troubled youths” who attend self-management clinics and exhibit positive behavioral changes, by sex, was reported as 20% in the final report, less than the target of 50%. The final report however noted that through monitoring the implementing partner was only able to determine that 20% of the youths had shown positive changes. Due to Covid 19 travel restriction, the IP was not able to further determine the progress of the other youths.

GYPI partner Equal Playing Field hosted a series of meetings and sports events as a channel for release of energy for the youth, to improve social cohesion, and to support youth leaders in the community by promoting success through sports. The target of 11 communities was reported as reached for Output indicator 2.1.4. This had the intention of

Finally, Output Indicator 2.1.5, the number of communities that engage in behavior change through SASA and cross learning exchanges, had a target of 11. The behavior tools used, the self-management

clinics, were an adaptation of SASA. The final report noted 12 communities were reached in this manner, exceeding the target.

Output 2.2 Women and youth promote and engage in the development and implementation of community level peace plans and by-laws (practice)

Under this output, GYPI planned to conduct 5 community consultations (1 per site) with government representatives, community leaders, Women and youth to sensitize them on CPDPs and identify priorities for inclusive community level peace for development initiatives. GYPI planned to select at least four facilitators (50% Women and youth) from community level to comprise ‘facilitation team’ for CPDPs, and then train these facilitation teams and design the 5 CPDPs. Finally, the project would support facilitators to implement CPDPs in their communities, as well as use community conversations to produce agreed upon by-laws to address conflict issues such as home brew, men combatants and SARV.

Output Indicator 2.2.1 was the gender ratio of CPDP facilitators (female to male), by age, with a 50% target. This was reported as met.

Indicator 2.2.2, the proportion of CPDPs with specific provisions to improve the security and status of Women and girls, was reported as 100% as all 5 CPDPs had these specific provisions.

Indicator 2.2.3 reported on a similar concept in a slightly different manner. The indicator, the number of CPDPs which focus on initiatives which enhance the role of Women and youth in peace-building and social cohesion, was reported as 5; this was the same 100% as above.

The final indicator reported on was Indicator 2.2.4, the number of community compacts/by-laws that promote peace and explicitly address the concerns of Women, was reported as supporting 3 which had been established prior to the GYPI.

Assess the major achievements of the project in relation to its stated objectives and intended results -making as far as possible a systematic assessment of progress based on monitoring data, including of higher-level results

Monitoring data has been used to assess whether and how the GYPI project achieved its objectives. The answers to this question also includes a focus on higher-level results. However, it is important to highlight that UN agency staff and former project staff noted that there were major gaps in data and lack of combined monitoring as per the monitoring schedule however RUNOs did separate monitoring visits to assess their respective interventions. In the view of the ET combined visits were needed to evaluate each other’s progress collectively. Partners from the Government said they were only involved in meetings and there was lack of Government engagement to provide assessments of major achievements. As verified by RUNOs, this was due to the lack of physical presence of the UN in the Province. Due to limitation in the budget of the GYPI project it was difficult for the convening agency to establish a physical point of coordination that would have facilitated increased Government engagement. However, FGDs found that beneficiaries appreciated support from the UN through the GYPI and stakeholders noted the success of the GYPI in establishing peace in the 10 communities through engagements including training delivered through the Project in Hela that drove behavioural change and in SHP community involvement in planning to create social coercion and ownership in meeting their own peace needs including the community halls with support from the project. In SHP, Government partners supported that the CPDPs were a major achievement. In Hela, Government partners expressed that although the Hela Provincial Government provided, it was yet to be accessed. Both groups expressed notable commitment for long term sustainability and expansion of the achievements of the GYPI through the UN.

The development of the CPDPs was a major achievement of the project in relation to its stated objectives and intended results. There was effective monitoring of the CPDPs by IOM separately by field officers. Positive results were seen and noted through FGD as flow on impacts when the halls and WASH facilities were set up in the communities as captured under the CPDP. The CPDP implementation targeted only Southern Highlands province under the GYPI project. In the wake of the GYPI, the Hela Provincial governor has committed USD 4 million to the follow-on joint UN area-based development project now in implementation that will expand on the results of the GYPI. However, the lack of CPDP plans and staff on the ground were noted as barrier implementation at present. More sustained efforts and structures for implementation are seen as necessary for more progress towards higher-level results.

The ET thus concludes from responses from UN staff, former Project staff, Government and beneficiaries that major achievements of the project were the CPDPs in SHP, including a notable commitment of funds by the Hela Provincial Government to support the GYPI.

To what extent did the intervention deliver results in an economic and timely manner?

UN agency and former project staff stated better coordination and communication would have ensured that the limited shared funds and resources were effectively combined to achieve greater results given the short time frame of the project. UN agency staff noted the need to economize on the budget as costs were higher than anticipated in the ProDoc. This led UNFPA and UN Women to increase the extent to which they implemented GYPI activities through partners compared to what had been envisioned in the ProDoc (and to larger roles for main partners the Diocese of Mendi and MI respectively). Government stakeholders expressed in FGDs that they were not really engaged to provide feedback on implementation. Church partners stated that the main challenge for them was COVID 19, however interventions were delivered to the best of their ability. Implementing partner Voice for Change, expressed there was a delay in release of initial trench that prevented them from timely delivery but they were able to pick up and provide timely delivery on implementation. UN staff highlighted that there were challenges in small Civil Society Organisation (CSO) partners in meeting UN requirements that would likely be the reason for delay. Beneficiaries could not provide feedback overall and continued to express they were not aware that the project was jointly implemented.

The ET concludes that limited coordination and communication by RUNOs impeded effective delivery. Implementation of the Project activities were often done separately in an uncoordinated manner in an uncoordinated manner by UN Women, UNFPA, and IOM, not collectively as a joint project. In some cases, RUNOs developed joint trainings as a way to train more efficiently – both by reducing costs and increasing quality by emphasizing complementary aspects in training programmes. Another way that efficiencies were capitalized on was the sharing of vehicles.

The challenges of project implementation under UN security rules were difficult; some of the 10 communities were remote from the two main towns, which were the only places UN staff could stay based on UN DSS rules. The need to return to town by 6 PM also limited how long staff could spend in communities. The requirement for military escorts, rains and natural disaster risks further limited travel. The RUNOs adapted to the overall higher costs of operating in the region and these challenges that impeded their ability to implement by working to a larger extent than anticipated through GYPI's local partners – who did not come under these same rules or have as high a financial cost for travel and accommodation (or for allowances to beneficiaries).

CPDPs were seen to have produced additional benefits, as IOM was able to fund wells and water points at community halls as priorities under these plans in the five communities in SHP. This “hard outcome” - water infrastructure - was not envisioned in the ProDoc, but seen as an added benefit that showed efficient use of resources. IOM was also able to operate as a direct implementer in SHP – not using partners -

building on an already established presence implementing a complimentary disaster risk reduction project supported by USAID.

Describe any major failures of the project and why they may have occurred

UN agency staff and former project staff noted effective coordination and communication as a failure of the GYPI project. The ET noted that the project did not achieve one major planned deliverable which was the establishment of the Peace center in Mendi in SHP. The project did not engage effectively enough to get Government ownership of project outputs and secure the continuity of volunteer outreach efforts started under GYPI, including having them provide reports to Government. This lack of engagement was the result of the Government not knowing how to effectively support in implementation. In Hela the Division of Community Development expressed there was no communication or involvement from UN staff to them as the division responsible for youth and Women. Members of this Division felt that although high level consultations with Provincial Government was conducted, the failure to communicate with their division led to them not know how to engage with the UN during implementation in the communities, which was their primary mandate. Stakeholders in an FGD in Koroba in Hela Province stated that the lack of communication and coordination raised questions of ownership. Participant asked: Is this UN initiative or a Government initiative? Who do the Community volunteers provide reports to? Who provides support to the volunteer network? Who ensures the sustainability of the initiatives of the project? FGDs with beneficiaries found that they appreciated the interventions by the UN; however, many beneficiaries in FGDs raised that there was a lack of consistency in the approaches of UN agencies. One particular inconsistency was seen as especially problematic. Beneficiaries stated that UN Women paid some volunteers and other UN organisation were not paying. This led to discontent among different participants who felt treated differently. Some LEP center networks received more and different support in terms of resources compared to others. The higher levels of support raised community expectations, which were then not always met. This tendency was noted by the ET in FGDs in all communities except in Walete, Hela Province.

UN agency staff and former project staff noted that there was failure to conduct combined monitory visits and thus there were gaps in data to clearly provide evidence of effectiveness and efficiency of the project. UN agency staff and former project staff noted major gaps existed in measuring the cascaded impacts of the training, therefore there was little evidence to measure impact. Stakeholders and beneficiaries noted that there were separate monitory visits and never combined visits as GYPI from field or country level, reiterated at the validation workshop. UN agency staff and former project staff noted the targets were too ambitious given the geographical area, the nature, and methods of the Project, which led to the failure to meet some of the targets. There were many identifiable gaps in data anticipated for monitoring, including at the output level.

The ET concludes that not establishing the Peace Center, limited engagement with local government in the two provinces, and project M&E were important gaps in effective project implementation.

Several notable limitations to effective project implementation were in.

1. Coordination and Communication

There were obvious issues with coordination and communication amongst the RUNO's from top management, to middle management and down to the field officers responsible for community-based implementation. In such a volatile environment, effective responses from Senior Management to the field officers is very important to manage community trust in the UN as shared by UN WOMEN field staff. Beneficiaries in Pombreal raised that when issues were raised

to Project Manager, responses such as we are waiting for top management approval was frustrating to the beneficiaries and aired during the evaluation.

In the communities, beneficiaries were not fully aware that the GYPI was jointly implemented by three UN organisations (UNW, IOM and UNFPA). This had to be clarified as an introduction preceding any FGD with the community in this evaluation, so beneficiaries could piece together all the activities they participated in to contribute collectively to the evaluation. Each UN organisation was seen by beneficiaries as having stand-alone interventions. The beneficiaries were also unclear of the overall objectives and what would be achieved collectively by all three UN agencies. This resulted in much confusion with beneficiaries. In some communities the lack of coordination and communication frustrated beneficiaries. The engagement of different beneficiary groups by UN WOMEN and UNFPA created segregations between beneficiaries who were not made aware that this was a jointly implemented project intended to share resources for the similar outcomes. Effectively the same beneficiary groups were to be well capacitated to then cascade the training as outcomes.

Communication and coordination between the UN GYPI coordination representative with Government stakeholders was poor. The lack of shared reporting led to the assumption by Government representatives that all activities were completed, needing no further input from Government. Particularly in the Southern Highlands the Government stakeholders in the Committee were confused and not really aware of what was achieved by the GYPI. There were no regular meetings, and for the few meetings that did happen, minutes could not be located. Government partners also expressed that inadequate notice was given to them when there was a high-level UN engagement or visits from top management to the Province were scheduled.

2. Government Engagement

To coordinate the partnership between the UN and the Provincial Governments, a Provincial steering committee was established; composed of all relevant Government stakeholder representatives. The Government stakeholders were only involved in meetings and there was no specific term of reference for this steering committee to clearly understand their role and responsibilities on what they were supposed to achieve. Government representatives expressed concerns that though they were invited to UN meetings, they are not clear on the overall work plan, types of activities, their objectives, and the implementation progress. They felt that UN agencies are working in isolation or in parallel and not working together in partnership with agencies such as Community Development. They feel that GYPI projects must be integrated into the existing government departments and their functions for ownership in implementation, monitoring and reporting to the steering Committee. Although the Government was involved, the relevant Government departments were not fully engaged in implementation and monitoring. The Peace, Good Order and Village Courts chairman for Southern Highlands Province, stressed on how the Justice Services and Stability For Development (JSS4D) program aligned with the Government priorities in the sector as a good model for Government engagement. Where Government stakeholders are involved in identifying priorities, planning, and design, they were more engaged in implementation meeting both Government and partner objectives. This was a weakness of the GYPI project in fully engaging the Government for ownership and sustainability. However, for those who participated in the GYPI, they admitted learning conflict resolution skills and saw the usefulness of the LEP centers. In Southern Highlands, they shared that the CPDPs and other ward development plans are a good initiative because all beneficiaries in the communities were involved in developing them. The communities are taking care of the LEP centers and Community halls; however, lack of UN monitoring and feedback to the LEP centers was a concern raised by the communities.

3. Ownership

The evaluation identified some critical questions from Government and other Duty Bearers which include:

- What is the overall plan or objective of the United Nations for the next five (5) years within the Southern Highlands and Hela Province?
- Who takes ownership of the Project now that it has ended and is being evaluated?
- Who maintains ownership and provides support to the LEP centres with monitoring, providing overall management and sustaining operation of what has been established through the GYPI project?
- Does the Government take ownership and at which level? Provincial or District?
- Does the UN continue to provide support to the volunteer network and to what extent?
- How will the UN receive reports/feedback on functioning LEP centers or community halls and reports on community activities implemented through the community halls and LEP centres?

Much of these questions arose because there was very little coordination and rapport with the LEP center community mobiliser network and the abruptness of how the Project ended without communication on sustainability. This raised questions by beneficiaries on the credibility of the UN and what the UN is intending to achieve in the community long term. There were other initiatives by other UN agencies including the early childhood learning centers established by UNICEF in Hela Province, around the LEP center network that also notably ended abruptly with little communication on sustainability shared with the LEP center network. A particular failure identified by RUNOs are joint monitoring field visits to connect with beneficiaries and to provide clarity to any questions or misconceptions that the beneficiaries may have had or further monitoring and mentoring of the LEP Community Mobiliser network. Because the UN agencies did not have these combined monitoring visits, they missed opportunities to engage Government representatives and to provide them with knowledge on the outcomes of the GYPI. There is an evident gap in the link between project outcomes, and necessary engagement of relevant Government partners for ownership that needs strengthening for greater engagement and long-term sustainability.

4. Managing Community expectations

During the Earthquake humanitarian relief assistance, UN WOMEN established the LEP centers and the Community Mobiliser networks in 5 locations in Southern Highlands and 5 locations in Hela Province. During this engagement, UN WOMEN paid allowances to the community mobiliser network established through the LEP. However, during the GYPI, no allowances were paid to the LEP community mobiliser network. It was noted that other volunteers engaged outside the LEP center network to conduct awareness by UN WOMEN were also paid for 1-2 fortnights. In contrast, UNFPA and IOM did not offer payment for any community involvement. UN WOMEN in all communities asked volunteers to register bank accounts and provide details. Such discrepancies raised expectations of payment by Volunteers through the LEP center volunteers, particularly for those who did not have other income sources. As an example, the LEP center coordinators in Pureni and Walete are clinicians where the LEP centers are established, they performed this volunteer role with no expectations of payment because they had an income stream. In contrast, volunteers who did not have other income streams or could not spend time in their gardens to provide food for their families expected some compensation for the time spent, as motivation and incentive to conduct peace awareness and outreach. Expectations were also created in discrepancies between resources and information provided to one LEP center or

Community hall compared to another. A uniform approach in support for all LEPs was an identified gap in the delivery of the GYPI. All RUNOs highlighted managing community expectation as a challenge.

The volunteers themselves as duty bearers also had to manage community expectations and assumptions that they were being paid by the UN for the work that they were carrying out. As individuals they were intimidated by the Community. CMs made recommendations such as conducting more trainings to recruit more community mobilisers through the LEP network, so they can go out in larger numbers, providing some form of identification through uniforms or badges that identify them as volunteers and providing a strong sound system for awareness raising as strategies to better capture the attention of community to pay attention to the messages delivered through conducting peace awareness and outreach. Volunteers also expected to be supported with logistics, stationary, and IEC material for awareness. The identified gap was the lack of support to the LEP center network to conduct peace awareness and outreach. The limited outreach capacity is an identified gap in the GYPI. There is very little evidence on the effectiveness of the cascading of training.

Implementing partners also shared that they also needed to manage expectations. The challenge was shared by UN WOMEN implementing partner, there was distrust on payment of allowances, because the beneficiaries had perceptions that the trainers had money to pay them which they had not given and refused to attend the training as a result. The situation was managed by sourcing other participants from the network of the implementing partner.

Beneficiaries who attended training continued to raise that promises were made by UN staff to provide certain items such as sewing machines for Women in Pombreal, Southern Highlands, under UNW. Such promises although considered as unsubstantiated need to be verified against what was captured under the Project design and procurement records particularly for UNW. In Hela Province, there has been an influx of different partners and organizations supported through the large oil and gas companies who have opened communities to various expectations. Together with the experiences of mismanagement of earthquake relief supplies, there is a strong sense of distrust and the unwillingness to share benefits to others which is an identified challenge.

5. Security of Volunteers

Volunteers who received training could not conduct awareness outside of their community fearing their own security. Awareness and advocacy started within their own homes, then household visits to extended family, one on one conversations at small markets, but very rarely to larger gatherings. This limitation was mainly because of security, particularly for female volunteers. There are pockets of inter-tribal fighting and ill-feeling, therefore it is difficult for those who received training to do awareness in neighboring enemy tribes. There is reportedly continued fighting in Walete, Hela Province because people selected for the training are from one community and cannot reach out into neighboring enemy tribes to do awareness. Awareness is not possible, with pockets of tribal conflict still existing. It is not possible for the few trained to go into enemy territory to do awareness. Therefore, it is difficult to negotiate peace between the two warring tribes, unless there is also inclusion of the enemy tribe in a separate training.

Due to security risks, Women have created inlets by buying *buai* (Betel nut), smoke and coke to send men to advocate and negotiate peace for them. Therefore, awareness through those few individuals trained in the LEPs was limited in its reach in peace building. In Koroba, Community mobilisers in the LEP center expressed the need to expand the network of volunteers so they do not need to travel to other areas to conduct awareness, exposing themselves to risk of being

harmed. The challenge they discussed with the TOT was that only few participants were trained. Due to security, they were not able to effectively cascade the information, limiting the reach and impact especially in a large District like Koroba with 89 council wards. The reach of awareness of the LEP in Koroba could only cover 23 council wards, which is only 26% of the total District coverage. Due to security concerns of volunteers, outreach and cascading of training remains limited.

Female volunteers who travel to conduct advocacy and awareness are also at risk of Domestic, Family or Sexual Violence from their husbands. This was not adequately captured under the risk matrix of GYPI. Mothers are accused of soliciting in other activities when they do not come home with income or anything to show for the time they spent volunteering in peace awareness and advocacy. These are identified risks and challenges with the engagement of Women in the peace building process.

6. Selection of training participants

Beneficiaries of training expressed that the content of all training offered, from the initial combined Peace Resolution UNSCR2250 training, and follow-on training by UN WOMEN and UNFPA through implementing partners were very relevant to the peacebuilding needs of the community. The training had a direct impact on their individual lives and that of those that they were able to reach. However, there were some challenges in the selection of training participants that was raised throughout the evaluation in Southern Highlands and Hela Province.

When the identification of participants is left to the LEP center coordinators, only their own relatives or family members are selected to participate. Those selected to participate are not active peace builders or persons of influence who can continue cascading information from training. Security of those participants to be taken out of their villages to attend training in Tari, Mendi or Mt. Hagen was not guaranteed and this limited the participation of influential individuals or a better spread of participants. Particularly in Hela, there was a challenge in getting young people to participate because most young men were involved in tribal fights and young Women in fear have fled the training. Therefore, a lot more older people participated in the training. This was a challenge due to the low level of literacy that they may have within the age category and the ability to grasp the concepts presented, particularly in TOT training materials.

7. COVID 19

GYPI implementation was also affected by COVID-19 which prevented monitoring visits to communities. Restrictions in social gatherings limited training, advocacy and outreach interventions. However, there was flexibility by the PBSO in granting a 5 month no cost extension which brought the implementation period to 23 months.

8. Monitoring Impact

There are challenges in how to effectively measure the cascading impact of the training delivered through the LEP Community Mobiliser network. There are gaps in understanding how effectively peace was negotiated, what techniques from the training were utilised in negotiating for peace, how cognitive dissonance with instigators of intergroup violence was created, the effective delivery of advocacy, then further monitoring of people trained by CMs (the people that received indirect benefits from the training). There were notably a lot of gaps in the information and data coming from the field. As reported by a UN Women staff person, “from looking at the field data, it is hard to say the objectives of the Project were fully achieved.” This provided a challenge to

the measurement of indicators and to make inferences against the theory of change which again was limited due to the 50-60% success rate as Community Mobilisers were not able to conduct awareness and outreach to other communities due to continuous fighting in the communities.

9. Programme management factors

There was a high turnover of field staff, who left either because they felt they were under-resourced for performing their roles in the field or were not communicating well with Project Coordinator. The Project Coordinator was also investigated for mismanagement and terminated before Project end. Other expatriate staff only supported implementation phases of the Project. The UN Women specialist also left a leading role in the Project early to take on an international post.

What is the project's level of collaboration and complementarity with the other PBF project in SHP and Hela, as well as with any other relevant related projects?

UN Women and UNFPA staff and former project staff, partners, beneficiaries, and stakeholders interviewed and that participated in FGDs did not identify any complementary projects in the two Provinces for the GYPI Highlands project to collaborate with. IOM benefitted from having a complementary project, the USAID community DRR project in SHP, to help support its operations. The ProDoc noted the GYPI was to be a catalytic project. The ET thus concludes that there were few complementary or relevant related projects, although the GYPI used and complemented the efforts of the previous UN earthquake response program, particularly its restoration components, and IOM benefitted from implementing more than one project.

Best Practices:

KIIs with UN staff, implementing partners and other interviews identified three best practices:

1. The true community participation from design the identification of peace and development priorities and working collectively to meet these priorities.
2. The engagement of the Church as implementing partners who share similar values of integral human development.
3. The engagement of Women and youth in the peace and development.

These and other lessons learned are discussed further in their own section below.

6.4 Efficiency

Efficiency is defined by the OECD/DAC as the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely manner. The effectiveness section above noted the ways RUNOs and their partners were able to deliver or not; this criterion assesses how commensurate these processes were based on their costs.

How well were resources used in terms of the efficiency of planning and implementation?

FGDs found that beneficiaries from both Southern Highlands and Hela Province appreciated the trainings received on Peace Building and Mind-sets, the establishment of the LEP centers, and development the CPDPs that lead to the building of community halls in the beneficiary communities in Southern Highlands Province, enlightened them on the benefits of peace, creating space and giving the opportunity

for Women and youths to contribute and effectively participate in peace building and taking ownership of their peace building contributions in their communities. Beneficiaries expressed that the training was very beneficial to individual participants and that more Women, youths and members of the community would have attended and benefited from the trainings should that have conducted at the LEP center or community halls.

Based on these findings – the estimates solicited in the fieldwork - the ET assesses that there is a 50-60% success rating on the extent to which resources were used to efficiently implement GYPI. This was challenged mainly by the lack of coordination by RUNOs in joint planning and monitoring, that would have seen maximize impact, from the available resources and coordinated expertise offered from the RUNOs

Were plans used, implemented and adapted as necessary?

The ProDoc set out a framework for planning, and UN agencies developed individual annual work plans to deliver on their specific outcomes to the GYPI project. Reporting documents show the use of plans. The ET concludes that while individual agency plans were used, they effectively contributed to the effectiveness of the project only to a limited extent. The adapted plans were weighted to more peace building training with soft outcomes which in the view of beneficiaries, partners, and RUNO was not balanced with hard tangible outcomes (livelihoods trainings) which would have contributed to the outcomes and the main aim of lasting peace in the Southern Highlands and Hela Provinces, such as the building of the community halls, livelihoods training and the distribution of drought resilient crop seedlings as hard sustainable outcomes, which was not explicitly captured in the design.

Was the overall project work plan achievable? Used? Was implementation in line with the approved ProDoc and work plan? If not, why not?

UN agency staff and former project staff were the only interviewee's knowledgeable about the overall work plan. Agency staff, when asked, often estimated that approximately 50% of the overall work plan was achieved. This estimate is rough, as agency staff are more knowledgeable about the work of their agencies, and less knowledgeable about the work of other UN agencies. The Peace Center intended to be a link to bind the LEP center volunteer network that was capacitated through the GYPI together was not achieved. Community halls were successful. The community-based development plans were created as planned. Community halls were recognized as common need across beneficiary communities. The halls were readily identified in the processes at the community level of developing their CPDP as favourable locations for Women and girls to safely access clean drinking water and thus sites for WASH projects under CPDPs – as well as a neutral space where Women, youths and the community can convene to discuss matters concerning their specific groups and the community as a whole.

These findings suggest that the overall work plan was only achievable to a limited extent despite its use by UN agencies and project staff. The effectiveness and efficiency challenges that RUNOs faced in implementing the project limited what was achievable, as did the limited links with government partners in implementation and monitoring.

What percentage of activities in the work plan were delivered?

UN agency staff and former project staff estimated that 50-60% of the activities in the work plan were successfully delivered. The ET concurs with this estimation.

Were project financial expenditures in line with the activity plan?

UN agency staff and former project staff were the only interviewees with knowledge of financial expenditures and the activity plan. They noted substantial budget variations in accordance with changes in the initial activity plan.

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

UN agency staff and former project staff confirmed that limited joint monitoring and evaluation plans were developed. RUNOs reported that they largely did their GYPI monitoring independently. Other informants had little information about monitoring data, but beneficiaries in FGDs and stakeholders noted that they would appreciate and sought greater presence of UN staff in monitoring, providing feedback and guidance towards GYPI activities in their communities.

In conclusion, monitoring by RUNOs of their own GYPI activities was conducted. Limited joint monitoring as GYPI was planned and conducted. The lack of coordination resulted in the data not collected regularly, coherently collated and used for collective and meaningful planning through regular meetings.

Assess whether the project can be considered as delivering value for money for its present scope/scale of impact.

The ET's assessment is that GYPI was over ambitious, which impedes value for money. The targets set in the ProDoc were too high given short time frame for GYPI projects by PBF rules, the complexities and high costs in Hela and SHP, and RUNOs limitations operating with the limited infrastructure in the Highlands. Thus, value for money was limited at this scope. The project however led to the development and securing of PBF funding for a larger, longer-term follow-on project in the highlands to boost impact.

To what extent were resources used economically to deliver the project?

UN agencies had challenges delivering the project economically, but made numerous adjustments to reduce costs and/or yield increased benefits in implementation. The main challenge was the lack of coordination by RUNOs. The need to hire staff to implement GYPI and challenges in doing so led to a slow start up of the project, delaying implementation by some six months according to some UN staff. Capacity limitations at UN Women, with several key managers and leaders leaving during GYPI implementation, impeded oversight and addressing the challenges of implementing the joint project. The building of the Community Halls and establishment of the LEP centers were successes of the projects, however that beneficiaries felt that GYPI would have reached more community members if trainings were conducted at the LEP centers and community halls. UN agency staff noted that costs were significantly lower and more training hours could be delivered by UN staff when trainings were held in the capitals of the two provinces. This led UNFPA and UN Women to bring community members into Mendi and Tari for activities.

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)

Beneficiaries felt that most community members selected for ToT did not have adequate education to comprehend the training delivered in English; thus, it was challenging for them to facilitate step-down trainings at community level. Beneficiaries felt this limited the step-down trainings that should have been conducted by those who received ToT trainings.

UN Women noted capacity gaps in their Country Office with staff departures that impeded addressing some of the implementation challenges in GYPI.

Assess working relationships within the team.

UN agency staff and former project staff noted that there were notable negative working relationships in the team particularly within UN Women. The Program coordinator reportedly felt there was lack of communication and engagement by senior management to support their work on GYPI, staff below the Program Coordinator reportedly had disengagements with and noted communications and coordination issues with the Program Coordinator. Some UN agency staff suggested that leadership through a program coordinator from outside these provinces faced challenges as Hela and SHP community mobilizers felt closer to the other staff who were from these provinces than to the program coordinator. These issues negatively impacted the capacity of the convening agency to pull the other two RUNOs together; UNFPA and IOM thus forged ahead as pressed with time and continued with GYPI implementation separately.

Assess working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors

Challenging relationships within the project team had negative impacts on partners and stakeholders. The result was that RUNOs were seen as separate entities and not working collectively under one GYPI project. This created some confusion with partners, community beneficiaries and stakeholders that was identified by beneficiaries in FGDs. With the short time frame of the GYPI, the complexity of the operating environment of the Southern Highlands and Hela Province (especially after a natural disaster) and the limited, efficiency needed streamlined coordination of RUNOs to share resources and costs to maximise effectiveness implementation. The 50-60% rating of effectiveness, primarily gathered from interviews with RUNOs, demonstrated limited efficiency in sharing of resources and demonstrated the costs to efficiency due to the lack of coordination by the CA and in communications between the CA and the other two RUNOs. Even with a no cost extension on the GYPI, efficiency in delivery remained problematic due to limited coordination.

Conclusions – Efficiency

In conclusion, in efficiency, there were notable issues. The data above suggest that:

- high turnover of international and local field staff created capacity gaps;
- the lack of capacity of local CSOs to meet UN standards delayed release of payments and negatively affected delivery;
- stringent UN security protocols limited regular and effective engagement with communities, and
- The selection of ToT participants reduced the reach of step-down trainings.

In addition, clear notable issues with coordination and communication were apparent among RUNO's from top management, to middle management and to the field officers responsible for community-based implementation. In such a volatile environment, effective responses from Senior Management to the field officers is important to manage community trust in the UN, some UN field staff noted. The UN Women GYPI Program Coordinator also raised challenges in waiting on responses from top management in commitment to convening of meetings and refused to participate further in the evaluation. There was an apparent gap in communication that needed to be strengthened for efficient resource sharing. The initial interventions of the GYPI were very efficient in the organising of a cost shared joint training on the UN 2250 peace resolutions. However, this momentum was reportedly lost as implementation progressed. RUNOs continued implementation individually and not jointly communicating and coordinating to effectively share resources. Coordination was lost due to the lack of engagement by the UN Women top management and Project coordinator based in Mendi, Southern Highlands Province. There was a high turnover of effective UN Women field staff who had grievances against the Project coordinator that were

not resolved by HR. Therefore, staffing around the GYPI would have impacted resourcing and implementation of the GYPI. Former field staff of UN Women shared that they were under-resourced to perform their roles which limited effective community engagement, which they felt demonstrated a lack of efficient and effective management of resources by UN Women needed to effectively implement the Project.

A notable gap in the Pro Doc design plan and actual implementation was the establishment of a proposed peace center to be built in Mendi and accessed by beneficiaries from both Provinces until further investment is made in establishing one in Hela Province. This however was not achieved by UN Women confirmed through observation during the evaluation. From review of budget documentation there were major deviations in budget allocation by UN Women for the Peace center into training and other miscellaneous costs. This resulted in imbalances between soft outcomes and hard outcomes of the project. However, IOM was still able to fill in gaps in establishing purposeful infrastructure based on the background they have had in both Provinces. This however beneficial also changed the design and impact of the Project. This is also indicative of the lack of combined planning and implementation to determine how best the major objective of the Project design around the Peace center could have still been achieved through cost sharing. Was it more cost-effective building five resource centers or reducing the number of community halls and combining those within the vicinity of Mendi with access to a main Peace center? In communities like Pombreal with bigger spread in ward council coverage, beneficiaries raised that accessibility and reach to the Community hall was also limited by distance. Other neighbouring ward council areas without community halls now feel marginalised and felt out as volunteers, which was raised in Koroba. These were notable impacts on the change in primary Project design.

In the communities, beneficiaries were not fully aware that the GYPI was jointly implemented by three UN organisations (UNW, IOM and UNFPA). This had to be clarified as an introduction preceding any focus group discussion with the community in this evaluation, so beneficiaries could then piece together all the activities they participated in to contribute collectively to the discussions. Each UN organisation was seen by beneficiaries as having a stand-alone intervention. The beneficiaries were also unclear of the overall objectives and what would be achieved collectively by all three UN agencies. This resulted in much confusion with beneficiaries. In some communities the lack of coordination and communication frustrated beneficiaries. LEP coordinators under UN Women were confused when UNFPA would start engaging with other groups outside the LEP network of community mobilisers who were then brought into the LEP center. This created segregations between beneficiaries who were not made aware that this was a jointly implemented project intended to share resources for the similar outcomes. As an example, in Pureni, Hela Province there is the established LEP center through UN Women, and also the Catholic Church Youth Rice Project supported through UNFPA and IOM. UNFPA have provided a camera to their implementing partner, while UN Women have provided a smart phone to the LEP center community mobiliser volunteer network. However, the LEP volunteer network asked for a separate camera for reporting as a recommendation from the evaluation. They said, "The camera is for them, we want our own." However, as a joint project this asset could have been shared. Whilst there may be other fitting examples of effective resource sharing between the partners to implement the GYPI this is a basic example of how the lack of coordination and communication between the UN agencies impacted the implementation through duty bearers and implementation partners.

6.5 Impact

Impact is "the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects."

What difference did the intervention make in Hela and the SHP?

Male beneficiaries said the training on Peace Building and Mindset were really transformational for individuals who received those trainings, mainly the benefits of peace, conflict mediation and settlement, and strategies on developing self-control. Training attendees are actively involved in mediating for peace in their communities. Stakeholders were grateful because they have noticed changes in the intervention communities as a result of the GYPI project. More Women from these communities are speaking up against violence and inter-tribal fights at public gatherings. Women have organised and led peace marches in Southern Highlands and Hela Provinces. The one-on-one and house-to-house awareness have seen to have reduced cases of violence in the project communities.

The ET thus concludes that GYPI:

- established a partnership with the Government that needs strengthening for greater engagement.
- built capacity of LEP center networks in peace building
- achieved social community cohesion within the LEP center and Community Hall communities
- strengthened the peace building initiatives with Churches as an institution

To what extent has the intervention generated significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?

In SHP, unexpectedly the LEP Centers became hubs for the whole UN system to use as entry points (such as the base for IOM to build multi-purpose community halls under GYPI). It was also not anticipated that the governments would use the community halls as they have, including for village courts. The GYPI established a partnership with the Hela Provincial Government that the UN was able to use to successfully develop larger scale follow-on projects including:

- Market development through UN Women
- Women's peace conference
- The Governor's USD 4 million investment in the UN's follow-on joint project in the province

Did the project make a difference in terms of peacebuilding and did its interventions lead to peace-relevant changes and how?

Through the trainings conducted by the Project, partners conducting the training observed behavioural changes in beneficiaries. Women were able to share on their involvement in peace negotiation after the training. Two young men in Walete Hela Province who attended the training were able to share their experiences in behavioural change. One of the young men had caught his wife having an affair with another man. The community who attended the FGD shared that they expected this young man to react with violence as he was a known fighter. But contrary he forgave the wife and publicly gave his wife away to the other man. The community in FGD shared that his outward display of behavioural transformation has made an impact also in their lives, the young men shared "if he can change, we can too". The changes the young man attributed to the mindset training conducted under the project. Both men have now been elected as Councilors and looked upon as leaders in the community and both continue to advocate for peace in the community. Another example of the relevant change the trainings conducted brought about was by a man from Pureni in Hela Province, one of the active fighting zones. When invited to the first training under the GYPI project his intent was to use that opportunity to go to Mt Hagen where the training was held and buy a gun to enable him to stop intergroup fighting against his tribe. However, after attending the training he came to the realization that there were other ways to resolve conflicts and shared when interviewed that "buying a gun was not going to stop the fights" it was not going to bring peace. He decided to become a strong advocator for peace in his community and uses his status as a District Manager to continue to advocate for peace as a community mobiliser. Using his story and experiences after training to mediate and advocate for peace. He expressed that more mindset trainings should be run throughout the Province under the GYPI. There were more indications identified

by former UN agency staff and former project staff that the ET was able to verify during field visits. Youth engaged in the trainings shared their own stories of behavioral changes brought about with the support of the project. Youths from Komo in Hela Province who were beneficiaries of the training under the Project have engaged in peaceful participation in Rugby as a sport and also in fish farming. Young people have expressed that they need to be kept busy through such sustainable platforms of engagements, so they do not engage in fighting. Similarly, this was expressed by youths in Pureni, Hela Province, where Catholic Church as a partner under the Project has supported the youths to be engaged in rice farming. Such interventions by the Project in engaging youths through the Church partnership has been viewed as peace relevant changes by young people, established through FGD.

The CPDPs and the resulting community halls built through the GYPI Project has also been relevant to the peace needs of the community. The community halls have been used for village courts, land mediations, a safe community meeting space where community issues can be resolved without conflict, and a safe space for Women to engage in other activities, such as the village savings club in Pimaga Southern Highlands Province. The ET noted from FGD that the community involvement in developing plans and also the building of the Community Hall provided them confidence, ownership and commitment to establishing peace in their communities, expressing that the use of the community hall has changed mindsets from fighting to better ways of conflict resolution.

The ET concludes from these observations that the GYPI Highlands project has thus led to some notable and observed peacebuilding and peace relevant changes in Hela and SHP. Although the reach of Community mobilisers was limited to their own communities where they felt safer as shared in Focus groups across both Provinces, there is some evidence observed by the ET of increased social community cohesion through the peace building processes of the GYPI

UN agency staff and former project staff asserted that the project had made a difference in peacebuilding. Partners also noted peace-relevant changes based on their work with GYPI support. Beneficiaries said they don't want to continue to live with the existing level of violence and chaos, thus suggested if GYPI interventions could reach all communities to achieve permanent peace in Southern Highlands and Hela Province. Stakeholders were grateful for the immediate outcome of GYPI and hope that GYPI can be expanded and replicate its interventions in more communities in both provinces.

Describe any unforeseen impacts or unintended consequences (whether positive or negative).

Project reporting, UN agency staff and former project staff, partners, beneficiaries, and stakeholders noted when asked that some consequences of the project or impacts were unforeseen or unintended. Positive impacts/consequences were the only ones characterized as unforeseen or unintended. These unforeseen or unintended impacts and consequences noted were:

- Those who attended the training were able to support each other in farming activities
- Youths who attended the Mind set training self-engaged with a local farmer businessman for help in pineapple, pawpaw and orange farming.
- A Councilwoman, as part of the Hoiyabia center, engaging displaced Women in horticulture and floriculture
- A peace march was organised by the LEP in Hoiyabia
- LEP center in Hoiyabia network engaged 18 (9 male and 9 female) youths for awareness raising on COVID 19
- Women's savings club in Pimaga, Southern Highlands
- A Hoiyabia CM assists in the referral pathway and is a human right defender.
- Walet Women lead in peace building, supported by young men

- Komo youths took up sports and fresh water fish farming to replace guns.

Based on these findings, the ET recognizes important positive unforeseen benefits that have resulted from GYPI interventions.

Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted (e.g., case-studies, stories, best practices).

Particular exceptional experiences were identified in some interviews, focus groups, and project reporting. These experiences included:

1. The use of the community hall as a village savings and loans facility for Women
2. Rice farming with youths in Pureni
3. Negotiation of peace in Pureni
4. The Komo Rugby League

In conclusion, there are notable highlights of the project with Women, youth, and peacebuilding. Categories where highlights were apparent included:

Trainings:

A majority of the impacts shared by beneficiaries in Hela Province were soft impacts particularly relating to the training that created behavioral changes by individual members of the community. Most success stories shared were direct impacts from the training beneficiaries but responses on success of step-down delivery from the Trainer of Trainers (TOT) is limited as triangulated through interviews with UN WOMEN staff. Beneficiaries from Koroba in Hela Province, expressed that there were also failures by UN WOMEN to monitor the quality of the dissemination of step-down training from the TOT. The quality of the training may not be as expected because of the capacity of the trainers cascading the training. Beneficiaries expressed the need to be monitored and supported before they can effectively deliver at the expected level to have the intended impact. In places like Komo, Hela Province the initiatives taken to make peace by a direct beneficiary in engaging youths in sports (Rugby League) and community participation in the sports has driven peaceful change as people become engaged and youths are occupied. Whilst only one step down training had been conducted due to the cost involved, which came at the CM's own expense, greater impact was seen through initiatives that created human development and mindset change through sports. The youths from Komo engaged in Rugby League were also engaged by a local association "Komo Youth's Voice For Change" were engaged by the local Youth leader on a local fresh water fish farm project that provides them some income source to support the soft change. This has ensured the sustainability of the soft change created through engagement in sports. Komo previously known as a tribal fighting zone has changed. There are no open displays of weapons in public places. Komo has become a peaceful area in Hela Province and this change is attributed to training from the GYPI project gathered as shared through the FGDs.

Peace Campaigns:

In Hela Province, Women as mothers and wives are passively very influential to their fathers, brothers, husbands and sons. Traditionally Women provoke violence by dressing in warfare attire with special face paint and can spend days crying and calling out to provoke men to go and fight. Women also cook and feed men engaged in tribal fighting. Men in Hela as a display of manhood and masculinity, and to avoid being ridiculed by the Women instigating the fight will engage in traditional warfare. Women also play a critical role in ensuring that their sons from birth are raised knowing who their enemies' tribes are and those who owe them blood from fathers, or relatives that have died at their hand or that of their fathers that have gone on before. Women as Mothers therefore play a major role in transgenerational instilling of

the payback mindset. Therefore, the targeting of Women as peace builders and the training of Women as mothers has been important to change their mindsets to advocate for peace through the influence they have on men, youths and younger children. Women in Hela Province have taken leading roles in establishing peace with support from the training through the GYPI as noted in FGD. Most Women volunteers under the LEP Centers do not openly advocate, but use inlets such as paying for buai (betel nut), smokes, coke or giving food to male youths to spread peace awareness. The engagement of Women throughout Hela Province is limited because of the cultural gender norms, Women will not stand up and talk in any gathering but are more effective when conducting awareness through household visits. Although the engagement of Women is positive, this reach may be very limited in the overall impact to building peace in the community because of traditional cultural barriers and safety of Women.

For greater impact, beneficiaries and duty bearers in KIIs strongly recommended that more interventions target the instigators of intergroup fighting. Peace Building and Mind-set training for them was sought to significantly propel the peace initiative. This is a strong recommendation because fighting in Hela Province in current times is fueled by individuals behind the scenes funding guns, ammunition and money into the hands of instigators and youth to fight. This can be politically motivated as well and a well-established syndicate to gain and maintain power. Therefore, as a bottleneck to the impact of peacebuilding, the instigators of intergroup fighting need to be engaged by programming.

Development of CPDPs:

The notable impact in the Southern Highlands was the collective input of the community into the development of the CPDPs. The CPDPs created ownership among the beneficiaries in meeting their own development needs. In Kumin, Mendi Southern Highlands, youths were engaged in building of the Community Hall and also the road leading to the Community Hall. Beneficiaries expressed commitment to take on some of the peace and development priorities, however needed more support because beneficiaries could not source any other funding. Beneficiaries in all 5 communities have expressed support for a sustainable livelihood option such as the distribution of seedlings or poultry for them to start raising funds to meet some of these priorities captured under the CPDP.

Community Halls:

In Southern Highlands, the major impact was notably the five (5) Community Halls in SHP built by equal effort from IOM and community contributions in Pimiga, Kumin, Topa, Semin and Pombreal. Pombreal is the only Community Hall that was not completed (an estimated 50% complete) due to the limited commitment by the community and lack of coordination by LEP members due to the expectations of payment. The Community Halls were built with 50% contribution or cost-sharing by the Community, who provided raw materials and labour. The Community Halls have created safe community meeting places to discuss community issues, and are utilised for Village Court hearings, by the peace and good order committee to mediate peace and land access as one of the major drivers of violence identified in Southern Highlands and Hela Provinces. In Topa Village Court hearings are scheduled every Tuesday at the Community Hall. The Community Halls are a safe place for Women and youth to convene. While at the Community Halls, Women and girls can also access safe drinking water supported by the donation of tanks and/or water supply by IOM. In Topa Women and girls shared they felt more safe accessing water at the Community Hall. In Pimiga, Kutubu District, Women use the community hall as a village savings club, where they meet every fortnight Friday to deposit into the savings club. The village savings model was introduced by WWF throughout Kutubu District. Women have now been able to recruit older men and youths into the savings club. Women's financial empowerment opportunities were supported with the soft impact of village savings model training with WWF and sustainability was strengthened through the hard tangible impact of the Community Hall infrastructure established under the GYPI. Women could

speak up and make decisions which were not traditionally accepted gender norms in Kutubu, SHP Province.

6.6 Sustainability

Sustainability is defined as “the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.” Sustainability is thus challenging to examine before a programme ends; however, even at mid-term, staff, partners, and beneficiaries can discuss work to support sustainability in the future and potential signs that are promising – or not promising – of future sustainability.

Assess the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue

UN agency staff and former project staff have expressed that GYPI as a catalytic project has established net benefits that should be expanded long term to see and effectively measure the theory of change. Government partners have also expressed that they would like to see more training. Beneficiaries have expressed in FGD that as community volunteers, they are willing to continue interventions if adequately supported to do so. Beneficiaries raised that this support is not always monetary but through other incentives. They have expressed they need support to be visible as well, with IEC material and merchandise to run stronger campaigns in larger groups. Beneficiaries in all communities have strongly expressed they would like to see the net benefits of training to be expanded widely, especially to both parties of inter group conflict. However, some support in creating sustainable livelihood income as hard outcomes to support the soft outcomes of the training is noted in all communities. Communities expressed the need for seedlings or poultry to help provide a sustained income that will support the net benefits. In Pureni, partners shared that youths who have trained who do not get engaged with projects such as the rice farming project they have, are likely to return to fighting. Stakeholders expressed they would like to see greater ownership that links the communities to support.

The ET has concluded that there are notable net benefits of the interventions are only likely to continue if supported well. Recommendations for greater sustainability, shared by beneficiaries and stakeholders that will support continuity are captured in the recommendations section of this report.

What is the potential for sustainability, replication and expansion?

UN agency staff and former project staff, partners, beneficiaries, and stakeholders have expressed that there were challenges and gaps with sustainability of the project which created lessons. UN agency staff and former project staff, partners, and beneficiaries raised that there is potential for interventions through the LEP center network to be replicated and expanded however need long term sustainability mechanisms to support. There are many lessons shared through that form recommendations

The ET concludes that GYPI project provides lessons that can be built on for greater sustainability, replication and expansion. The GYPI, as expected of a short term 18-month Project with an over ambitious design and limited resources, would have limited likelihoods of sustainability. The existing challenges in the cultural and political context of the Province, faced with continued pockets of intergroup conflict also adds complexity to the sustainability of the Project. However true to the intent, the GYPI was designed to trigger support for longer term and more sustainable investments by the UN into the Southern Highlands and Hela Province, which has been forthcoming.

Long lasting establishment:

Through the GYPI Project, some strong institutional partnerships have been established for longer term investment by the UN. The GYPI Project has introduced the UN as a stronger Government partner both at National and Subnational level. There has been commitment by the Provincial Governments to establish a steering committee in Southern Highlands and Hela Province. A network between Government stakeholders has been established. With effective coordination this network has potential to further strengthen future Government and UN partnerships. In Hela Province through this established committee UN Women has started feasibility study with the Provincial Government to build a market facility in Tari, under the safe markets program. Women who are part of the LEP networks and trained under the GYPI Project are now engaged under the newly introduced UN Women “Women make the Change” program which was noted during the evaluation. The Chair of the steering committee has indicated that the Provincial Government looks forward to a 5-year plan of what the UN would like to achieve in the Province and the UN is further welcome in the Province. To the PBSO he said “Please come back.”

Key factors affecting sustainability:

Key Factors identified by RUNOs, IPs, stakeholders and beneficiaries that support sustainability include strengthened subnational networks including LEP center network, strong Church and Government partnerships with the UN and focus on hard tangible development outcomes that support soft behavioural change outcomes.

Sustaining the existing peace created through the GYPI project is a critical challenge as most of the impacts from the Project is achieved through training with soft benefits on effective conflict resolution. Lasting behavioral and mindset changes come over time, however strong commitment has been observed from beneficiaries and Duty bearer volunteers created through the GYPI Project to continue the work of building peace and development. Current beneficiaries under the GYPI Project have requested for continuation and expansion of the peace building work as a foundation for other UN investments. The GYPI Project has created a foundation for a more sustainable investment by the UN into Southern Highlands and Hela Province. The GYPI Project, although faced with challenges of limited Government engagement, has set the institutional framework that can be built on for more sustainable longer-term investment. The Government has welcomed and acknowledged the presence and partnership of the UN and have pledged commitment to continue this partnership. As a strong indicator of partnership built on the introduction of the GYPI project, the Hela Provincial Government has reported that they have completed feasibility and all necessary requirements for the jointly supported Market facility in Tari through UN Women’s safe markets program. Also, in Hela Province the established Government partnership network through the GYPI Project will see the Province host a Women’s forum in June 2021, bringing in a host of International Development partners into the Province. Although more work needs to be done in establishing sustainable peace, a good foundation has been set with the GYPI Project in the Highlands.

6.7 Gender Equality and Human Rights

To what extent were gender and human rights integrated into the programme design and implementation?

Documents demonstrated integrated gender into the design of the project and interviews noted continued attention to gender and human rights in programme implementation. UN agency staff and former project staff noted and Partners noted that the trainings were effectively designed to gender sensitise the wider community to accept the participation of Women and youth in the peacebuilding process. The ProDoc targeted Women and youth through an approach emphasizing rights, which the RUNOs then

operationalized in implementation by working with and through Women and youth leaders to engage community chiefs, elders, and the broader community, the selection of Women and youth as community mobilisers, and the mobilization of their peers through GYPI. Beneficiaries in all FGDs appreciated the training and shared how it positively impacted them individually.

The ET concludes that the design integrated gender and human rights as per the ProDoc, and in implementation.

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

UN agency staff and former project staff expressed that the principles of gender equality and human rights were captured in project design and observed in implementation. UN agency staff noted that the male advocacy training was able to focus on gender sensitisation through influential males to advance gender equality. However, training the UN agency staff noted male from Hela were not able to attend the male advocacy training but only involved in conflict resolution training which incorporated human rights concepts.

Particularly in Hela, UN WOMEN through implementation partner Voice for Change conducted gender sensitisation training. The partner expressed in KII that the training was influential and had a positive impact in peace building as more Women are able to stand up and speak out in public and be heard when conducting peace campaigns, advocacy and awareness. However, throughout all FGDs in Hela Province cultural norms remain a challenge in the project work and impact because Women still feel they are not always heard openly in public. Women volunteers explained that the approach they have taken is to find inlets to negotiate for peace without their direct engagement. They do this through offering incentives like buying coke, betel nut or smokes for men to negotiate peace on their behalf. From UN agency staff this may be limiting to the goals in reach of the impact.

It is not evident to the ET how the training particularly resulted in gender transformative change that facilitated the greater participation of Women and youth in peacebuilding that would advance the project's aim of participation of Women in the peace building process.

The main goal of the project was to foster and sustain Women and youth inclusive peace-building in the Highlands region to reduce conflict and improve development. From the perspective of duty bearers, implementing partners, and RUNOs, the program design adequately captured principles of gender equality and human rights. The Program was designed to ensure that Women and youths as marginalised groups in the community had equal participation in conflict resolution and development according to the expected outcomes:

Outcome 1: Targeted subnational institutions are inclusive of Women and youth to prevent and respond to inter-group conflict

Outcome 2: Women and young people effectively engage in community-level peace-building mechanisms to prevent and respond to inter-group conflict.

Under outcome 1, Women mainly through the Church as an institution were reported to have been able to conduct Peace awareness and advocacy outreach campaigns and marches in both Southern Highlands and Hela Province. The Church network for Women has been notably effective as an institution for Women to leverage off for visibility. This was engaged by UN WOMEN in building a volunteer network particularly in the Southern Highlands. However, the GYPI did not tap into the Provincial Council of Women network and to utilise its existing subnational institutional framework to build on the inclusive participation of Women. The Women's network in Hela is established and has potential to be engaged.

Women consulted in Hela, felt that this network was not fully utilised and expressed strong recommendations to utilise this institution for inclusion of Women in the peace building process. Women in Hela were able to share their individual experiences in how they negotiated peace with key instigators of intergroup fighting. There is potential for this involvement to be enhanced with more training as was offered through the GYPI. For youths an existing subnational institute for youths, Grassroot Peace Action Team (GPAT) could not be verified, as members of the GPAT could not be identified and a physical meeting space could not be established. Donation of the 18 solar lights to the GPAT network also could not be verified to assess how it has directly benefited youth in creating awareness on peace and conflict resolution. In direct contrast, for Women, the utilisation of existing subnational institutions such as the Church based networks and structured Government mandated networks through the Council of Women provides clear visibility to achieving this outcome. Identifying a subnational institutional framework established through the National Youth Development Authority could potentially fill in the identified gaps for inclusive youth participation as identified for Women.

Although more Women could stand up and speak out when culturally only men were allowed to speak and Women did not have a say in any decision-making process. This is a cultural norm that is still very strongly practiced at present throughout the Hela Province. Therefore, from the perspectives of the duty bearers, implementing partners, and RUNOs, how the concepts of gender equality are translated by beneficiaries still needs strong emphasis.

Under outcome 2, Women and young people were effectively engaged under all LEP centers in Southern Highlands in the development of CPDPs and thus were also actively involved in the first development initiatives with IOMs support to build their own Community halls. Youths reported to have contributed labour, while the Women cooked for those providing labour to build the Community halls. Such engagement was observed to strengthen the training, provided by UN WOMEN and UNFPA that promoted mindset and behavioural changes to prevent violence that leads to loss of life, property, peace and security which are basic human rights. In Hela Province, the current high rates of displaced Women and children, mostly orphans from tribal warfare, are strong indicators of the breach of human rights. This was particularly observed in the Tari, Hoiyabia LEP center in Hela Province that provides a safe house, food, shelter and clothing with the support of the United Church. The coordinator at the LEP center in Hoiyabia continues to provide early childhood learning for the displaced children through the UNICEF initiated project that ended in 2020. However, from the LEP coordinator's perspective in Hoiyabia and that shared by other duty bearers, implementing partners, and RUNO's there is still a lot more that needs to be done to ensure that gender equality and human rights are adequately translated to beneficiaries in their specific community contexts. The Church as implementing partners highlighted that the Project ensured that Women and youths were viewed more as subjects of change than just objects.

6. Lessons Learned

Lessons learned are both lessons asserted by UN agency and former project staff, partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders in interviews, lessons noted in project reporting, and drawn from the analysis of the findings and conclusions above by the ET. Lessons learned are generalizations based on our analysis and knowledgeable informants that implemented the GYPI highlands project that have potential applicability going forward for UN agencies and partners in PNG working in peacebuilding or these provinces.

- *Extensive consultation is necessary for effective delivery of Projects* projects in the Highlands to bring together all key partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries – including particularly government stakeholders – to magnify and make impact more sustainable

Learning from the GYPI, contrasting approaches by RUNOs led to different levels of engagement and success in achieving outcomes of the project. A highly participatory approach by IOM in consulting with the community to design and then implement activities was identified both by beneficiaries and Government partners as highly good practice. This consultation by IOM with the beneficiaries ensured that they were fully aware that this was a shared joint effort between the IOM and the Community. The community were able to mobilise themselves which triggered community contributions and ownership of the process and the products as an outcome. Greater community consultation and involvement in design to implementation is necessary to meet Project objectives. Beneficiaries, although faced with many economic challenges and constrained by limited resources, have sacrificed for development.

In direct contrast there was little consultation with the Provincial Government or responsible Government agencies like the division of Community Development by other RUNOs. Therefore, there was lack of ownership and engagement by government. Beneficiaries and stakeholders felt that there should be greater consultation with the Government in the design so that there is government ownership and commitment to the process and the product. With extensive consultation, the process ensures that priorities of Government and UN would have greater coherence in meeting shared objectives. Programs like JSS4D, which Government partners highlighted as a successful program in engaging with Government in Southern Highlands, served as examples of how it could be different. The JSS4D program uses a model that effectively engages Government line agencies to identify and design activities that are aligned to sectoral priorities and objectives determined with PNG and Australian Government representatives at the national level. In such a design, Government agencies are involved in all sectors of Project management including reporting, monitoring and evaluation and sharing of best practices.

UN agencies need to determine ways to support integration of programming in joint projects and facilitate working together across agencies to avoid working in silos.

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. The opportunity created through PBF to combine resources for greater impact provides for learning and sharing to identify which areas of the respective organisations can be effectively streamlined while maintaining individual systems. It allows for cross cutting principles of gender equality and inclusivity to be effectively streamlined across all activities which is particularly important. Although much of the success of the collaboration rests with the convening agency and the Project coordinator playing a pivotal role in how this collaboration is managed, effectively there needs greater support from other agencies driven from the heads of each UN agency. The traction of the strong collaboration in the inception was lost as commitment from leadership to the joint programming, sharing, learning, reviewing, monitoring became weak. It is important for the RUNOs to review learnings from the GYPI to build on for stronger collaboration as an effective approach encouraged by the PBF.

In jointly implemented projects by UN agencies, effective communication and coordination amongst UN agencies, with Implementing partners and beneficiaries is important for effective and efficient project delivery.

There needs to be stronger commitment by RUNOs to build effective coordination strategies at all levels into a jointly implemented Project such as the GYPI to ensure that joint objectives do not change and the effective and efficient use of resources is maintained throughout the lifespan of the Project. For effective coordination between RUNOs, communication at all levels needs to be strengthened. Communication and coordination needed to be strengthened with the Government through the steering committee members, who were not aware of the GYPI and its objectives although being involved in meetings. Implementing partners felt there was no coordination and communication from the UN WOMEN Project coordinator. Project coordinator shared briefly that there was also a lack of greater involvement and commitment from

top level management from each RUNO. From field officers again there was no coordination and communication from the UN WOMEN Project coordinator. Field officers shared the observation that under the previous humanitarian relief assistance delivery. To improve communication between RUNOs and community networks, LEP center coordinators were placed on a communication Closed User Group (CUG) phone plan which allowed for effective communication by field officers with the field to follow up on reports when visits could not be made. This was not provided under the GYPI, which made field reporting challenging. Additional communication support is needed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Project delivery and reporting in the Southern Highlands and Hela Province. The lack of communications and coordination of the RUNOs negatively impacted effective and efficient project delivery, which had the potential to achieve more than the 50-60% success rate.

The experiences and exposure of communities determines expectations in these communities; expectations need to be managed effectively in developing and delivering community-based interventions in volatile communities such as in the Southern Highlands and Hela Province

The GYPI faced challenges in managing expectations of beneficiaries, which if not achieved can negatively impact on delivery and outcomes. To manage expectations, UN agency and project staff need to have clear communication and consistently engage with partners, beneficiaries, and stakeholders to build rapport and trust in communities. Field staff with appropriate backgrounds were effective in building rapport and trust through effective communication skills. To manage expectations by the community, there has to be a clear communication strategy for information dissemination built around this context. Due to the presence of large oil and gas companies in both Provinces and strong political turmoil, communities have distorted views and perceptions based on these engagements which creates misconceptions. Learning from the GYPI, the objectives and outcomes of future interventions by the UN need to be effectively communicated using models such as those used by IOM in the Southern Highlands under the GYPI. Such models need to be used effectively by all RUNOs in a collaborative approach in jointly implemented projects. All RUNOs should use a uniform communication approach with communities in a joint programming approach.

Risks such as strong cultural gender norms, security and exposure of Women to other forms of violence need to be mitigated to effectively engage Women in community-level peace-building mechanisms to prevent and respond to inter-group conflicts.

Within the Southern Highlands and Hela Province there are some risks that are more significant for Women that need to be well understood and mitigated in Project design to ensure the “Do no harm” approaches are maintained while promoting GEWE. Some of the risks that need to be mitigated for full engagement of Women are strong cultural gender norms that Women are not to speak or be heard and the acceptance of Women not to speak when around men in a gathering. Male dominance is really quite strong as Women also need men for protection. There is a need for greater gender awareness and wide community gender sensitisation to change the status of Women to being subjects of change and not just objects. In geography also in the Highlands exposes Women to many risks when travelling outside their homes. Particularly in Hela, communities are always tense and volatile which raises the risks of Women engagement in community volunteer work. Women who participate as community mobiliser volunteers face domestic abuse and violence by their partners when they are seen to neglect their wife and mother duties to travel outside their homes for awareness and advocacy. Through the GYPI a learning is that Women have more effective direct peacebuilding engagement in their own homes when interacting with their sons and husbands, within their extended families nephews, uncles and grandfathers reached through home visits within the community, using their community status as members of the church, health care workers or teachers and within networks of other Women from established institutions such as through the Church network or through the Council of Women network.

Churches are effective sub national institutions for effective partnerships in sustainable peace building long term.

Strong partnership has been established through Church networks under the GYPI. Peace campaigns as noted by volunteers are always done with prayer and incorporated with biblical messages. The respect given to the Church even by instigators of violence makes the Church an effective subnational institutional framework for effective partnership in peacebuilding in the Highlands region. Through partnership with UNFPA the Catholic Diocese ran mindset training that resonated and created lasting change shared by beneficiaries. The partnership also with faith-based organisations such as that with UN WOMEN and Melanesian Institute is also identified as having strong content that drives lasting behavioural change. Long term investment by the UN in lasting peace is encouraged to use the Churches that have established funding and reporting structures that meet UN and PBSO criteria for partnerships.

Delivery of soft outcomes through training that needs cascading are limited by level of literacy, and the capacity to disseminate effectively needs long term monitoring.

Various modes of selection of beneficiaries to the training have been used by RUNOs under the GYPI. When left to individuals there is a tendency to select who they know like their relatives to ensure numbers in indicator targets are reached and not necessarily engage in a process to identify those that are best suited for the design of the training. Communities have expressed they have a lot of youths who have not had the opportunity to continue higher levels of education further who are able to grasp training concepts better. However, to effect change they also need to be influential in the community to effectively disseminate and cascade information. It is important that a standard criterion for selection of participation is used in identifying participants who can effectively deliver the soft outcomes of the project. More engagement and involvement with the community is needed to identify and nominate suitable candidates that meet a standard criterion. This is challenged by short term projects such as the GYPI with high indicators of training participation numbers in key results framework that focus on quantity rather than quality of the output. Maintaining the effective theory of change for the GYPI, requires long term investment to effectively deliver behavioural change and peace dividends in the Highlands.

Hard tangible long-term outcomes strengthen and advance the preliminary soft outcomes delivered by the GYPI; hard outcomes in combination with soft assistances creates visibility and trust which is needed in Highlands's context where the UN's peace interventions are still in their early stages.

For sustainability, soft behavioural change outcomes need to be strengthened with hard outcomes to build trust and rapport in the community for sustainability in the peacebuilding process. This is evident in the building of Community halls and improving access to safe drinking water as objectives under CPDPs developed collectively by the community, implemented through IOM under the GYPI in Southern Highlands Province. The hard infrastructure outcomes built trust and ownership in the communities. In some communities, beneficiaries shared views that UN WOMEN and UNFPA were just talk; they sought in addition hard outcomes that are seen and felt. Examples of this kind of support from other RUNOs was identified and seen as possible. For example, in Pureni in Hela Province, the hard support in agribusiness through rice farming was seen as important to support the soft behavioural change training that targeted youths, implemented by UNFPA. The learning for future UN investment is that soft outcomes are strengthened when combined with hard tangible outcomes and are more sustainable in the long term.

Community mobilisers conducting peace awareness and advocacy campaigns need to be visible in the community to be effective.

The GYPI coverage in reaching all the fighting zones throughout Southern Highlands and Hela Province has been limited. Outside the areas where the peace building process has been initiated there is still

fighting. Outside the communities where peace is created, people still do not feel safe. Whilst the Government has also pushed forward to efforts in peace building this is established through large military and police presence which has not created lasting peace. Peace campaigns although conducted are *ad hoc* and one-off campaigns that also lose traction as there is lack of coordination, planning and support into designing of a Peace campaign program to have greater impact for long lasting peace. Volunteers established through the LEP centers would like to see a stronger campaign strategy. They have stressed that this needs to be visible and loud to capture attention and captivate for long lasting impact. Visibility can be improved through the establishment of a key peace campaign program linking all the LEP centers. Volunteers added that the campaigns need to be supported with banners, IEC material, clear uniforms, hats or other forms of identification and sound systems. They expressed the message of peace has to come out with force and in mass outreach or advocacy to show a united strong front and voice against intergroup conflict.

7. Recommendations

Project Management:

1. *RUNOs with support from PBSO should develop management strategies to strengthen the overall integration and implementation of joint programming*

The GYPI was designed to be a jointly implemented Project with shared use of resources with similar target beneficiary groups. The dynamics of joint project implementation demand more effective communication to achieve coordination. Limited communication and coordination between UN agency and project staff negatively impacted the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation. Limited communication and coordination also caused confusion among beneficiaries.

RUNOs should develop effective management strategies, including a communication and coordination strategy, that provides a link from top UN agency management at the country level in PNG to mid-level program management that is streamlined to field level. Uniform beneficiary communication strategies sensitive to the cultural and exposure levels of beneficiaries should be developed across all RUNOs. Field officers should be well orientated on this uniform approach. The Coordination and communication strategy should identify and use key engagement points for Government engagement; these cannot be limited to meetings where reports of what the UN has been able to achieve are presented. The project coordinator role should be staffed by an experienced professional with experience in coordination across multiple UN agencies or multi stakeholder partnerships. The project coordinator should have experience with successfully addressing challenges of community-based communications in volatile, violence prone communities. UN staff raised that the project coordinator should be staffed independently and not an agency specific staff but possibly at RCO level coordinating across all RUNOs. More effective coordination by RUNOs can support more effective delivery and more efficient use of resources for maximum impact.

2. *PBSO should consider greater flexibility in PBF awards for staffing in proposed project budgets to support effective project delivery within short timeframes in challenging environments*

The RUNOs strongly recommend that PBSO consider increasing budget for staffing so the Project can be staffed with a higher caliber of human resource at competitive market value to attract staff that can contribute to more efficient and effective project management in challenging locations like Southern Highlands and Hela Province. Adequate and project specific staffing will ensure greater coordination and commitment to joint implementation.

3. *The PBF should continue to fund joint projects and should consider providing additional support for RUNOs to support the joint development, management, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting*

UN agencies have limited experience with joint projects. PBF-funded joint projects are some of the early efforts to strengthen integration in program development, management, M&E, and reporting towards making delivering as one a reality – and moving beyond delivery to these other key areas of joint work. The PBF should consider ways to support UN agency staff towards enhancing the jointness of PBF programming and consider allocating funding for pre-proposal training and collaboration, training and mentoring towards joint management and implementation, and support to strengthen joint M&E, and reporting.

Project Methodology:

4. *RUNOs should develop ways to strengthen activity implementation in Southern Highlands and Hela Province by systematically ensuring greater consultation and collaboration in program design, activity implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting.*

Based on experiences with the GYPI, it is important for PBSO to ensure that the design, implementation, as well as monitoring, evaluation and reporting for future PBF funded projects is accompanied by thorough consultations particularly with Government stakeholders at all levels - both National and Subnational. This includes working with critical implementing government agencies developing possible partnerships that could be linked directly to Project implementation. Consultations and collaboration are required to gather effective background information on the context as well as available capacity to achieve outcomes. More funding invested in a consultative project design process may result in not only a better design but also more effective and efficient delivery. UN agencies need to learn effective strategies for Government engagement, perhaps from other successful programs within the same context. The GYPI experience shows that simply knowing about the Project is not enough to engage them. Effective government engagement by the UN should take a two-pronged approach, working from top level down as well as the bottom level up. At top levels, from the National to Provincial Governments, the GYPI established a Steering Committee to consult with to contribute to Project design. It is realistic for the capacity of the respective Provincial Governments to be used to support implementation as a partner to the UN. The executive management of provincial governments should take greater responsibility for technical support in implementation, and for monitoring and reporting to train and build capacity of Government officers involved in implementation or expansion. As a bottom-up approach, ward council presidents engaged to each LEP center must be fully engaged in overseeing direct implementation, monitoring and reporting on the activities, challenges, and recommendations from each LEP to the respective agencies assigned to them by the Provincial Government. Having Government engagement at all tiers of project management - from design to implementation and then monitoring and reporting - provides opportunities for greater coherence in alignment to Government priorities, more ownership and better long-term sustainability. Such models are effectively used by the Justice Services and Stability For Development (JSS4D) program within Southern Highlands Province.

Consultation with beneficiaries through effective community engagement is equally important, particularly because of the lack of exposure and literacy that leaves opportunities for misconceptions amongst communities. With more involvement, comes ownership and commitment by the Government and the people to building peace, which is the cement for sustainability in lasting peace efforts.

4. *UN agencies should develop activities that engage with the instigators of intergroup violence: Stronger interventions with instigators of intergroup violence are requested by Government and Beneficiaries.*

Future peacebuilding Projects in the Southern Highlands and Hela should focus on as key instigators of violence. These prominent instigators of intergroup fighting or “Papa blo Pait,” should be targeted in the peacebuilding process. This targeting can complement a focus on reaching Women and youth. Government stakeholders and beneficiaries feel interventions that successfully target key instigators of conflict are needed to address the root cause of violence in Southern Highlands and Hela Province.

6. *Develop and support a more structured peace campaign program that is visible throughout Southern Highlands and Hela Province.*

Peace campaigns were envisioned as major outcomes of the GYPI. Peace campaigns were not achieved effectively and need to be strengthened. Volunteer peacebuilders expressed there is strength in numbers and visibility. Volunteers recommend that future support from the UN support more events as well as better organised events, including through the provision of uniforms or other forms of identity to volunteers. This would enable peacebuilders to conduct campaigns that reach larger numbers of beneficiaries. As violence and intergroup fighting continues particularly in Hela Province, the GYPI had only a stone throw’s reach and impact. Consistent messaging for peace is needed to really drive advocacy and awareness campaigns via until there is lasting change and peace in the Highlands.

Project Sustainability:

7. *The PBF should consider developing funding instruments with longer time frames; violence is still problematic outside the primary GYPI intervention sites.*

Peace from human transformation changes in a society like Southern Highlands and Hela Province and its complexity such as culture and political power, needs long term interventions. The PBF should consider longer term investments in Southern Highlands and Hela Province. UN staff have raised that learning from the experiences of this GYPI, a minimum of 24 months of implementation, considering a few months for an inception phase for mobilization of partners, staff and resources should be considered. People in the communities expressed that they do not want the UN to leave them. The presence of the UN through the PBF GYPI Project has restored a level of trust and growth that has not been seen for a short period of time through any project. People of Southern Highlands and Hela are ready for change and committed to the process but expressed the need for support from the UN to push forward the work of peace building. Through the GYPI there is peace within the 10 intervention communities surrounding the LEP Centers however outside these areas of direct intervention there is still fighting, and people still do not feel safe to leave their homes. The mass of people are still yet to be reached for lasting peace and opportunity - and also for expansion through the foundations set by the GYPI.

8. *Lessons and experience from the GYPI project should be used to inform longer-term peace building in the Southern Highlands Province and Hela Province.*

There are many lessons learned from the implementation of the GYPI. These lessons are informed by beneficiaries, community and stakeholders, who are key to improvements of future investments of the PBF through UN within the Southern Highlands and Hela Provinces. As a catalytic project, the GYPI generated lessons learned for future peace building efforts.

9. *UN agencies and the PBF should continue to focus on supporting sustainable capacity development of the Churches, LEP centers, and other Government recognized subnational frameworks such as the Provincial Council of Women Network and work with the National Youth Development Authority to use Youth networks*

Church Networks: For more efficient outreach and greater impact within Southern Highlands and Hela Provinces, the UN should continue to work with the Churches. Churches have built community trust, respect, and stability in communities widely impacted by violence. Church property is never touched during tribal fighting and provides safe refuges for those fleeing from violence. In Provinces where there is so much distrust, and misconceptions are widespread due to the lack of exposure of members of the community to people outside of their communities, the Church has established broad trust built through decades of community presence. Building on the successful partnership with the Catholic Church established through the GYPI, the UN should partner and work with other Churches in the Highlands to be more inclusive and effective in peacebuilding, particularly for the involvement of Women and youth in the peace building and development processes.

Women's Networks: Women consulted in Hela Province were members of the Provincial Council of Women, a sub-national institution for Women with extensive structural reach down to ward council level in PNG. The National Council of Women forms the Provincial Council of Women at subnational levels. This Women's network is institutionalised through the National Council of Women Act 2013 under the custodianship of the Department for Community Development and Religion. Women in this network are prominent leaders, including in other institutions such as the Church. Working with PCWs and prominent Women that lead through dual roles strengthens Women's engagement in peace building processes. Women through this network have recommendations that they would like to be linked through the established LEP center network. In places where LEP centers are yet to be established the Women have expressed that they would like to support the expansion of LEP centers through their network to have at least 1 LEP covering 3 to 4 ward council areas. Women in this network recommended for more training and other benefits streamlined through the LEP center network so more Women can be empowered.

Youth Networks: For youth options to establish a subnational institutional structure can be explored through the National Youth Development Authority. However, there are other successful subnational opportunities for engagement of youths. There is strong recommendation throughout all communities to use sports as a behavioural change tool for youths who are engaged in tribal fighting. Engagement of youth through sporting institutions such as the Komo Rugby Club in Hela Province built peace within a District that experienced widespread violence through tribal fights. The Division of Community Development in Hela have expressed that engagement of youth in sports is a major priority for the Provincial Government and the agency and recommended the UN to strengthen the engagement of Youth through sports.

LEP Center networks: The GYPI utilised the LEP centers and the Community Mobiliser network as an entry points into communities which was very successful in the delivery of the GYPI project outcomes. Future investments through the PBF should utilise this established network. Future project support should establish a LEP center coordination committee consisting of Church representatives, youth representatives, and Council of Women Presidents and with oversight provided by Presidents of ward councils. LEP Center coordinators can report to this committee. This can ensure transparency in LEP Centers and effective reporting through clearly developed LEP operating guidelines. Strengthening the functional management capacity of LEP centers will enable them to channel various other peace and development benefits into the communities, which can also ensure inclusiveness in benefit distribution through the LEP centers and effective targeted approaches to yield the most impact. A possible outcome of the effective strengthening of the LEP network is proper screening and selection of beneficiaries or duty bearers for training (which was identified as a challenge for the GYPI).

LEP Community Mobiliser Volunteer network members, who had been trained to negotiate peace in Southern Highlands and Hela Province, also raised recommendations for support to improve the effectiveness of the peace outreach and advocacy that are supported by the findings, conclusions, and lessons learned of the evaluation. These specific recommendations include:

1. Increase the number of LEPs so the area that they can reach is two to three council wards, which could enable LEPs to adequately cover the District and provide for the volunteer network from the respective LEPs to safely reach communities without support for transportation.
2. Train more volunteers and members of the community.
3. Provide a sustainable, consistent supply of resources through LEPs, including stationary and effective a sound system equipment for outreach.
4. Increase the visibility of teams through clear identification markers for members such as uniform hats or shirts.
5. Offer incentives for volunteers - if not monetary then through a performance-based reward model with medals or plaques after outreach and advocacy milestones are reached.
6. Consider other longer-term incentives for volunteers, such as sponsorship for counselling certification training.

10. Soft outcomes should but be supported by hard outcomes for long term sustainability of the peace process

Women and youth in communities saw providing agriculture training, such as distributing seedlings or poultry projects, to those who have completed the peace building and mind-set training as avenues for Women and youth to sustain their livelihoods and maintain peace. Youths in Southern Highlands asserted that without sustainable livelihoods, they will go back to fighting. In Hela, where violence is fueled by money and guns from people seeking political power behind the scene and where there are no other income streams, youth also noted that a potential return to picking up weapons was a prospective livelihood. Therefore, engaging youths in sustainable income generating activities as through agribusiness and animal husbandry are thus critical in cementing the peace created through soft behavioural change support, one outcome from GYPI training.

In Komo in Hela Province, youths are engaged in fresh fish farming by the “Komo Youths Voice for Change”. This further strengthens and cements peace in the community established through the GYPI. A significant observation of transformative change was that in Komo, in direct comparison to other communities in Hela where there continues to be the open display of men carrying bush knives and other weapons in public, no weapons were seen. This observation strengthens the recommendation of having more hard project outcomes accompany and build on and cement soft outcomes created by the GYPI.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference (TOR)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy: End of Project Evaluation

Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative: PBF/IRF: Strengthening the role of Women and Youth as Peace Builders with a primary aim to improve Development and foster inclusive peace building in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea

Location:	Southern Highlands and Hela Provinces, Papua New Guinea
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract (IC)
Project:	Peacebuilding Fund project
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date:	February 2021
Duration of Initial Contract:	February to March 2021 (37 working days)

BACKGROUND CONTEXT

PNG has a long history of tribal clashes though there is no record of the extent of casualties. A recent UN led conflict mapping process to Hela showed that in 5 fights some lasting three months, one lasting 7 years, 134 people have been killed. There are over 100 ongoing conflicts in SHP and Hela. Using these figures, we can then extrapolate that there may have been close to 7,000 casualties over the last 5 years or so.

This conflict has been compounded by the proliferation of weapons and the breakdown of traditional peacemaking structures. Allocation of royalties from extractive industries operating in the region remains a flash point for violence. There is a notable absence of Government services (health, education and justice services) and governance structures at all levels are politicised and weak. Women have very few opportunities to influence the decisions of leaders to start conflict since the culture is strongly patriarchal. Conflict in the two provinces has been rising gradually since the 1980s. A key change in recent years is that inter-group fighting now involves the use of high-powered weapons. This has had profound effects on conflict dynamics, increasing the threat levels, lowering the barriers to entry. Access to arms has empowered young men less experienced in combat and without community mandate to act outside of consultation with traditional leaders. Access to arms also increases the severity of clashes, and therefore complicates peace mediation processes, as the cost of conflict increases.

The increase in resources available to those in power have politicized local tensions leading to further challenges (provincially and nationally). Politicians support the progress and development of some clans/locations over others (commonly those that supported them to win the election). Politically charged attacks or assumptions about political involvement in clashes further entrenches disagreements and exacerbates the void between the rights holders and the duty bearers. A recent example of this in Mendi, the provincial capital of Southern Highlands Province (SHP), is the burning of a national passenger aircraft, provincial courthouse, and the official provincial governor's house in June 2018 in response to election results. Disenfranchised young men are vulnerable to manipulation and their violent services purchased by businesspersons and politicians.

In addition, SHP and Hela Province commonly experience natural disasters, and tensions rise due to disruptions in access to resources and livelihoods, politicization of aid and displacement. In recent years, PNG faced a serious drought in 2015/16 affecting over one million people. The epicentre of the recent 7.5 earthquake in February 2018 was located in SHP, causing over 150 known deaths and affecting half a million people. The impact of conflict on the delivery of life-saving assistance is evident. Since 28 March

2018, inter-communal tensions twice resulted in the suspension of humanitarian operations in both Provinces.

Government services to address tensions are limited. Village courts, which are an official part of the national law and justice system exist but are not mandated to mediate serious tribal conflict. In many areas, there is an absence of any visible government presence, with Police in both Hela and SHP rarely venturing outside of the respective capitals. Peace and Good Order Committees, that bring together all actors in the formal and informal peace process, do exist but often lack capacity to negotiate lasting peace agreements. There are some Women village court magistrates and respected Women do from time to time participate in Peace and Good Order Committees, but this is rare. Many groups find themselves in a situation where warfare is conducted beyond the “rules” of tradition (increasing the risk to Women and children, and disruption to government services), and yet the state is commonly unavailable to intervene, leaving huge gaps in terms of rule of law. As a result, conflict mitigation, prevention and resolution largely rest with the men in the communities involved in the conflict and faith-based/community organizations.

Gender and Youth Promotion Initiatives Project:

In 2018, the United Nations in Papua New Guinea embarked on an 18-month project entitled “Strengthening the role of Women and Youth as Peace Builders to improve development in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea”. The Peacebuilding fund was supported through the IRF modality through the Multi-partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Gateway. The project was jointly implemented by three UN agencies: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) - International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

The project was implemented in two provinces in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea, where there is serious and ongoing tribal conflict. The UN is currently delivering humanitarian aid to communities devastated by recent earthquakes in the area. This PBF program will leverage on results, networks and knowledge built from the existing humanitarian work though it will focus specifically on preventing and responding to conflict. The locations cover 3 districts and 11 Local Level Government areas:

- Hela Province: Komo, Pureni, Walete, Hoyabia and Koroba
- Southern Highlands Province: Bosavi, Topa, Pombreal, Kumin, Semin and Pimaga

The aim of the project is to foster and sustain Women and youth inclusive peace building in the Highlands that will in turn create an enabling environment for longer-term development outcomes. The project had a duration of 18 months commencing in January 2019 to June 2020 with a 5-month no-cost extension that ended on 31st October 2020.

Rationale

- The overall purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative in Hela and SHP in order to determine how the impact aligned with the project outcomes. The evaluation will examine project reach, how resources were utilised, coordination of activities and challenges faced. UN Women, UNFPA, IOM and the UNCT will use the findings from the evaluation more broadly to inform future programme planning and implementation.

1. Evaluation Objectives and scope

- i. Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project to responding to the context of the inter-tribal conflict in Hela and SHP. Also, assess project alignment with international agreements and conventions on the Gender Equality and Women Empowerment (GEWE) and youth participation in peacebuilding.
- ii. Assess effectiveness of the project intervention in achieving project outcomes the achievement of project results as defined in the intervention, with a specific focus on effectiveness concerning Women and youth empowerment.
- iii. Assess efficiency, value for money in project intervention and achievement of project results as defined in the intervention.
- iv. Assess the sustainability of the intervention results, especially concerning Women and youth empowerment.
- v. Determine the overall impact of the intervention with respect to GEWE and youth empowerment.
- vi. Analyze how human rights approach and gender equality principles have been integrated in project design, implementation, and monitoring.
- vii. Identify and validate lessons learned, good practices, challenges, examples, and innovations of efforts that support gender equality, human rights, and youth empowerment.
- viii. Assess how approaches and strategies used have affected outcomes; provide actionable recommendations for UN Women, UNFPA, and IOM with respect to each agency's work in SHP and Hela Province.

The evaluation will be conducted at the end of the project and will cover the entire cycle of the project, the initial 18 months and the 5 months no cost extension period. It will take into consideration activities conducted across SHP and Hela Provinces, evaluating the coverage and reach of the project as well.

Decisions on the specific locations for the evaluation will be proposed by the project RUNOs and agreed with the PBF Secretariat and the evaluation team, based on the methodology and the proposed sample size. The selection will include a representation of the two provinces for this exercise, as well as a specific focus on Pilot project communities with extension to the Duty bearers.

2. Evaluation approach and methodology

i) Approach

The evaluation will use a theory-based approach, following OECD DAC evaluation guidelines and criteria, UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation and UNEG norms, standards for evaluation and revised UN-SWAP guidance on integrating GEEW into evaluations.

ii) Evaluation criteria and preliminary evaluation questions

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:** If the GYPI Project intervention was appropriate in addressing problems faced by Hela Province and Southern Highlands Province.
2. The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries' (especially those of Women and young people) needs and priorities in the area of prevention of inter-group conflict in SHP and Hela Province, as well as to partner institution needs and priorities. Further assess the following:
 - The appropriateness and relevance of the project design to the project outcome and deliverables, including an examination of the theory of change and testing the hypotheses that informed it;
3. **Coherence:**
 - The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the Highlands (Hela, SHP) context in the various social sector or and the relevant provincial government strategies
 - Assess whether the objectives remained valid over the course of the project, and whether adjustments were made.
4. **Effectiveness:** Did the intervention achieve its objectives? To what extent did the intervention deliver results in an economic and timely manner? What are the identified best practices/approaches that have been developed during the duration of the implementation?

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.
 - What is the project level of collaboration and complementarity with the other PBF projects in SHP and Hela as well as any other relevant related projects?
 - If the project was relevant vis-à-vis the conflict causes/factors and the peacebuilding priorities of the two Governments and the beneficiary communities.
5. **Efficiency:** How well were resources used? Efficiency of planning and implementation. Were plans used, implemented and adapted as necessary? For example:
 - Was the overall project work plan used? Alternatively, was the implementation in line with the approved PRODOC and work plan? If not, why?
 - 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?
 - 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.
6. **Impact:** What differences did the intervention make in HP and SHP? The extent to which the intervention has generated significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.
- Did the project make a difference in terms of peacebuilding and did its interventions lead to peace-relevant changes and how?
 - 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.
7. **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.
 - Are the project contributions lasting? 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?
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, UNFPA and IOM implementation in Hela and SHP. Data collection (including secondary data) will include a review of project documents, key informant interviews, Mixed method involving qualitative and quantitative 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) Sampling

The sampling of data will be using qualitative methods, including key informant interviews and Focus Group Discussion using a survey approach.

v) Stakeholder Participation

The evaluation team will finalize the stakeholder mapping based on the list to be provided by RUNOs team. The stakeholder participation will be conducted in two ways:

- Direct project beneficiaries will be identified with the support of the project RUNO team in the pilot sites.
- Indirect beneficiary of the project will be determined by the evaluation team in the design phase. The indirect beneficiaries will participate as key informants. They will also be engaging in the validation meeting.

3. Evaluation process

a) Preparation phase

The preparation of the evaluation will include TOR approval and consultant selection, compiling documents for the evaluation

b) Inception phase

- 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.
- Finalize the stakeholder map
- Review the Theory Of Change
- Develop relevant qualitative and quantitative data collection tools.
- Conduct an inception workshop/consultation with key project stakeholders.
- Prepare an Inception report to be shared with the project managers and finalize upon receiving feedback from the evaluation review group

c) Field phase

- Data Collection and preliminary analyses
- Initial validation meeting with key stakeholders on preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations

d) Reporting phase

- Continue with data analysis
- Develop a report as per UNEG quality checklist for evaluation reports and UN-SWAP evaluation performance indicators

e) Validation workshop

- Finalize the report with feedback from key stakeholders. Following the final validation workshop. Final feedback from stakeholders will be incorporated to compile the final report

f) Dissemination phase

- The final report will be shared with each of the RUNOs and PBSO for clearance before sharing externally

The consultancy is estimated to take 37 days, but there may be some flexibility in the duration depending on submitted proposals and suggested methodologies.

4. Documentation available for the analysis:

- GYPI Prodoc
- Baseline Evaluation Report
- RUNO Field Monitoring reports
- Mission and Activity reports
- PBF 6 monthly and annual reports
- PBF End of project report
- GYPI monitoring and evaluation Plan and Results Framework

5. Evaluation Management

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 IOM) 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 SHP/Hela focal point will provide further information on project activities and stakeholders, and will facilitate liaison with implementing partners and beneficiaries.

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

6. Duration of work

The consultancy is estimated to take 37 days over a period of 3 month 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 January 2021.

Timing of roles and responsibilities

No	Key Events	Time frame	Tentative dates
1	Preparations & Submission of the inception report	5 days (1 wk.)	18-22 Jan 2021
2	Data Collection	14 days (2 wks.)	25 Jan -7 Feb 2021
3	Analysis	5 days (1 Wk.)	8-12 Feb 2021
4	Reporting & hosting of validation Workshop	10 days (2 Wks.)	15-26 Feb 2021
5	Any final amendments	Week 1 (3 days)	1-3 March 2021
6	Dissemination		

7. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of a lead evaluator (identified through this TOR) and will provide leadership and technical support remotely. The lead consultant will be supported by two local consultants who will act as research assistants. The Local consultant will lead the site data collection and beneficiary engagement. 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 PNG and SHP and HP 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).

(i) Qualification and Experience Required

Experience:

- Should have at least a minimum of 7 years of experience and evaluation in development and peacebuilding projects, including survey design and conduct, data analysis and report writing.
- Should have solid experience in gender and youth-responsive analysis.
- 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.

Education:

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

8. Ethical Code of Conduct

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

9. 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 evaluation report is completed, and certification by the UNFPA GYPI focal point is done.

Activities/Weeks/Days	Tranches	Amount	Weeks (%)
Upon finalization of the design/ Inception report,	Tr 1		30%
Submission of draft report	Tr 2		30%
Upon submission of the final evaluation report	Tr 3		40%
TOTAL			100%

10.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 (Masters), 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 evaluation, including use of mixed-method design, in peacebuilding 	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 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; and Proven cross-cultural communication and the ability to function effectively in an international, multicultural environment. 	5 5 5 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 shortlisted 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 a 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 Consulted

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>

GYPI Project Documents

PBF Project Progress Report, Final, Country Papua New Guinea, 1 December 2020

PBF Project Progress Report, Semi-Annual, Country Papua New Guinea, 30 June 2020

PBF Project Progress Report, Annual, Country Papua New Guinea, 31 December 2019

PBF Project Progress Report, Semi-Annual, Country Papua New Guinea, 30 June 2019

Final Report: Baseline Study for the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI) Project in Southern Highlands Province and Hela Province. No Date.

IRF Project Document, United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)/Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), Project Title: Strengthening the role of Women and Youth as Peace Builders to improve Development in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea

IOM Activity Progress Report, November 2019

Annex 3: List of Sites Visited, Interviews and Focus Groups

SITE VISITS

SHP

1. Pimaga
2. Kumin
3. Topa
4. Semin
5. Pombreal

Hela Province

1. Komo
2. Koroba
3. Walet
4. Hoiyabia
5. Pureni

INTERVIEWS

UNFPA

Franklin Kunjip (Mendi - SHP & Hela province)
Steven Panu, Deputy Country Representative
Dr Behnaz Abolshams

UN Women

David Lundape (Tari, Hela province)
Steven Gari (Mendi, SHP)
James Neo, Programme Analyst
Goodshow Bote. M&E specialist

IOM

Peter Murodera
Benjamin Sipa (Mendi - SHP)

Civil Society Organisation partners

Melanesian Institute (MI)
Voice for Change
Catholic Diocese of Mendi

Government partners

SHP
Francis Yasi, Community Development

Hela

Ken Angobe, Community Development Director, Provincial Youth representative, Sports Manager
Alio Wape, Tari-Pori District Community Development Officer
Michael Telave, Takali Youth Development Council Chairman, and Secretary of Peace and Good Order Committee)

Stakeholders

Michael Palana Koroba, District Manager, Koroba, Pureni and Walete

PCC members

1. Leo Supiri, SHP Chairman
2. Sr Mary Balupa, FSC SHP
3. Wekia Kelly, Community Development Women's officer SHP
4. Posu Nama, Chairman SHP Youth Group
5. James Tesi, Community Development Youth officer SHP
6. Isaac Mea, Provincial Village Courts and land mediation manager
7. Constable Theresa Kemawawa, Family and Sexual Violence Unit-Mendi SHP
8. Sargent Jimmy Suwai, OIC Family and Sexual Violence Unit-Mendi SHP
9. Morris Subnek, Community Development Child Protection Officer
10. Thomas Hengepe, Hela Province Chairman
11. Sr Claire Nembo, FSC Hela Province

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

SHP

1. Pimaga LEP center network
2. Kumin LEP center network
3. Topa LEP center network
4. Semin LEP center network
5. Pombreal LEP center network

Hela Province

1. Komo LEP center network
2. Koroba LEP center network
3. Walete LEP center network
4. Hoiyabia LEP center network
5. Pureni LEP center network

Institutions

1. Komo Boys Rugby group
2. Hela Provincial Council of Women group
3. Hela National Council of Women group
4. YAM Youth group Tepe Mendi, SHP
5. Catholic Church group Mendi, SHP
6. Seventh Day Adventist Church group Mendi, SHP
7. United Church group Mendi, SHP
8. Hoiyabia Church group, Hela Province

Annex 4: Evaluation Instruments

DOCUMENT REVIEW GUIDE

The evaluators 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

- Addressing the peacebuilding problems of Hela and Southern Highlands Provinces
- Responsiveness to needs of beneficiaries
- Responsiveness to needs of partners
- Appropriateness of project design to reach outcomes and deliverables
- Threats and opportunities over the life cycle of the project
- Theory of change fit

Coherence

- Fit of intervention in context of other interventions
- Fit of intervention in context of social sectors
- Fit of intervention in context of provincial government strategies
- Continued relevance of objectives?

Effectiveness

- Achievement of outcomes
- Achievement of outputs
- Best practices/approaches
- Economical use of resources to deliver results
- Timeliness of delivery of results
- Any failures identified
- Collaboration/complementarity with other projects
- Addresses conflict causes
- Addresses the peacebuilding priorities of the government
- Addresses the peacebuilding priorities of beneficiary communities

Efficiency

- In planning
- In implementation
- Use of work plan
- Percentage delivery
- Financial expenditures in line with activity plan
- Monitoring – data collection, storage, and use
- Value for money
- Extent resources were used economically in delivery
- Any capacity gaps identified
- 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 communications

Impact

- Difference project made in the two provinces

- Significant higher-level effects (positive or negative)
- Difference in peacebuilding/peace-relevant changes
- Any unforeseen/unintended consequences

Sustainability

- Continued benefits from intervention
- Potential for sustainability, replication and expansion
- Key factors affecting sustainability
- Organisations that could ensure continuity
- Evidence of replication or magnification, future likelihood

Gender equality and human rights

- Extent integrated into design and implementation
- Evidence for how GE and HR advances project and relationships

INTRODUCTION AND INFORMED CONSENT

Thank you for talking with us.

My name is _____. And I am _____. We are working independently for the United Nations to conduct an evaluation of the work conducted by UN Women, UNFPA, IOM and its partners through the project “Strengthening the role of Women and Youth as Peace Builders to improve Development in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea,” known as the GYPI Highlands project.

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.

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

This interview is entirely voluntary; you have the right **to stop answering** at any point without consequence.

We 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]

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

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE AND QUESTIONS

Introduction

Please tell me about your experience with the project. How did you learn about the GYPI Highlands 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 Highlands project.

Relevance

Based on your experience with GYPI, do you think the project did the right things to address the peacebuilding problems in the Highlands?

How much did the GYPI project respond to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries (especially Women and youth) in the prevention of inter-group conflict?

How much did the GYPI project respond to the needs and priorities of partner institutions in the prevention of inter-group conflict?

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?

Coherence

How well did GYPI activities fit with other projects in the Highlands, social sector projects there, and provincial government strategies?

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

Effectiveness

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

Would you say the intervention delivered results in an economic and timely manner? Why or why not?

Are there any practices or approaches of the project that would identify as “best practices”? If so, what are these practices?

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 the importance and relevance of these key achievements?

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

How did the GYPI project collaborate and complement other PBF and other relevant projects in Hela and the SHP?

Was the project relevant in addressing the causes of conflict in the Highlands?

Was the project relevant to the peacebuilding priorities of the government?

Was the project relevant to the peacebuilding priorities of beneficiary communities?

Efficiency

What evidence is there for efficient planning and implementation?

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 evidence is there that the GYPI used resources economically to deliver the project?

Were there other programme management factors that had strong positive or negative effects on delivery?

How were working relationships in the project team?

How were working relationships between the project and partners, stakeholders and the PBSO?

What did the project do to support learning?

How were the internal communications within the UN on the project?

How were external communications with those outside the UN?

Impact

What difference did GYPI make in Hela and the SHP?

Did the GYPI Highlands project lead to significant higher-level effects? If so, what were these effects?

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

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

Can you identify and describe any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted from the GYPI experience 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?

How do you see the potential for sustainability, replication and expansion?

What do you see as the key factors shaping the sustainability of the project?

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?

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

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION PROTOCOL AND QUESTIONS

Thank you for coming today for the focus group

My name is _____. And I am _____. We are working independently for the United Nations to conduct an evaluation of the work conducted by UN Women, UNFPA, IOM and its partners through the project “Strengthening the role of Women and Youth as Peace Builders to improve Development in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea,” known as the GYPI Highlands project.

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.

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

Participation in this group session is entirely voluntary; you have the right **to stop talking** at any point without consequence.

We hope to learn from your knowledge and experience with the project and its activities through the discussion today. Please answer Yes if you are willing to participate in this study? [Ensure that participant(s) verbally agree to participate]

Do you have any questions for us before we begin with a short list of questions for you and the other participants to discuss?

We would like to learn about the ways that you engaged with or know about the activities of the GYPI Highlands project.

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Please tell me about your experience with the project. How did you learn about the GYPI Highlands project and begin to work with the project or its activities? [GO AROUND TO GET RESPONSE FROM EACH PARTICIPANT]

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 Highlands project.

Relevance

How much did the GYPI project respond to your needs and priorities in the prevention of inter-group conflict?

Effectiveness

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

Efficiency

What things did the project team do that you found worked particularly well – or poorly? Why did these aspects have these effects?

Impact

What difference has the GYPI highlands project make in your communities? Why has it had these effects?

Sustainability

Are project contributions lasting? Why or why not?

Gender Equality and Human Rights

How much did you and others discuss gender equality?

Did attention to gender equality advance the project's work? If so, how?

How much did you and others discuss human rights?

Did paying attention to human rights advance the project's work? If so, how?