

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

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

**Lawrence Robertson
Independent Evaluator**

4 August 2020

DISCLAIMER

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

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in Papua New Guinea (PNG) commissioned an independent End of Project Evaluation of the “Empower women and youth for a free, fair, transparent and violence free Referendum” Project. The project was funded by the United Nations (UN) Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)

triangulation of data, and comparison of findings. The COVID-19 pandemic affected the evaluation plans



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

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

United Nations

Output 22 Increased opportunities and incentives for women and youth to support social cohesion and peacebuilding efforts in the Referendum process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- i. Assess the relevance of each RUNO's contribution and of the project as a whole to the post-conflict priorities in Bougainville relating to the referendum, including alignment with international agreements and conventions on GEWE and youth participation in peacebuilding
- ii. Assess effectiveness of project support for organizational development in progressing towards the achievement of GEWE and youth empowerment results as defined in the intervention
- iii. Assess efficiency of project support for organizational development

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

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

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

System puri " drR next

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

Major external events have influenced the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



**Under key activity 22a) Conduct youth leadership training on peacebuilding to enhance youth led
Referendum awareness raising and serving as agents of peace, UNEPA organized Leadership trainings,
awareness raising events, and a series of the self management trainings**

UNEPA and UNWn envoked towards 22b) Support the use of Youth Resource Centre as a central hub

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

Failures and their causes

UN staff interviewed and project documentation noted challenges in their own capacity to implement the project as well as challenges in working with IPRs to ensure that activities were implemented as planned and on time. UN Women's first project manager came in five months after the project began and was reportedly

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

Some CSO partners saw the challenges of their UN partners and ABG IPs. One said “I think the project itself was success, but I think the challenges are with some of the individuals that the project engaged with” Another CSO interviewee felt that the limitations were more the individual Bougainvillian beneficiaries of the project: “I think depending on what the background of the stakeholders was, each person was challenged

firo

o ,e ,E

r aÉr o

em o r

o ip f < r o

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

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

Differences made by GYPI

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

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

Another way lasting benefits of GYPI was perceived was through the contribution of the project to the high



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

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

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

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

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

PBSO are key consumers and users of evaluations of PBF-funded projects and

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

**Bugainville (with travel to other locations in the Autonomous Region
of Bugainville), Papua New Guinea
Individual Contract (IC)
Peacebuilding Fund project
English**

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

Aligned with the BPA, the proposed Project aimed to support inclusive participation, preparation, and institutional readiness to realize a successful Referendum, by focusing on the engagement of women and youth in this process, a significant gap which remains overlooked. Women and youth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Is the GPH Project intervention doing the right things?

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

Quality and Relevance of Design

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

The project context, threats and opportunities over the life cycle of the project. Did the project make a difference in terms of peacebuilding and did its interventions lead to peace-relevant changes and how?

is the project relevant vis à vis the conflict causes/factors and the peacebuilding priorities of the two Governments and the beneficiary communities?

2

How well does the intervention fit? The cogge rehenem

!

tree

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

**United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). June 2010 Quality Checklist for Evaluation To Rand
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>**

Other training reports

Workshop reports

UN Women Justification for Adaptation of Activities and Results Framework 2019

Joyceanne Tuga, Youth Representative, Buin District Youth Association, Buin, South Bougainville
Albert Kaeba, Nazareth Center for Rehabilitation Community Counsellor [Human Rights/Male Advocate], Buin, South Bougainville

Hm Isabel Peta, Regional Member for South Bougainville Women, Bougainville House of Representatives, Buin, South Bougainville

Jhm Nondakele, District Community Development Officer (ABG Department for Community Development), Buin District Administration, South Bougainville

Jane Malano, Community Counsellor [Women Human Rights Defender], Buin South Bougainville

Lara Anpa, Community Counsellor [Women Human Rights Defender], Buin Safe House, South Bougainville

Bernad Kipara, Youth Representative, Kieta District Youth Association, Kieta, Central Bougainville

Geard Tacussy, District Community Development Officer (ABG Department for Community Development) / Acting Panguna District Administrator, Panguna, Central Bougainville

Other project qualities

Any catalytic effects

Risk tolerance

Timeliness

Gender equality and human rights

Extent integrated into design and implementation

Attention to advances of the project

Introduction and informed consent

Thank you for taking part in this research
Terkyulo gtdokwarainni

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

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

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

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



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

Yuting GYFI igat d' gutpela bilong em ver bai istap longpela taim iken? Sapos igat, ware n'ol dispela gutpela bilong projek? Long ware n'ot tuod dispela gutpela sating projek i nekim bai ken stap longpela taim iken?

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

Ware sating yuting i nas kanap long nekim d' gutpela s'is projek i kanap i pinis long stap d'sem longpela taim?

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

Long luksave bilong yu wantaim projek, ware n'ol kanap v'ok bai yu putimigo pas a'irit long sapot bilong UN i go long Bougainville?

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

Yuting yu kentok d'sem projek i bin n'olim kanap v'ok bilong kanap i bel isi long taim d'spela kanap v'ok i nas kanap?

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

Long ware n'ot tu projek taim i g'vim luksave long gat war kanap luksave long nan n'nei, i halivim projek long v'ok bilong em raw'ok bung bilong em wantaim d' patras?

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

Long ware n'ot tu projek taim i g'vim luksave long human rights, i halivim projek long v'ok bilong em raw'ok bung bilong em wantaim d' patras?