

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

United Nations Peacebuilding Priority Plan 2015 – 2017

Autonomous Region of Bougainville Pa!ua Ne" #uinea

United Nations \$evelo!ment Programme

%a" rence Robertson
&nde!endent ' ontractor()valuator

November 201*

\$&+ '%A& ,)R

- .e aut.or/s vie"s e0!ressed in t.is !ublication do not necessarily reflect t.e vie"s of t.e United Nations United Nations \$evelo!ment Programme or t.e reci!ient United Nations organisations!

A ' *NO + LE , - E . ENT (

- .e evaluator " ould li5e to t.an5 + .addie -a!o of UN\$P for all .er great .el! in organising and com!leting t.e evaluation!

support groups, AB# and civil society institutions to address the needs of some conflict-related trauma victims

- The UN/s work on strengthening relations, skills and trust between the #oPN# and AB# to support the implementation of autonomy arrangements and the BPA and supporting access to more objective and accurate information and fora for dialogue and debate – as seen as relevant and appropriate – as well as critical to the main achievements in implementing the BPA over the 2015-2016* period. The PPP/s work on building relations, skills and trust between the #oPN# and AB# – as seen as the most successful area of the PPP – some areas of support in trauma healing were seen as less strategic and thus less relevant and appropriate. The revision of the Project Document in this area did not resolve dissatisfaction with its objective particularly with its development partners

- The United Nations had numerous challenges in staffing the Project and the PPP team had many challenges in designing and implementing activities as well as managing monitoring and reporting on these activities in the challenging environment of PN# and the ARoB. The PPP team was attentive to the economical use of resources in programme implementation. The political nature of the programme and delays from both governments challenged planning and increased costs to the Project. The procurement team used best practices to procure goods and services rapidly and competitively. Planning was a constant challenge for the PPP? annual plans were developed and implemented in ways that allowed for flexibility since much of the timing and agenda was under the control of the two governments. The constant slippage in the timing, B) data does not seem to have been used for management – only to report to PB+9. The PPP was implemented by a lean team led by an international Project manager as able to resist the pressures of both governments

UN activities under the PPP are accepted by partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries in PN# and the ARoB. The two governments depend on the PPP for practical facilitation of meetings. They are accustomed to ~~engage from the~~ UN about the need for meetings on BPA implementation and rely 4(i) 10.8696(m) . .65326(a) 9.21631(l)

- PB+9 should consider less demanding monitoring and evaluation modalities and reporting on PPP implementation and "or5" it. PPP leaders to develop (, B) systems that will be used as part of PPP management as well as for information sharing!
- - .e PB+9 should consider developing programmes "it. longer time periods than the 2year term for the PPP or making it clear that PPPs will be sequenced since peacebuilding is a long-term process!
- PB+9 should continue to consider supporting peacebuilding priority plans that may not be able to focus on sustainability replication or magnification but that are able to support priority actions to build or sustain peace at critical periods in the peacebuilding processes around the world!
- - .e UN should continue to support the implementation of 5y processes in BPA implementation!
- Project design and implementation should focus on 5y priorities of both governments in dealing with the referendum and its aftermath. Plus public awareness activities!
- - .e design of activities in a successor PB:2funded programme on peacebuilding in Bougainville should focus more on sustainability and national ownership!

1) INTRODUCTION & Aims, Mission, and Purpose

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Papua New Guinea (PNG) commissioned a final evaluation of the United Nations Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) 2015 – 2017 in mid-2017. The Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility (PRF) of the UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) financed the implementation of the PPP by the Recipient United Nations Organisations (UNOs) in PNG after the UN Secretary-General declared the area eligible for support from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) in 2014. UNDP and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) implemented the PPP in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville (ARoB) of Papua New Guinea from August 2015 onwards. The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the overall progress of the project over the 44 months against its intended goals and objectives. The evaluation used the PPP as divided into four single projects to evaluate the design of the PPP, achievements in each component of the PPP towards these outcomes, the effectiveness of the processes used, and sustainability. The evaluation also assessed overall PPP outcomes and indicators used in the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework for the PPP.

The final evaluation Report consists of this introduction that explains why the evaluation was conducted, the background context for the PPP and an explanation of how the PPP was organised and explains the purposes of the evaluation. The subsequent section outlines the methods used in the evaluation including the questions to be answered by the evaluation and identifies limitations to the evaluation/s methods and risks as well as ways that the evaluator has mitigated these limitations. The final section organises findings from the evaluation/s methods and summarises these accumulated findings as conclusions. The final section analyses the conclusions to make recommendations and draw lessons learned from the PPP. Report annexes include an evaluation matrix, a bibliography of documents used, a list of interviewees and the data collection instrument used in the evaluation.

The final evaluation was conducted in July and August 2017 immediately after the period of implementation. This enabled data collection while memories are fresh and lessons to be learned right after implementation. The evaluator has thus assessed sustainability shortly after the conclusion of implementation.

1.2 Aims, Mission, and Purpose

The context for the PPP was shaped by conditions in PNG in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville (ARoB) as well as the United Nations. Based on this background, UNDP Papua New Guinea proposed the partners, stakeholders and the Peacebuilding Fund to develop the PPP.

The ARoB has been a conflict-torn area of Papua New Guinea. The region of approximately 400,000 people has been characterised for decades by poverty and underdevelopment. Bougainville suffered nearly a decade of violent conflict in the late 1980s and 1990s. Organised violence largely ended with the signing of the Bougainville Peace Agreement (BPA) in 2001. However, tensions between and within communities in Bougainville remained and relations between the Autonomous Bougainville Government (ABG) and the Government of PNG were problematic. The United Nations has been one of the key international partners in peacebuilding in Bougainville and has had an important active role in supporting the ABG and partners in the implementation of the BPA.

The UN established the Peacebuilding Fund to support post-conflict peacebuilding initiatives in 2008. The PB+9 was developed as a set of instruments and experience in dealing with events related to conflict and sustaining peace. A PPP is a peacebuilding strategy developed by the UN and the government of a member country which together endorse the PPP and submit it for PB+9 funding through a joint steering committee. The UN and the government and UN. A PPP is meant to be a high-level based on contributions – financial and other – from all parties.

The UN Secretary-General declared that PNG was eligible for support from the PB+9 in 2014. The UN and ABUJ conducted a comprehensive Peace and Development Analysis (PDA) funded by the PB+9 and facilitated by Interpeace. It concluded that the historical drivers of conflict in Bougainville remained and that the region should not be classified as post-conflict. PDA findings in 2014 suggested that there were potentially more contributing factors to conflict in 2014 that raised risks of conflict compared to the situation in the 1970s and 1980s before the outbreak of the conflict. The PDA identified the conflict factors in 2014 as: i) resistance to outsiders because of perceived threat to Bougainville resources, culture and identity; ii) unequal distribution of benefits and costs from Panguna mine and from other natural resources; iii) internal communal jealousies and disputes over land and other resources. It also noted that there were no easily accessible non-monetised means of resolution.

The UN Security Council and ABUJ developed the PPP and submitted the plan to PB+9. The PPP was developed to address the findings of the PDA and implement recommendations from the analysis. The Plan was approved by the Security Council, ABUJ and the UN in 2016. Implementation commenced in August 2015. PR grants are designed to have a maximum duration of three years. A six-month monitoring

is not possible. An extension is possible.

Processes used and sustainability - The PPP was organized into four outcome areas and outcomes and each of the four projects have project outcomes:

- The PPP was made up of four project documents (one for support to PB: coordination and monitoring

choices at the Bougainville referendum and to have increased confidence in the BPA process through access to more objective and accurate information and for a dialogue and debate on key peacebuilding issues both within communities and with their political leaders.

The Project Document for PPP Outcome 3 Promoting security and social cohesion in Bougainville was funded at the UN\$ 1 500 000. The UN is implementing the outcome through UN\$ 1 270 000 and UN: PA 700 000. Outcome 4 had the following outcomes:

Outcome 2 Increased community social cohesion and community security through access to trauma healing and reconciliation services

Outcome 2 Community police trauma counsellors and health workers dealing with family and sexual violence provide more effective and informed services on trauma response and reconciliations.

The PSA highlighted that two significant issues related to dealing with the legacy of the past had been largely neglected. These two issues were trauma healing affecting many communities as well as individuals and the poor conditions and environment for discussing the conflict and learning from the past. The 2014 Household Dealt with Safety Survey conducted in Bougainville through a joint UN programme led by UN\$P called Partners for Prevention/ found alarming levels of family and sexual violence and that a key contributing factor to this violence was the persistence of post-conflict trauma. This led to structuring work under Outcome 4 to support social cohesion and community security through alternative non-politicised gender and conflict-sensitive trauma healing within communities. The second issue was the limited discussion of the past conflict and corresponding limited learning from the past conflict which could have ramifications for the risks of current and future conflict.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Project evaluation is to assess the overall progress of the projects against their intended goals and objectives. These benefits may be useful to UN\$P other UN organisations and units including the PB Secretariat, the AB# #OPN# organisations working in the ARoB and PN# to support peace and development and other donors and partners interested in peace and development in the ARoB.

1.1) - Design

The evaluation has used conventional evaluation methodologies to collect and analyse data on the design implementation outcomes impact and sustainability of the PPP. The Terms of Reference 7-9R for the evaluation detailed important areas for findings and analysis on the development and implementation of the projects of the PPP. These have been used to structure the evaluation. The key questions about four main areas of the PPP are: quality and relevance of the design the effectiveness of the PPP in relation to its stated objectives and intended results the efficiency of planning and implementation and the potential for sustainability replication and magnification. An Inception Report was used to develop an evaluation strategy attached as Annex 18 and to develop questions for the evaluation/s field work.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The 9R asked that the evaluation address the following specific issues and questions:

Quality and Relevance of Design

Assess the continuing appropriateness and relevance of the design. The project context, threats and opportunities may have changed during the project. Assess whether the objectives are still valid and what adjustments have been made.

Effectiveness

conducted semi-structured interviews with 20 staff of UN organisations and their partners as well as 10 leaders from the PNP and ABC civil society organisations and community-level organisations in Bougainville (see Annex 4). The evaluator used an interview protocol and semi-structured interview questions designed to gather qualitative information (included in Annex 6). Interviews were conducted either in person or over the phone (5 in person). Interviews have been used to gather qualitative information from 5 key individuals directly relevant to the purposes of the evaluation. The evaluator followed up on structured questions from the draft interview guide with respondents to learn more from particularly interesting responses and to dig deeper into their perspectives. Not all informants were asked all questions as there were too many questions from the TOR for an hour to one and a half hour interview. Knowledge and experience with projects also varied among respondents. Different

been held even once in the four years prior to the PPP setting up the key mechanisms for executive branch engagement such as the Bougainville Referendum Committee and developing relationships between legislators through the Biartisan Referendum Committee of the PNG Parliament and the Referendum Committee of the AB House of Representatives. Interviewees from the two governments noted that the project helped build and maintain relationships between key counterparts from both governments. Interviewees appreciated the support of the project for joint technical team meetings to prepare for CAB meetings as critical steps in building relationships between the two governments and working towards implementation of the BPA.

Interviewees noted continued problems in the relationships between both governments and in implementation of autonomy arrangements and the BPA. These issues were seen as validating the need for the PPP to continue to support dialogue between the two governments. Interviewees did not report that UN staff were able to address the content of these persistent disagreements between the two governments in BPA implementation. As the distribution of development grant funding from the PNG Government, some UN interviewees asserted that the UN should have been more involved in these

The 2017 interim survey for the PPP gathered information from a multi-strata sample of the population of the AROB and compared this alongside to the public opinion data from the earlier September 2010 baseline survey for the PPP. One of the largest changes in sentiment was on elected voting behaviour and in the 2010 survey 71 percent of respondents declared that they were inclined to

too small, too disparate, and not focused on community security. PB+9 thus sought a restructuring of implementation and the activities under the objective. Key donor partners also sought change in this area. Some UN development partners and PB+9 interviewees reported that development partners felt that UNDP and UN:PA activities in this project were potentially duplicative and/or focused on areas that were perceived as less strategic. These included working to support trauma healing through the refurbishment of facilities, training and networking of professionals, and service provision itself rather than pursuing a strategy of developing policies and frameworks for trauma healing. Specifically, as the evaluation was undertaken by UN staff, some UN staff noted that development partner staff turnover

80 percent of the total population of Bougainville were being trained in 2017. These figures have slipped a little, now only 77 percent of respondents claim command of the Bougainville language, 6 percent some command, 24 percent do not. This may be a function of the language respondents expressed greater confidence in these areas than in the past. The reasons for this decline in confidence are not clear from the survey from other products or from interviews.

In this 2017 survey the population of Bougainville felt even more strongly that their BDoR

- The PPP also encouraged and supported AB# efforts (f) - b

sample of communities in North Bougainville. These mechanisms reduced the quality of data that was unprecedent in Bougainville on the perceptions and amount of information of community leaders and the consultation on the BPA. This mechanism appears to have not been used to a great extent. However, as the BPA process did not work autonomously but instead required substantial support from the UN Specialist to fund, organise and lead meetings with community leaders to get any monitoring data. No interviewee noted the use of the BPA data for PPP management. While the data from the consultation surveys was available, no interviewee noted specifically that this information was used to inform PPP planning or implementation. This information is potentially useful for management. The PPP team did not develop an elite survey; instead, program management interacted with the elites in the AB and OPN as a part of implementing the PPP. This provided the team with the views of 5 elites. Do these views were not reported on systematically or used in the BPA system?

The neutrality that was possible through an international project manager was seen as important by some UN staff as well as by development partners. An electorate was seen as potentially able to resist the constant pressure put on programme activities from the OPN, AB and development partners.

PB: outreach, communications and work on awareness should have been better. This was a common view expressed by some UN staff and donor partners. This was seen as a key in both capturing stories that could be used as examples and in capturing the results of the PPP.

The programme team was seen to learn from experience in implementing the PPP to improve delivery. However, the first tranche of support for members of the BD9R to support public dialogue and debate on BPA implementation was implemented through a contract to a private firm. This in turn worked with the BD9R members and staff. This practice was seen to work poorly. The PPP team adjusted and provided the second tranche of support for public dialogue and debate on BPA implementation through

Lessons learned in the implementation of the PPP were said to have been a part of the processes of development of the current PB: Project Referendum and Project and FP&1 Lessons learned from the PPP contributed to the FP& and PB: Having a stronger focus on communications at grassroots levels using local approaches greater attention to women and youth and more consultation with donor partners in design

activities – the additional support provided by the PPP staff and the different funding modality used in the second set of BD9R outreach activities resolved these timeliness problems!

The project management team was able to implement the PPP – this suggests that the project management was robust enough to meet the implementation needs for the PPP – the small team came in for substantial praise for their ability to execute the challenging project in the demanding conditions of PN# and the AROB! Key UN interviewees noted that the PB: coordinator was inherently put in an extremely difficult situation in leading the PPP by having the key roles in facilitating engagement between the two governments in the small resource constrained AB# – the tasks of supporting the AB# while adhering to the PPP and UN regulations were seen as demanding? AB# counterparts were seen as not systematic and often last-minute in their demands on the project – the frequent and last-minute requests for support from the AB# were seen as inherently leading to tensions between the AB# and the PB: coordinator who needed to follow regulations and plans!

Some UN interviewees emphasized the benefits of having a neutral international serve as PB: coordinator and of having an international in charge of operations and procurement – the highly political positions small size of the AB# and place of the project in between the #OPN# and AB# was seen as requiring international staff! Expectations were noted that national staff were

The project management team was able to implement the PPP. This suggests that the small project team was robust enough and to meet the implementation needs for the PPP. The interviewees raised project management UN staff development partners and some government partners noted room for improvement in management in particular in the size of the project team use of B) and in communications. The project board was not seen as active in management. The only use of the ' ' was to approve the PPP. It approved modest changes in design of objective 4 on trauma healing sought by development partners and approved the annual reports staff and stakeholders had different views on whether the PPP had made efficient use of partners. It is in implementing activities particularly on the DDR outreach activities.

Potential for sustainability replication and recognition

It was seen as relevant and appropriate interviewees found that UN activities under the PPP were accepted across partners stakeholders and beneficiaries in PN# and the ARoBI. Interviewees agreed that UN support through the PPP was accepted – and expressed appreciation for UN support across the board. It is appreciation followed discussion of efficiency and effectiveness. The interviewees noted some challenges in PPP implementation.

The main areas where the PPP came in for criticism in acceptance was in objective 4 on social cohesion. Where development partners and UN staff felt more care could have been taken in the design monitoring reporting and communication of results.

PB+9 and PPP language in reporting was an evident stress on the potential for catalytic effects from these interventions. This rhetoric was seen by some UN staff and development partners in interviewees as overstating the potential for catalytic effects in the context of PN# and the ARoBI. Interviewees noted the limited finances of both governments as well as the scarcity of donors that made it unlikely that modest support from the PB: had much potential to stimulate other resources or activities in the absence of additional resources. This was the case for civil society as well? The modest resources of the B = : the NaAaret Centre for Rehabilitation 7N' :R8 and other organisations did not allow for expansion and these organisations did not note additional opportunities for funding through their engagement with the PPP or other programming.

Interviewees noted that PPP supported practices were continuing in the ARoBI and trauma healing. The N' :R continues to work on community programming and through its safe houses after support from the

CONCLUSION

UN activities under the PPP are accepted by partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries in PNG and the ARoB. Acceptance, however, does not do justice to the role of the PPP in supporting BPA implementation in Bougainville. The two governments depend on the PPP for practical facilitation of meetings and rely on the PPP to help facilitate their face-to-face interactions. Engagements outside of the face-to-face forums are limited. This was left complaints by AB# leaders that the #oPN# was not met or "as continuing to not meet" as its responsibilities under the BPA as constant features of dialogue.

PB+9 and PPP language about catalytic effects was not seen as realistic in the context of PNG and the ARoB. The limited finances of both governments as well as the avarice of donors mean that there is little expectation of PPP financing stimulating other resources.

Although some PPP-supported practices continued to be implemented by partners after the support of the PPP had ceased, the limited capacity of the AB# and #oPN# challenged assumptions that both governments would be able to continue these activities after the handover of PPP activities to the governments. Facilities and PPP-provided equipment, as in cases to date, are currently found limited use by government partners. Interest in continuing activities in all three outcomes is clear but key counterparts do not have the capacity or financial support to continue the activities of the PPP at present. These capacity constraints have limited and are likely to continue to impede the incorporation of reported supported activities or results into government institutions.

Scaling up PPP activities requires substantial resources which are not now available in a resource constrained environment. The successor PB Programme for Bougainville is seen not as scaling up but instead as essential funding for BPA implementation.

Interviewees recommended as future PB-funded activities the plans and activities of the second successor PB Programme continued support for dialogue between the two governments and parliaments, increased awareness and dialogue on the BPA referendum and post-referendum issues and progress on elections. Interviewees suggest future PB activities to mark the end and recognize the time as of the essence of Bougainville was to hold a successful referendum by 15 June 2021.

1) LEARNING, ANALYSIS, REFORMATION

Relevance

Based on the way the United Nations developed, agreed and implemented the Peacebuilding Priority Plan in PNG and Bougainville over 2016-2021* the UN does not have issues with its staff, partners or stakeholders about whether it is appropriate and relevant for the UN to support the dialogue between the two governments on the implementation of the BPA, awareness raising on BPA implementation or social cohesion. The engagement of the UN in peacebuilding was conducted after gaining the approval of stakeholders through consultations, is widely recognized as appropriate and relevant in PNG and the ARoB.

In the next several years will be critical in sustaining peace in Bougainville. As an accepted and valued partner and in the absence of other accepted neutral organisations that could serve as alternative partners

- The UN, UNDP, UN Women and PBC should consider additional ways to monitor systematically over a sustained period of time the community-based and AB# institutions monitoring their output to enable a wider reach to this large critical population across the AB#.

- The PBC should consider less demanding monitoring and evaluation modalities and reporting on PPP implementation and monitor their PPP leaders to develop, B) systems that will be used as part of PPP management as well as for information sharing. PB# in Nepal For the theory, B) is most effective when it is used for management. PPP managers should use, B) data to support their management of the program. The content and extent of, B) for a project should primarily depend on what the project needs and can utilize for management. The detailed information collect

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation questions (ub\$>uestions) Indicators/Performance measures, data sources (ub\$>uestions)

opportunities to
implementing the BPAJ

Do you see it as appropriate
and relevant for the PPP to
"or5 su!ort access to
more objective and accurate
information and fora for
dialogue and debate to .el!

!eo!leo! 5t4 - 667(o)10.8ugon ao to .elta8!3.68 To [(!) - 0.48828!(-1.6s(oB3(o60815(i) - 4.602.55 10.48828!(!!4.60815(a) - 1.0.8696(r) - 3.9
i - 15.966(e) - 1.69063 3(nd d)10.86eva t Por BPlend dtainfolementingion aa!a5u(!!) - 0.48827(o)10.86962015 e! . Ao.2!63!t)6.26009(e)
implementing the BPAJ

Do you see it as a priority and relevant for the PPP to monitor support community social cohesion and security through dealing with conflict-related trauma effectively supporting the resolution of local disputes peacefully and through better access to information to access a priority post-conflict support services?

Did the priority in this area continue to be relevant over the period of PPP implementation from August 2015 through April 2017?

relation to its stated objectives and intended results	PPP in strengthening partners and political dialogue between PNP and AB	Specific knowledge of reported activities
Are there any major failures of the project to date? What are these failures? If any, why have they occurred?	Do you concern about the process of negotiations and its prospects under the PBA?	Evidence for their perceptions or behavioural change both retrospective and current stories
Are there any unforeseen impacts? Positive or negative of the PPP? What are these unforeseen impacts?	Do you concern do you think the situation in Bougainville is about the process of negotiations and its prospects under the PBA?	Evidence for perception or
What if any are the exceptional experiences from the PPP that should be highlighted? (e.g. case studies, best practices)	What do you see as the main achievements of the PPP in supporting knowledge building and understanding of the Bougainville Peace Agreement?	
	What do you see as the main achievements of the PPP in promoting security and social cohesion in Bougainville?	
	Do you see any major failures or lapses in the implementation of the PPP? If so, what are these	

	<p>failures? = what are the causes of these failures?</p> <p>Do you see any positive or negative unforeseen impacts of the PPP? If so, what are these unforeseen impacts?</p> <p>What would you say should be highlighted as exceptional in the implementation of the PPP as best practices or lessons learned?</p>				
<p>Efficiency of Planning and Implementation</p> <p>Do the intended resources are being used economically to deliver the project? Are plans being used implemented and adapted as necessary?</p> <p>What programme management factors have been important in delivery?</p>	<p>Did the PPP manage activities to economically use resources?</p> <p>Do the PPP used planning to deliver the project?</p> <p>Was the financial expenditure in the PPP in accordance with the planned?</p> <p>Has the data been collected and it available to inform future plans?</p> <p>What would you say was the overall programme</p>	<p>Specific examples</p>			

	<p>management in the implementation of the PPPJ</p> <p>any capacity gaps in the project team affected delivery</p> <p>any capacity gaps at UN\$P affected delivery</p> <p>any capacity gaps among partners affected delivery</p> <p>working relationships in the team affected delivery</p> <p>working relationships in partners stakeholders and donors affected delivery</p> <p>efficiently as the PPP pursued learning coordination and exchange in related projects</p> <p>efficiently as the PPP team communicated internally</p> <p>efficiently as the PPP team communicated in external stakeholders</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>Dave Project implementers received the funds needed to implement activities in a timely manner</p> <p>So you think the management of the projects has been capable and effective? Why or why not?</p> <p>Do they effectively did the programme management team monitor programme performance and results?</p> <p>Do they did any issues from reporting get passed to the project board (leadership) and result in effective follow-up action?</p> <p>How do they do the projects make efficient use of partners' skills in implementing the activities?</p>				
<p>Potential (or sustainability) Replication and Institutionalization</p>					
<p>What are the key factors that have affected the sustainability of the PPP?</p>	<p>Do you accept that the PPP in the environment that it is implemented in in PNG and the ARoBJ?</p>	<p>Specific examples of activity results that are enduring or large effects?</p>	<p>Secondary documents (Project reporting, etc.)</p>	<p>Interview guide and questions</p>	<p>Content and thematic analysis and comparison</p>

Can the project be considered as delivering value for money for its present scale of impact?

What should be recommended as key strategic options for the future of the PPP? How does the strategy scale down replication? What are the key areas for continuation, major modifications to strategy?

What steps have the project taken to ensure that the activities and results continue on beyond the end of the funding?

Do you think the activities supported by the projects will continue to provide lasting benefits after the project ends? Why or why not?

Do other partners continue to use practices from the PPP? What evidence is there for continuing scaling up or replicating PPP activities through local partners?

Do any of the results have been incorporated into local ABNs or OPNs? In what institutions?

What might it cost to scale up the impact of the PPP?

Were there any savings that in your opinion could have been made in the implementation of the PPP?

What are the key findings of the PPP?

ANNE 0 : &I&LIO - RAP5 1

P&(O ,ocu 8ents

United Nations Peacebuilding +u! !ort488281(ui) -2(l) -12(di) -2(ng)10(+) -4(u)0.488281(!!) -0.488281!ui di9 .05

Project Dalf Fearly Progress U!dates 7elgl @anuary2@une 201C8 Promoting security and social cohesion in Bougainville

Project Fearly Progress U!dates 7elgl 20178 +u! !ort to PB: 'oordination and monitoring in PN#

Project Fearly Progress U!dates 7elgl 20178 +trengt.ening !artners.i! and t.e !olitical dialogue bet " een #oPN# and AB#

ANNE 0 /: INTERVIE + (

UN, P

- racy Eienings \$e!uty Resident Re!resentative

@ulie Bu5i5un Assistant Resident Re!resentative

ANNE 2: EVALUATION IN(TRU . ENT (

(TRU ' TURE , , O ' U . ENT REVIE + PROTO ' OL

Relevance @" A

)vidence for a !ro !riateness and relevance for t.e PPP to " or5 to strengt .en relations .i !s and trust bet " een t.e #oPN# and AB# to su ! !ort t.e im !ementation of autonomy arrangements and t.e BPA 79b;ective 18

)vidence for c. ange in a !ro !riateness or relevance

)vidence t. ese ob;ectives still valid today

)vidence for ad;ustments associated6(i) -4.60882(de) (de) -1.65193(nc) -1.65193(e) -1.65193()10.8696(t) -4.60882(.e) b bvi reni.65193(c) 9.21764(t) -4.60815(i) -4.60815(t)10.4

f21631(l) (t) -4.6193(e) -1.65193ltiy

(s)8.56483474(s)8.564(l) -4.60815ntsy607been t tive

Causes of any failures

- Unsubstantiated claim of unforeseen impacts of the PPP? Positive or negative? Evidence of unforeseen impacts
- Unsubstantiated claim of best practices or lessons learned

Efficiency of Planning and Implementation 4.1

- Evidence for attention to managing activities to economically use resources
- Evidence for use of planning to deliver the project

• Comparison in reporting documents of financial expenditures in the PPP annual reporting compared to Project

- Evidence, B) data has been collected? assertions that, B) data has been available to inform future plans

Assertions of successes in programme management in the implementation of the PPP? Explanations for successes in programme management

- + statements that capacity gaps in the project team affected delivery
- + statements that capacity gaps at UNDP affected delivery
- + statements that capacity gaps among partners affected delivery
- + statements that working relationships within the team affected delivery
- + statements that working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors affected delivery
- + statements noting the pursuit of learning, coordination and exchange with related projects
- Evidence for efficient internal communication among the PPP team
- Evidence for efficient communication with external stakeholders
- Evidence that project implementers received the funds needed to implement activities in a timely way
- Evidence for project management
- Evidence for monitoring programme performance and results
- Evidence from Project Board that issues from reporting were discussed and resulted in effective follow-up action
- Evidence for efficient use of partners' skills in implementing activities

Potential for sustainability, replication and magnification 4.2

- Evidence that the PPP is accepted in the PN# and the ARoB
- Evidence for attention to standards making the activities and results continue on beyond the end of the funding

(E . I (TRU ' TURE , INTERVIE + - UI , E AN , =UE(TION(

Introduction and Informed Consent

- Thank you for taking time today!

My name is Aarance Robertson and I am working independently for the United Nations to conduct an evaluation of the work conducted by UN\$P and its partners through funding from the Peacebuilding Priority Plan. The goal of the review is to learn about what has been accomplished in the region through the plan what has worked well and what has not worked as well lessons from this review will be used to help the UN UN\$P and its partners in future work here and around the world.

The information collected today will only be used for the review and I will not use this information in any way that identifies you as an individual or your specific community in the report.

I would also like to clarify that this interview is entirely voluntary and that you have the right to withdraw from the interview at any point without consequence.

I hope to learn from you from your knowledge and experience about the plan and its activities. Are you

What adjustments have you seen in the implementation of the PPP in this area to changes in threats and opportunities to implementing the BPAJ

Objective 4

Do you see it as appropriate and relevant for the PPP to focus on supporting community social cohesion and security through dealing with conflict-related trauma effectively supporting the resolution of local disputes peacefully and through better access to information to access appropriate post-conflict support services?

Should the focus in this area continue to be relevant over the period of PPP implementation from August 2015 through April 2017?

Are these objectives still valid today?

What adjustments have you seen in the implementation of the PPP in this area to changes in threats and opportunities to implementing the BPAJ

Effectiveness

What do you see as the main achievements of the PPP in strengthening partners' and political dialogue between OPN and AB?

Do you have concerns about the process of elections and its prospects under the BPAJ

Do you have concerns about the situation in Bougainville is about the process of elections and its prospects under the BPAJ

What do you see as the main achievements of the PPP in supporting knowledge building and understanding of the Bougainville Peace Agreement?

What do you see as the main achievements of the PPP in promoting the role of the P of Pe

Have any capacity gaps in the project team affected delivery?

Have any capacity gaps at UNDP affected delivery?

Have any capacity gaps among partners affected delivery?

Have working relationships within the team affected delivery?

Have working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors affected delivery?

Does it efficiently use the PPP pursued learning, coordination and exchange with related projects?

Does it efficiently use the PPP team communicated internally?

Does it efficiently use the PPP team communicated with external stakeholders?

Have project implementers received the funds needed to implement activities in a timely way?

So you think the management of the projects has been capable and effective? Yes or No?

Does it effectively did the programme management team monitor programme performance and results?

Does it did any issues from reporting get passed to the project board (leadership) and result in effective follow-up action?