

**SECRETARY-GENERAL'S PEACEBUILDING FUND
PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT TEMPLATE**



PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT
COUNTRY: PAPUA NEW GUINEA
TYPE OF REPORT: SEMI-ANNUAL, ANNUAL OR FINAL FINAL
DATE OF REPORT: 04 JUNE 2018

Project Title: PBF/PNG/E-1 Support to PBF coordination and monitoring in PNG in Bougainville	
Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway: 00096369	
PBF project modality: <input type="checkbox"/> IRF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRF	If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Country Trust Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Trust Fund Name of Recipient Fund: Peacebuilding Fund
List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc): UNDP in Papua New Guinea	
List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of the Chief Secretary to the Government of Papua New Guinea • Office of the Chief Secretary to the Autonomous Government of Bougainville • PBF Joint Steering Committee and its Technical Working Group 	
Project commencement date ¹ : 13th August 2015 Project duration in months ² : 36	
Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below: <input type="checkbox"/> Gender promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Youth promotion initiative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-border or regional project	
Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization): Voucher ID 00007461: \$ 800,000 : \$: \$: \$ Total: 800,000 <i>*The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO's approval and subject to availability of funds in the PBF account</i>	
How many tranches have been received so far: 1	
Report preparation: Project report prepared by: Shaddie Tapo - Programme Analyst, UNDP PBF Project report approved by: Julie Bukikun - Assistant Resident Representative Did PBF Secretariat clear the report: Yes Any comments from PBF Secretariat on the report: This report is cleared and ready for uploading.	

¹ Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer.

² Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

Has the project undertaken any evaluation exercises? Please specify and attach: No

NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:

- *Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general / common language.*
- *Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*
- *Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*

PART 1: RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1 Overall project progress to date

Briefly explain the **status of the project** in terms of its implementation cycle, including whether all preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (1500 character limit): The PBF Secretariat established in 2015, has been providing effective coordination, monitoring, reporting and communication on the progress of the PRF projects implementing the Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) to the two governments through the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), to the CO through the Bougainville Task Team (BTT), and to PBSO through the mid and annual reports throughout the lifetime of the PPP. Meant as the Secretariat project for the PBF, all preliminary activities such as establishment of the secretariat and of the coordinating mechanisms, have been completed, leaving only ongoing activities such as coordination, monitoring, capacity-building, reporting and communication as ongoing project activities to date.

Given the recent/current political/peacebuilding/ transition situation/ needs in the country, has the project been/ does it continue to be **relevant** and well placed to address potential conflict factors/ sources of tensions/ risks to country's sustaining peace progress? Please illustrate. If project is still ongoing, are any adjustments required? (1500 character limit)

Given the scope of the outcome areas of the PBF projects and the magnitude of the implementing partners for each of these areas, the Secretariat was very relevant in providing coordination of all the efforts from various implementing partners in order for collective progress status to be clearly assessed, and for across-outcomes approach to allow for efforts from one outcome to have trickle-down positive effects for all other outcomes. This project was further well-placed under UNDP given that UNDP has an office on Bougainville and very strong existing partnerships with civil society but most importantly at the government levels for decision-making convenience.

In a few sentences, summarize **what is unique/ innovative/ interesting** about what this project is trying/ has tried to achieve or its approach (rather than listing activity progress) (1500 character limit).

The project contributed to a coordinated approach on the implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan. The convening of the Joint Steering Committee including its Joint Technical Team meetings is the work of the secretariat with support from UNDP Country Office. A key role the secretariat adapted was the convening on behalf of the UN (the Chair rotated between the UN and other partners) of the Development Partners working Group on Bougainville which provided a discussion forum for all development partners working on Bougainville. The secretariat played a key role to organise the meetings and provide briefings to all partners on matters related to the PBF and referendum.

Considering the project's implementation cycle, please **rate this project's overall progress towards results to date:**

on track

In a few sentences summarize **major project peacebuilding progress/results** (with evidence), which PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit): This project is the linkage between the 3 PRF projects and the implementing partners including oversight committees such as the PBF Joint Steering Committee, whose responsibility was to make well-informed decisions for the 3 projects. Being the coordinating body for the PBF in PNG, progress in all other projects as reported in the 3 PRF projects are attributed to the leadership and management stemming out of this project. In addition, the secretariate organised with UNDP the first ever meeting between the newly elected members of the Bougainville House of Representatives and their Referendum Committee in 2016 with the members of the National Parliament Bi-partisan Committee on Bougainville matters.

In a few sentences, explain how the project has made **real human impact**, that is, how did it affect the lives of any people in the country – where possible, use direct quotes that PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

By playing a coordinating role for the PBF, all the PBF projects were strategically implemented taking into account, target population, geographical locations, partnerships and equity to ensure PBF support is spread wide in coverage and reach. Without a coordinating role, this would not be effectively made. The meeting of the Bougainville House of Representatives and their Referendum Committee in 2016 with the members of the National Parliament Bi-partisan Committee on Bougainville matters also contributed to the members forging positive partnerships. During the meeting, the Chair of the National Parliament Bi-partisan Committee committed to visiting Bougainville. The visit took place and a report was prepared in 2017 and tabled in the PNG parliament in March 2018.

If the project progress assessment is **on-track**, please explain what the key **challenges** (if any) have been and which measures were taken to address them (1500 character limit).

It was assessed during the Peacebuilding Priority Plan implementation that greater inter-departmental collaboration was needed within the Bougainville Government to overcome the lack of consistency and jointness in the effort to deliver on the different outcomes of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan using a whole-of-government approach. This also concerns an across-Outcomes approach, ensuring that efforts within either of the 3 PPP projects positively impact on the progress of all projects. This was a good indication that effective coordination and engagement be consistent and frequent. The introduction of the Letter of Agreement with specifications for inter-departmental collaboration driving the Referendum Ready Concept which covered interventions from political dialogues, Bougainville Peace Agreement awareness raising, and civic engagement; all towards building an enabling environment for community social cohesion, tried to address the whole-of-government approach and across-outcome impacts. This mitigating strategy has been very effective in ensuring collaboration across departments as well as interparliamentary and constituency referendum committees.

If the assessment is **off-track**, please list main reasons/ **challenges** and explain what impact this has had/will have on project duration or strategy and what **measures** have been taken/ will be taken to address the challenges/ rectify project progress (1500 character limit):

Please attach as a separate document(s) any materials highlighting or providing more evidence for project progress (for example: publications, photos, videos, monitoring reports, evaluation reports etc.). List below what has been attached to the report, including purpose and audience.

1.2 Result progress by project outcome

The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes. If your project has more approved outcomes, contact PBSO for template modification.

Outcome 1: The coordination, monitoring and reporting on results of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan and the projects supported and strengthened through the establishment of a PBF Secretariat.

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: *Describe main progress under this Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration), including major output progress (not all individual activities). If the project is starting to make/ has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context. Where possible, provide specific examples of change the project has supported/ contributed to as well as, where available and relevant, quotes from partners or beneficiaries about the project and their experience. (3000 character limit)?*

The PBF Secretariat established in 2015, has been providing effective coordination, monitoring and reporting on the results of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) and its PRF projects to the two governments through the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), to the CO through the Bougainville Task Team (BTT), and to PBSO through the mid and annual reports. The furnishing of this report and the other 3 PRFs are work of the secretariat, including the convening of 3 Joint Technical Committee (JTC) and 2 JSC meetings, one in 2016 and the other in 2017. The Secretariat hired the services of a research consortium Anglo Pacific Research (APR) in 2016 to do a baseline survey for the implementation of the priority plan projects, and a mid-term survey in 2017 to assess progress from these established baselines. An end-of-project Evaluation is scheduled for July 2018.

Outcome 2: The Joint Steering Committee, its Technical Committee and the Office of the Resident Coordinator of the United Nations system are supported to play their role of strategic direction and monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan.

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

Almost all the government officials making up the membership of the Joint Steering Committee are also members or observers to the Joint Supervisory Body, therefore, issues affecting the implementation of the Bougainville Peace Agreement raised in the JSC are guaranteed to be raised in the JSB. As a result of the JSC meetings and side dialogues this project supported, decisions and positive progresses were made regarding the joint implementation of the developed Referendum workplan which required further decisions on referendum date, questions to be put forward, implementing agency to oversee and conduct the referendum, joint key messaging on the BPA and the referendum, development and pursance of signatures on instruments for the establishment of the Bougainville Referendum Commission, weapons disposal programme, including amendment to the Social Cohesion and Community Security project, approval of the No-Cost Extension of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan from January 2018 to April 2018, the endorsement of a Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative project and the new phase of PBF support from 2018 after the current phase lapse. The setting of the referendum target date at June 15, 2019, the Joint messages on the BPA

now guiding awareness programmes, the implementation of the Joint Referendum Workplan and the Joint Weapons Disposal Strategy, and the establishment of the Bougainville Referendum Commission are subsequent results which the two governments achieved with support from this project to the JSC.

Outcome 3:

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: Please select one

Progress summary: (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

Outcome 4:

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: Please select one

Progress summary: (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

1.3 Cross-cutting issues

<p><u>National ownership:</u> How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The National Government in agreeing to and participating in the Joint Technical Team meetings and Joint Steering Committee, including directions to government officials to action resolutions from these meetings are clear demonstrations of its commitment and ownership of the peace process on Bougainville. In a time of economic hardships and other national priorities, these demonstrations send out a positive vibe to ABG and its constituents including the former combatants.</p>
<p><u>Monitoring:</u> Is the project M&E plan on track? What monitoring methods and sources of evidence are being/ have been used? Please attach any monitoring-related reports for the reporting period. (1500 character limit)?</p>	<p>The M&E Plan for this project is on track with main data sources being the JSC and JSB meeting minutes.</p>
<p><u>Evaluation:</u> Provide an update on the preparations for the external evaluation for the project, especially if within last 6 months of implementation or final report. Confirm available budget for evaluation. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The project's post-evaluation budgetted at US\$35,000 is scheduled for July 2018 with the Terms of Reference covering 4 key questions including: 1. Quality and Relevance of Project Design 2. Project Effectiveness 3. Efficiency of Planning and Implementation, 4. Potential for project sustainability, replication and magnification An external evaluator has been contracted to carry out this evaluation.</p>
<p><u>Catalytic effects (financial):</u> Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from whom and how much? If not, have any</p>	<p>This project contributed immensely to the development of a new project proposal to PBSO for funding of peacebuilding activities in PNG, from 2018 to 2020. The project and funding of US\$4million have been approved by</p>

<p>specific attempts been made to attract additional financial contributions to the project and beyond? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>PBSO to commence in June 2018.</p>
<p>Catalytic effects (non-financial): Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. (1500 character limit)</p>	
<p>Exit strategy/ sustainability: What steps have been taken to prepare for end of project and help ensure sustainability of the project results beyond PBF support for this project? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>This project is the secretariat to the PBF PRF projects in the country as part of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan's Management strategy and therefore exists only during the lifespan of the current PBF. However, the project has contributed to strengthening small joint technical working groups for priority areas in the BPA implementation, with both government capacity-built to drive the TOR for these working groups, to ensure progress achieved thus far is maintained and built on for the full implementation of the BPA.</p>
<p>Risk taking: Describe how the project has responded to risks that threatened the achievement of results. Identify any new risks that have emerged since the last report. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Lack of government decisions in progressing the BPA would greatly impact on the achievements of the 3 main PRF projects, therefore, the Secretariat project strived for constant and regular dialogue between the project and the Joint Technical Team to push for JSC meetings so that both governments can come together to make decisions for the project. Further, since the project's key performance indicators were tied to the two governments' efforts, the project has been very committed to supporting convening of strategic government meetings to give rise to issues affecting BPA implementation and subsequently performance of the 3 main projects. The mitigating strategy worked but not at the speed that the project expected due to other competing national priorities of the National Government.</p>
<p>Gender equality: In the reporting period, which activities have taken place with a specific focus on addressing issues of gender equality or women's empowerment? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The project ensured the female representatives in the JSC to allow for women's voice to be heard at the JSC and subsequently at the JSB level.</p>
<p>Other: Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? (1500 character limit)</p>	

1.3 INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT: *Using the Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments- provide an update on the achievement of key indicators at both the outcome and output level in the table below (if your project has more indicators than provided in the table, select the most relevant ones with most relevant progress to highlight). Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation. Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (300 characters max per entry)*

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
Outcome 1 The coordination, monitoring and reporting on results of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan and the projects supported and strengthened through the establishment of a PBF Secretariat	Indicator 1.1 Robust monitoring system in place for the Priority Plan	Priority Plan Results Framework exists	Priority Plan Results Framework is refined and integrated with PRF project results frameworks. An M&E Plan is developed, baselines are completed and regular monitoring/ analysis of progress is undertaken	A robust monitoring system is now in place for the monitoring of the PPP. Monitoring is conducted at the national level, the project level, and the implementation level where stakeholders have been trained and equipped with basic M&E skills and tools to conduct monitoring and reporting.		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	Indicator 1.2					
	Indicator 1.3					
Output 1.1	Indicator 1.1.1					
	Indicator 1.1.2					
Output 1.2	Indicator 1.2.1					
	Indicator 1.2.2					
Output 1.3	Indicator 1.3.1					
	Indicator 1.3.2					
Outcome 2 The Joint Steering Committee, its Technical Committee and the Office of the Resident Coordinator	Indicator 2.1 JSC and its technical committee provide strategic oversight of PBF support	JSC and Technical Committee established in 2013 and approved the Priority Plan	JSC meetings held at least every 6 months (or more often when required), to review project progress, Priority Plan	JSC held annually, one in 2016 and one in 2017. All project reports for these 2 years were reviewed and cleared in these meetings, including the approval on the	Target of at least 2 meetings a year was not met due to JSC members being heavily involved in national government priority activities such as preparations for the National General Elections, the preparation for the 2018 APEC Summit, and the 2018 Local-level Government Elections.	

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
of the United Nations system are supported to play their role of strategic direction and monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan			progress and propose changes where needed	amended Outcome 3 project document		
	Indicator 2.2					
	Indicator 2.3					
Output 2.1	Indicator 2.1.1					
	Indicator 2.1.2					
Output 2.2	Indicator 2.2.1					
	Indicator 2.2.2					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
Output 2.3	Indicator 2.3.1					
	Indicator 2.3.2					
Outcome 3	Indicator 3.1					
	Indicator 3.2					
	Indicator 3.3					
Output 3.1	Indicator 3.1.1					
	Indicator 3.1.2					
Output 3.2	Indicator 3.2.1					
	Indicator 3.2.2					
Output 3.3	Indicator 3.3.1					
	Indicator 3.3.2					
Outcome 4	Indicator 4.1					
	Indicator 4.2					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	Indicator 4.3					
Output 4.1	Indicator 4.1.1					
	Indicator 4.1.2					
Output 4.2	Indicator 4.2.1					
	Indicator 4.2.2					
Output 4.3	Indicator 4.3.1					
	Indicator 4.3.2					

PART 2: INDICATIVE PROJECT FINANCIAL PROGRESS

2.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditures

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, delayed, or off track, vis-à-vis project plans and by recipient organization: *on track*

How many project budget tranches have been received to date and what is the overall level of expenditure against the total budget and against the tranche(s) received so far (500 characters limit): There was only one tranche for this project with a total of US\$800,00 received in August 2015 for the project cycle. To date, 100% of the allocated funds have been expended.

When do you expect to seek the next tranche, if any tranches are outstanding:

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters limit):

Please state what \$ amount was planned (in the project document) to be allocated to activities focussed on gender equality or women's empowerment and how much has been actually allocated to date:

Please fill out and attach Annex A on project financial progress **with detail on expenditures/ commitments to date using the original project budget table in Excel**, even though the \$ amounts are indicative only.