

















Spotlight Mid-term Assessment Report using ROM review

Type of ROM review Projects and Programmes
Project title Spotlight Initiative PNG Country Programme
Project reference
EU Delegation in charge Delegation of the European Union to Papua New Guinea

Key information				
Domain (instrument)	Region			
DAC Sector	Human and Social Development: Gender Equality			
Zone Benefitting from the Action	Papua New Guinea			
Type of Project/Programme	Geographic			
Geographic Implementation	Single country			
Contracting Party	Spotlight Initiative			
EU contribution	USD 15,680,000			
Project Implementation Dates	Start Date	1 January 2020	End Date	31 December 2022 ¹
ROM expert(s) name(s)	Dora Kuir-Ayius			
Field phase	Start Date	15 October 2021	End Date	31 January 2022

Scoring overview: green (good) orange (problems) red (serious deficiencies)									
									
Relevance	1	2	3	4	5	6			
									
Effectiveness	7	8	9						
									
Efficiency	10	11	12						
									
Sustainability	13								
									

Persons interviewed and surveyed	Interviews/FGD	Survey
EU Delegation	1	0
RCO	1	0
PMU	1	2
Partner country government	4	2
UN agencies	4	4
CSO reference group	8	2
CSO Implementing partners	6	6
Total	24	16

Key documents ²	Number
Essential documents	
Other documents	

¹ A six-month no-cost extension to June 2022 has been agreed

² Please consult Annex 1 for details on essential documents and other documents.

Abbreviations

CIMC	Consultative Implementing Monitoring Council
CSE	Comprehensive Sexuality Education
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSRG	Civil Society Reference Group
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Government of Australia
DfCDR	Department for Community Development and Religion
DJAG	Department of Justice and Attorney General
EUD	European Union Delegation
EVAWG	Ending Violence Against Women and Girls
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FSC	Family Support Centre
FSVAC	Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee
FSVU	Family Sexual Violence Unit
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GBVAC	GBV Action Committee
IP	Implementing Partner
KII	Key Informant Interview
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MTA	Mid-term Assessment
OCFS	Office of Child and Family Services
PMU	Programme Management Unit
PNG	Papua New Guinea
RC	(UN) Resident Coordinator
RCO	Resident Coordinator's Office
RUNO	Recipient UN Organisation
VAWG	Violence Against Women and Girls

A. Purpose, Objectives, Limitations and Mitigation Measures

Purpose and objectives of the Mid-term Assessment (MTA):

The purpose of the MTA is to assess the programme at country level as soon as it reaches the end of phase I, to take stock of where the Spotlight Initiative is vis-à-vis its initial programme and to assess the new ways of working to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The specific objectives are to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme, based on the agreed MTA questions, and to formulate relevant recommendations to improve subsequent project implementation.

As per the Terms of Reference, the MTA uses the EU Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) methodology as an approach to ensure that the results are comparable (across countries) and easy to interpret. However, the questions to be answered for the MTA are different from standard ROM methodology questions and were agreed in advance by the EU and the Spotlight Secretariat. The 13 MTA questions are grouped by Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability, which form the main headings of the report.

The ROM methodology uses the following criteria for grading the questions:

Table 1. Grading reference table for criteria and monitoring questions

Good/very good	The situation is considered satisfactory, but there may be room for improvement. Recommendations are useful, but not vital to the project or programme.
Problems identified and small improvements needed	There are issues which need to be addressed, otherwise the global performance of the project or programme may be negatively affected. Necessary improvements do not however require a major revision of the intervention logic and implementation arrangements.
Serious problems identified and major adjustments needed	There are deficiencies which are so serious that, if not addressed, they may lead to failure of the project or programme. Major adjustments and revision of the intervention logic and/or implementation arrangements are necessary.

Papua New Guinea country context

Papua New Guinea (PNG) has among the highest incidence of violence against women and girls (VAWG) in the Pacific Region. According to the 2016-18 Demographic and Health Survey, 54% of women and girls aged 15-49 have experienced physical violence and 29% sexual violence by their husband or partner in their lifetime. During the year preceding the survey the reported incidence of physical violence was 44% and of sexual violence 24%. The 2020 UNDP Human Development Report ranked PNG in position 161 out of 162 countries on the gender inequality index scale, only followed by Yemen.

In 2017, the Government of PNG adopted the National Strategy on Gender Based Violence 2016-2025 as a framework for preventing and responding to GBV. Services for survivors of GBV are provided by government departments and institutions, including the Department for Community Development and Religion (DfCDR), the Office of Child and Family Services (OCFS), and the Department of Justice and Attorney General (DJAG), each with its own set of procedural guidelines for the referral pathways. Safe houses, throughout the country, including the Family Support Centre (FSC) in Port Moresby as well as the Family Sexual Violence Units (FSVU) at police stations use the Guidelines for Service Providers and the Guidance for Shelter Providers to provide for the safety and the referral of survivors. These guidelines

were developed in 2018 by the Consultative Implementing Monitoring Council (CIMC) and Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee (FSVAC) following a national consultation with all stakeholders and government agencies working with GBV survivors in the country.

Context of the Spotlight Initiative in PNG

The Spotlight Initiative in PNG was launched on the International Women's Day, 2020 by the UN Deputy Secretary General, Deputy Prime Minister, European Union (EU) Ambassador to Papua New Guinea (PNG) and Civil Society Representatives. It covers all four regions of the country with activities in eleven provinces. Key partners include the Government of PNG, faith-based organisations (FBOs) and other civil society organisations (CSOs). Within two months of the launch, activities were disrupted by the COVID-19 epidemic. Lockdowns were instituted to control the spread of COVID-19 affecting many projects and bringing some activities to a standstill.

Methodological approach used

Data for the MTA were collected in an online survey, 19 key informant interviews (KII), and one focus groups discussion (FGD) with provincial members of the Civil Society Reference Group (CSRG). Despite several reminders and deadline extensions, the response rate to the survey remained very low with 16 completed questionnaires received in response to 113 invitations (14%). This was too low for a quantitative analysis, but narrative responses were coded and used in the qualitative analysis together with KII transcripts and the FGD protocol. All KIIs were conducted by telephone or via the internet and covered all four regions of the country.

Table 1. Limitations and measures taken

(1) Low response rate to the standardised (global) Online Stakeholder Survey	
The response rate to the survey was too low for a valid analysis.	The narrative responses to survey questions were included in the qualitative analysis of KII transcripts and FGD protocols.
(2) Late start of the MTA and limited time for data collection	
The late start of data collection (because of the resignation of the first consultant contracted for this assignment) meant that the data collection period overlapped with the Christmas holiday period. Scheduling interviews became very difficult and planned travel to three regional sites (Lae, Mt Hagen, Kokopo) had to be cancelled due to time constraints.	Input from regional Implementing Partners (IPs) was nevertheless obtained during a meeting of CSOs and the Civil Society Reference Group (CSRG) in Port Moresby.
(3) Non-availability of performance data from the global M&E system	
Output and outcome indicator performance data from the global data system were only provided for the first year of the programme up to December 2020.	The PNG Spotlight M&E Coordinator shared the updated performance data as of January 2022 which were used for the MTA although not yet entered in the global M&E system. When official performance monitoring data from the Global Secretariat for 2021 become available, the findings regarding the achievement of results will be updated in the global system.
(4) Contact restrictions for COVID-19 control	
Physical meetings as well as personal visits to scheduled meetings were not possible because of COVID-19 related social contact restrictions. It was often difficult to schedule and/or conduct virtual meetings because of frequent non-responses to request for meetings and because of a weak digital infrastructure in PNG.	All targeted interviews could finally be scheduled and conducted with the help of RUNO staff, albeit with some with considerable delay. Visits to project sites or to the offices of implementing partners and FGDs with ultimate beneficiaries could, however, not be conducted.

B. Relevance

1. Does the action align to the principles of the Spotlight Initiative as listed in the Spotlight Initiative Fund TORs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Good - Good <input type="checkbox"/> Problems <input type="checkbox"/> Serious deficiencies
<p>The programme design and interventions demonstrate a strong alignment with the Spotlight Initiative principles. The programme uses a gender sensitive and gender transformative, inclusive, and human rights-based approach that is aligned to the national priorities for EVAWG in Papua New Guinea. In terms of leaving no one behind, many key informants and survey respondents believe the programme is designed to reach the most vulnerable women and girls, however some key informants felt that more efforts could be put into engaging men and boys as change agents as well as reaching women and girls with disabilities. The document review, however, highlights that in 2021 work has been undertaken to engage with people living with disabilities, including through sexual education courses for young people that promote the SRHR of young people with disabilities as well as advocacy to ensure access to services and information is improved for people living with a disability. Boys are reached through the healthy relationships/gender equality awareness programme in schools which focuses on gender-equitable norms, attitudes and behaviours, and men are also engaged through the Community Conversations Programme as well as the Male Advocacy intervention. Furthermore, the Special Parliamentary Committee on GBV is also seen by some as an important milestone where male Parliamentarians are acting as change agents.</p> <p>The 2020 Annual Report noted that careful attention was paid to the “leaving no one behind” principle when selecting CSOs as IPs, ensuring that partners were selected based on their capacity to reach and engage the most marginalised groups in the country. However, several key informants from civil society felt that smaller CSOs and women rights organisations missed out on the opportunity to apply for Spotlight Initiative funding, because the deadline for applying coincided with the first national lockdown to halt the Covid-19 pandemic and smaller organisations were severely affected due to movement restrictions and limited access to internet. Further, it was reported that many smaller CSOs and women’s groups did not meet the selection criteria for funding. Another stakeholder mentioned that other options such as small grants funding for institutional capacity strengthening were considered for smaller CSOs, particularly pillar 6 activities.</p> <p>The Spotlight Initiative programme in PNG is aligned with the National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to GBV (2016-2025). The strategy puts strong emphasis on a holistic and coordinated approach by the PNG Government, the FSVAC, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), Faith Based Organisations (FBOs) and the private sector to address GBV using an evidence-based approach in developing legislation, policies, budgets, plans and activities.</p> <p>The Spotlight Initiative programme aims to facilitate and support the implementation of the national strategy, through six outcome areas. These focus on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Legislative and policy framework: support the implementation and monitoring of approved laws and policies at national and provincial level, as well as the revision of the Women’s Health Protection Bill and the National Youth Policy, as well as the engagement of the Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) to oversee the practical implementation of policies. (2) Strengthening institutions: establishing and/or strengthening the capacity of existing GBV Secretariats and FSVAC at national and subnational levels to manage a coordinated, holistic and quality approach in addressing GBV, as well as developing a more streamlined approach to 	

protection, through the establishment of Child and Family Service Councils (FSC) and working with national and provincial health authorities to allocated funds for specific medical units under the FSCs.

- (3) **Prevention and social norms:** expand promising social norms transformation programmes to specific provinces, targeting rural women and youth, men and adolescent boys, women with disabilities, sex workers, women living with HIV, lesbian, and transwomen.
- (4) **Delivery of quality, essential services:** work across the justice, health, social welfare, education and child protection sectors to improve quality and reach of essential basic services for GBV survivors. This will include building capacity of local service providers, as well as developing referral pathways for children and adolescent survivors and developing Standard Operating Procedures for the implementation of national behaviour management policy, so adolescent girls can receive support from trained school counsellors.
- (5) **Data availability and capacities:** establish a case management information system and support the Office of the Child and Family Services to collect, generate and analyse data on violence, strengthen GBV administrative data management, generate quantitative and qualitative data products on VAWG as well as work with the GBV Secretariats to strengthen the quality of justice service providers administrative data.
- (6) **Supporting the Women's Movement:** establish a capacity building unit who will be tasked to build the capacity of local organisations, including indigenous CSOs, in terms of resource mobilisation and quality service delivery of prevention and response services in target provinces. The programme will also strengthen the network and capacity of the HRD through shared learning and partnerships, ensuring diverse voices of women are amplified and inform advocacy and influencing efforts.

The programme design considered existing programmes and initiatives from the Government, UN agencies and CSOs in order not to reinvent the wheel and build upon existing structures. Decisions on programme implementation areas were made based on prevalence rates from data sources such as the DHS, complemented with available administrative data.

The design process included four consultation rounds with multiple stakeholders including from national and provincial government departments such as the justice department, provincial health authorities, education, community development, police, local administration, and several national and local CSOs and FBOs, as well as two rounds of feedback from an interim Civil Society Reference Group (CSRG). The country programme document (CPD) was developed by external consultants. The consultation process, while appreciated by those who took part, was according to several key informants, rushed and this affected the coherence of the overall programme.

"One additional issue that I noticed in the overall design is that in PNG, we relied on external facilitators to guide this process. Basically, the programme document was written by consultants, which, looking now two years down the road probably didn't give justice to the context or they didn't elaborate the strategies, the way we would wish those to be elaborated".
[Key informant interview, RUNO]

Key findings

- The Spotlight PNG Country Programme design addresses national development priorities, supports relevant sectoral policies and plans, is based on local evidence and complementary to the existing national commitments and programmes implemented by government and CSOs for addressing VAWG.

- Participatory multi-stakeholder planning during the design phase included a wide range of government officials and CSOs. While the consultative process was much appreciated, some stakeholders noted that more time should have been allocated to the design phase.
- The programme is aligned with the principles of the Spotlight Initiative which are reflected in activities under the six programme pillars.

2A. Are the Initiative's deliverables aligned with the UN agencies' mandate, priorities and expertise? Are the right UN agencies involved? 2B. Are programmes implemented in line with the UN System reform?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Good - Good
	<input type="checkbox"/> Problems
	<input type="checkbox"/> Serious deficiencies

Are the Initiative's deliverables aligned with the UN agencies' mandate, priorities and expertise? Are the right UN agencies involved?

There are four Recipient UN Organisations (RUNOs) involved in the Spotlight Initiative in PNG: UN Women, UNFPA, UNDP and UNICEF. An analysis of the expertise, experience and strategic priorities of the four RUNOs is presented in Table 1 below. It shows that their experiences, priorities and expertise of the are both critical and complementary for implementing the six pillars. The agencies also have a history of collaboration and joint project implementation which predates the Spotlight Initiative. UNDP and UN Women, for example, had jointly worked on strengthening women's political leadership and participation. In UNDP's strategic plan (2018 – 2022), it is part of the agency's strategic priorities to collaborate with UNFPA with the aim of making quality SDG data available.

Table 2. Mandate and priorities of the four RUNOs

RUNO	Priorities, expertise and experiences
UNDP	<p>UNDP has three priority areas: (1) governance for peaceful, just, and inclusive societies; (2) crisis prevention and increased resilience; (3) women's empowerment and gender equality. These are relevant to the objectives of the Spotlight Initiative in PNG.</p> <p>UNDP has supported PNG's government in developing the country's national GBV strategy. Its country programme document for PNG (2018 – 2022) targets three areas: peace, prosperity and planet with focus on reaching the poorest and most vulnerable people. There is a strong focus on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) in the first two areas. Under the first area (peace), it plans together with UN Women to strengthen participation and leadership of women and youth in democratic processes, to support the government and civil society to implement the national GBV strategy and to ensure the participation and inclusion of youth and women in peace building processes. Under the second area (prosperity), UNDP together with UNFPA aims at improving the availability of reliable SDG data.</p>
UNICEF	<p>According to UNICEF's PNG website, the work of the agency has five cornerstones: education, protection, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and nutrition. The agency works closely with CSOs and communities at the grassroots level and with the government, academia and the mass media at national and sub-national level. UNICEF PNG CP Program aims at strengthening the national and subnational protection system that ensures access to protection and responsive services to children and women and promote their wellbeing, safety and access to justice.</p>
UNFPA	<p>UNFPA's strategic plan aims at achieving transformative results in increasing the access to Sexual and Reproductive Health (SRH) with a strong focus on the SDG principle of leaving no one behind (LNOB) and on SDG 5 (gender equality) including the empowerment of adolescent girls and women. In PNG, UNFPA's priority areas are preventable maternal death, unmet need for family planning and GBV and harmful practices. Its key interventions in GEWE are the prevention of GBV and increasing the number of reported and prosecuted cases of GBV, the strengthening of the National Council of Women's machinery, to support the development of guidelines for health works to assist GBV survivors, advocacy for GEWE and support to the development of legislation and policies on SRH. UNFPAs Population and Development</p>

	Programme aims at building national capacity in collecting and analysing data (together with UNDP).
UN Women	Achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women are at the heart of UN Women's mandate. As a global champion for women's and girls' rights, UN Women is a key agency for all Spotlight Initiative programming. UN Women's programmes in PNG have four focus areas: the promotion of women's participation in governance (with UNDP), EVAWG (prevention, referral, support to GBV survivors), strengthening women's peace and security as well as strengthening policies and global norms on GEWE (legal frameworks, capacity building of the government).

The agreed division of labour among RUNOs for the delivery of the Spotlight Initiative is described in Table 2. One UN agency has been assigned for leading each of the pillars. UNDP leads on Pillar 1 and 2, UNICEF leads on Pillar 3, UNFPA on Pillar 5 and UN Women on Pillar 4 and 6. In addition, the responsibility for each activity, output and outcome indicator has been assigned to one of the four RUNOs. The distribution of responsibilities is well aligned to the strategic priorities and previous work of the four RUNOs in PNG (as described in the previous table).

Table 3. Agreed Division of Labour for the Spotlight Initiative

Outcome / Pillar	Lead Agency	Focus of activities	Participating Agencies	Percentage of budget
1. Laws and Policies	UNDP	An enabling legislative and policy environment on VAWG and other forms of discrimination is in place and translated into plans, guaranteeing the rights of women and girls is in place and translated into action.	UN Women, UNFPA	4%
2. Institutions	UNDP	Institutions will develop, coordinate and implement programmes that integrate the elimination of VAWG, including DV/IPV, and other SDG targets into development planning processes.	UN Women, UNFPA, UNICEF	16%
3. Prevention	UNICEF	Favourable social norms, attitudes and behaviours will be promoted at community and individual level to prevent VAWG and VAC, including Domestic Violence (DV) and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV).	UN Women, UNDP, UNFPA,	30%
4. Services	UN Women	Women and girls who experience violence and harmful practices use available, accessible and quality essential services and recover from violence while perpetrators will be prosecuted.	UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF	28%
5. Data	UNFPA	Comparable data on different forms of violence against women and harmful practices, collected, analysed and used so laws, policies and programmes will be evidence-based and context-adapted.	UNDP, UNICEF	11%
6. Women's Movement	UN Women	Women's rights groups and, autonomous social movements and CSOs will be able to influence, sustain, and advance progress on GEWE and VAWG, including domestic violence/intimate partner violence, policies and programmes that respond to the needs of all women and	none	11%

girls, including those facing multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination.

Are programmes implemented in line with the UN Development System reform?

The UN in PNG has made important progress in implementing the UNDS reform in the past 10 years by putting joint management structures in place such as a common budgetary framework to deliver its programmes, the UN Communications Group, the Operations Management Team and the Priority Working Groups. The Spotlight Initiative was able to draw on these structures during the design, planning, implementation and monitoring processes.

In alignment with the UNDS reform, the accountability for the Spotlight Initiative in PNG lies with the UN Resident Coordinator (RC). His role is to co-chair the Country Steering Committee (CSC), to provide strategic direction and oversight of the programme and to ensure national ownership at the highest level. The four RUNOs are organised in a sub-working group of the Peace Outcome Results Area under the country's United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) (2018 – 2022). This ensures overall integration and coherence of the Spotlight Initiative with the UN's work in the country. To operationalise an integrated programme approach, a Programme Management Unit (PMU) of four members (Spotlight Technical Specialist and Coordinator, Communication Officer, M&E Officer and a Programme Associate) was set up. They co-locate in the RCO. According to key informants, this facilitates their collaboration in day-to-day collaboration. The PMU ensures streamlined communication and coordination of all RUNOs under the strategic leadership of the RC. The technical coherence function of the programme has been assigned to UN Women. The agency has overseen the technical work of the Spotlight Coordination team. The Spotlight Coordinator has a technical reporting line to UN Women and a strategic reporting line to the RCO. According to UN Women, this approach has worked well. The online survey responses from the other RUNOs indicated that they were not aware or misinformed about the agency responsible for the technical coherence role (one RUNO participant responded that they did not know which agency was responsible, two respondents marked that the responsible agency was UNDP and one respondent reported that it was UNICEF).

To foster inter-agency coordination and coherence, RUNOs held meetings on a weekly basis during the design phase which enabled input from their teams and partners for the country programme document, the budget and the Annual Work Plan (AWP).

There RUNOs and RCO have rolled out joint activities, for example, the joint expression of interest and call for proposals for CSOs, the joint development of the Social Behaviour Change Communications (SBCC) strategy TORs or joint training (see also question 12). Joint visibility and communications have also been used to ensure that the Spotlight Initiative programme is seen as a united team within the UN system in PNG.

Key findings

- The capacities, strategic priorities and experiences of UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNICEF are well aligned with the six pillars of the Spotlight Initiatives.
- The assignment of responsibilities, activities, outputs, outcomes and pillars to specific RUNOs is coherent and grounded in their institutional capacity, experience and expertise.
- The Spotlight Initiative has harnessed existing UN mechanisms to operationalise the UNDS reform and put in place structures and processes to deliver the programme in an integrated fashion. Coordination structures have been put in place through the PMU and the technical

coherence oversight. Key actions are planned and implemented jointly, and the programme's visibility has been promoted through joint communication using the Spotlight brand.

3. Does the action presently respond to the needs of the target groups / end beneficiaries? Are the necessary consultations taking place with key stakeholders?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Good - Good <input type="checkbox"/> Problems <input type="checkbox"/> Serious deficiencies
<p>Understanding needs of target groups</p> <p>The programme design process was evidence-based and participatory, including government officials, representatives of national and provincial GBV service providers, as well as national and local CSOs, representing various beneficiary groups such as youth, people with disabilities and survivors of GBV (see question 1).</p> <p>Key concerns that were raised during these consultations included concerns about youth and children and the effects of violence that they experience, lack of public awareness in schools and with youth at community levels, lack of quality counselling and magisterial services, limited coordination of different service providers at provincial level, lack of resources for safe houses, problems with government ownership, lack of implementation of approved legislation, lack of a systematic data collection approach and limited opportunities for women's organisations to improve leadership and skills, in particular for young female leaders. These concerns were taken into consideration when developing the overall programme and its interventions.</p> <p>Due to contact restrictions as part of COVID-19 control measures, visits to project sites or FGDs with ultimate beneficiaries could not be conducted and voices of end users were therefore not heard. A FGD with members of a provincial CSRG as well as interviews with CSOs highlighted that CSOs welcome the interventions supported by the Spotlight Initiative, in particular the work done to support GBV survivors along the referral pathway. However, there is a general concern that the Programme may be overly ambitious, aiming to tackle too many challenges at the same time, while also suffering from capacity constraints by the implementing partners. This concern is further elaborated in questions 5, 8 and 9.</p> <p>Under Pillar 4, there are also concerns from government and civil society that existing assistance structures for GBV survivors were not sufficiently supported. Existing safe houses, for example the Lifeline and Haus Ruth safehouses, which belong to the PNG Council of Churches, were not sufficiently supported and face challenges for maintaining their operations. The choice to provide support to other and/ or new safe houses was perceived as a questionable strategic choice. The lack of operational compliance systems in place poses risks for UN Women in direct disbursement of funds, hence the approach through Femili PNG. The overhead support budget for these safe houses were not considered under this arrangement and was considered to be a lesson learnt for future programming. As one member of the CSRG mentioned:</p> <p><i>"In my opinion, it is an unfortunate decision to make. Lifeline and Haus Ruth safe houses thought they were disrespected or seen as unfit to manage funds through this action of UN Women."</i> <i>[Key informant interview, CSRG]</i></p> <p>Collecting and using feedback for decision-making</p> <p>In terms of feedback, several CSOs and women's organisations consulted consider that opportunities for feedback towards the RUNOs exist through scheduled reports but also activity-level meetings, working sessions and governance platforms such as the CSRG and CSC. This was also corroborated in interviews with RUNOs where examples of openness and dialogue with institutional partners and beneficiaries were</p>	

provided. As a result of COVID-19, most meetings were held virtually, and this has to some extent diffculted the feedback consulting process in particular with beneficiaries, smaller implementing partners and some CSRG members in the provinces who often suffer from bad connectivity. Feedback from CSO and government partners is discussed at the CSC through representation by the CSRG and government departments, as demonstrated by available meeting minutes.

Key findings

- The programme design process was evidence-based and participatory, including government officials, representatives of national and provincial GBV service providers, as well as national and local CSOs, representing various beneficiary groups such as youth, people with disabilities and survivors of GBV. Concerns raised during these consultations have informed programme interventions.
- Institutional beneficiaries consulted as part of the MTA welcome the interventions supported by the Spotlight Initiative. Support provided to GBV survivors along the referral pathway is particularly appreciated and addresses the needs of ultimate beneficiaries.
- Formal and informal feedback mechanisms exist and foster openness and dialogue. Feedback from CSO and government implementing partners is fed back to the CSC through representation by the CSRG and government departments.

4. Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment (ownership) and deliver accordingly?

☒ Very Good - Good

☐ Problems

☐ Serious deficiencies

Government

The Deputy Prime Minister chaired the Interim Country Steering Committee (CSC) since June 2019 and subsequently also the permanent CSC until April 2021. Since April, the Secretary of the Department of Justice and Attorney General co-chairs the CSC on behalf of the Government. Other government officials who contribute to the CSC include the Director for the National Office for Child and Family Services, the Secretary for the Department for Community Development and Religion (DfCDR), the Principal Legal Officer for the Department for Justice, the Secretary of the DJAG and the Police Commissioner of the Royal PNG Constabulary. From the document review and key informant interviews, the participation of government representatives in the CSC is appreciated and demonstrates its ownership and leadership. While some key informants believe that a stronger leadership role could be played by the DfCDR, given their large contributions to the GBV response in particular at the provincial level, others find the current leadership by the Department of Justice to be justified and appropriate. Online survey respondents from the UN and CSOs also reported low interest and participation of some individuals in national level government entities to engage on the topic of GBV. The GBV Secretariat and the National Council of Women were described by some as “inactive”.

The Government has also set up a Special Parliamentary Committee on GBV, including members of the opposition. The Committee held its first public hearings in May 2021 inviting civil society leaders, public officials and GBV survivors to provide testimonies on existing challenges. The Committee produced a report in August 2021 which was submitted to Parliament proposing 71 recommendations. A key concern about this Committee is that it is made up only of male Parliamentarians, but this is because no women were elected to the National Parliament in 2017 and the Parliament does not yet have reserved seats for

women. The Prime Minister tried to address resolve this by proposing the in 2020 using a introduction of Temporary Special Measure (5 regional reserved seats) in 2021 to accelerate women's political participation in the National Parliament but legislation was never tabled. While the National Executive Council approved a quota to require political parties to endorse 10-at least 20% of female candidates, this has also not yet been become legislated, in advance of the June 2022 national election due to a political impasse since November 2020 with Parliament being adjourned for several months and resuming work in August 2021.

In November 2021, the Government announced its commitment to allocate 7.93 million Kina (approximately USD 1.4 million) from the National Budget to the National GBV Secretariats. This budget allocation was requested by the DfCDR in July 2021 and will aim to strengthen the Department at national and provincial level in terms of human capacity and resources. The resuscitation of the GBV Secretariats is seen as a positive development and has the endorsement from the Provincial Administrators. Some interviewed informants at the provincial level, however, noted that more attention should be paid to delivering interventions at the provincial and district level.

"I think they really need to bring it down from the higher government level to the provincial to the district you know, and, I think there's a lot of people that are willing to do the job, but the problem is knowing how to do it." [Key informant interview, CSO]

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)

Six CSO IPs and eight members of the CSRG were interviewed for the MTA. The CSO respondents all confirmed their commitment to their work in response to ending VAWG but noted that given the geographic and cultural context in PNG, their work is challenging and often unappreciated. Lack of resources, trust and support from local decision makers were quoted as important stumbling blocks.

"We are still lacking that kind of commitment not as an individual, but as a department, you know, a departmental response from government institutions. So that is very challenging, and I think another constraint also is the lack of trust from, from either the government officials, as well as donors to work with local people, you know, because I believe there's money, but when you start to release money, people need also to be accountable, need to ensure that that money goes to the survivors. I think one of the issues is also the buried trust." [Key informant interview, CSO]

The support and resources received from the Spotlight Initiative are considered important but there is a general feeling that the Spotlight Initiative has generated high expectations which were difficult to realise during the COVID-19 pandemic and within the limited time available for implementation. It was noted that UN systems and processes can be cumbersome for many grassroots CSOs, which is compounded by limited capacities. This can cause delays with engagement of IPs, disbursement of funds, etc. This was confirmed by informants from CSOs, who complained about funding delays (see question 9) and that funding has been allocated mostly to established CSOs. In their perception, smaller grassroots organisations are not directly benefiting from the Initiative. This was reiterated by another stakeholder, who pointed out that this combination of factors (e.g., minimum required allocation of funds CSO partners, the tight timeline and high commitments of the programme, and the availability of CSO partners with required organisational capacity) indicates a structural challenge with the global design of the programme and incentivises partnerships with larger and more established organisations. However, it should be noted that despite these challenges most of the recruited implementing partners are grassroots organisations and first-time partners with UN agencies.

United Nations (RUNOs and PMU)

The four RUNOs are highly committed to the Spotlight Initiative and commit their human resources and expertise for the coordination and technical support for programme implementation. All RUNOs have programme management staff who are funded under the budget of the Spotlight Initiative grant. The RUNOs and RCO have had difficulties in recruiting and maintaining staff on the programme as the programme management team, for example, had to be replaced in the second quarter of 2021 (this is further explored in question 12). Representatives from government and CSO implementing agencies expressed satisfaction with the support and commitment received by the RUNOs, however, some key informants also noticed that the changes in personnel at the RUNOs and RCO has affected effective delivery and further progress of the Initiative.

EU Delegation

The Delegation of the European Union for PNG has maintained high-level participation in the programme, including during the programme design phase in the first months of the programme, in the approval of workplans and budget revisions, in the selection of implementing partners, the induction of the CSRG, and in the first meetings of the CSC. Joint advocacy by the EUD and the UN agencies was also observed and appreciated and the EUD has participated in the launch of several initiatives and communication campaigns. However, since the departure of the programme management team in the second quarter of 2021, the communication with the EUD was interrupted and they were not kept informed about progress, according to key informants interviewed.

Key findings

- Government partners are committed to the programme and to ending VAWG. These commitments are observed in the Special Parliamentary Committee on GBV as well as the commitment to allocate national funding to the GBV Secretariats. Some interviewed informants, however, believe that more attention should be paid to delivering interventions at provincial level.
- Civil society organisations demonstrate commitment to the Spotlight Initiative but face geographic and cultural challenges. Lack of resources, trust and support from local decision makers were cited as important barriers for the delivery of their work.
- The four RUNOs are also highly committed and contribute human resources and coordination and technical expertise. Changes in personnel at the RUNOs and RCO has however affected continued progress in programme delivery as well as communication with the EUD.
- High-level commitment from the EUD was observed and appreciated although the EUD expressed dissatisfaction with, less communication between the programme secretariat and the EUD in the last six months.

Recommendations

1. The PMU should renew its engagement with the EUD and should continue and improve preparation of regular updates for the delegation, for example by including a clear schedule to determine when these updates are due so that all RUNOs are prepared and can provide quality and relevant inputs. Also, face-to-face updates at the technical level could be considered to revamp engagement (PMU). In case of further staff turnover within the PMU, it is recommended that UN Women as the technical lead temporarily ensures regular updates to the EUD.

5. Is the programme Theory of Change well developed? Are the indicators to measure results well defined and relevant to measure the achievement of the objectives in line with the ToC?	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good - Good
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Problems
	<input type="checkbox"/> Serious deficiencies
<p>Theory of Change</p> <p>Interviewed stakeholders from the RUNOs agreed that the Spotlight Initiative’s Theory of Change (ToC) as a holistic framework is useful and helps to address violence against women and girls in a more integrated way across the six programme pillars. The ToC helps to illustrate the pathways of change, including through relevant assumptions. However, the ToC was not fully understood among CSO and government implementers, and some stakeholders doubted the practical relevance of the theoretical framework. Several key informants (government, IPs) also commented that the ToC did not sufficiently reflect the social and cultural context of PNG.</p> <p>Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <p>The CPD outlines that an integrated monitoring, evaluation and learning system will be designed to track programme results and foster continuous learning and improvement. A dedicated M&E Specialist was contracted at the start of the programme and acted as the main focal point for programme monitoring in coordination with RUNO’s focal points. This specialist, however, left the programme in April 2021 and a temporary M&E consultant was contracted in August 2021 to support the team until February 2022.</p> <p>A baseline was conducted at the beginning of the programme and its results were approved in the June 2020 CSC meeting on the condition that the programme would address three important data gaps. These gaps include (1) the size of budget allocation for addressing VAWG, (2) the number of cases reported to the police that reach courts and (3) Parliamentarians views related to VAWG. The results framework used by the PNG Spotlight Programme is based on the Global Spotlight Initiative results framework. No data was provided to the MTA team indicating that additional, or country specific indicators were added to the results framework to further address the data gaps as outlined by the baseline.</p> <p>Interviewed key informants were generally not satisfied about the indicators that aim to capture the work they are involved with. Staff working on legislation or institutions (pillar 1 and 2) noted that the indicators do not sufficiently cover institutional changes. For example, the work done by the Special Parliamentary Committee was difficult to be adequately captured by the available indicators in terms of the landmark change it has been for the Parliamentarians who were involved. Staff working on prevention (pillar 3), on the other hand, also find the indicators to be limited in capturing actual behaviour change. The results framework is focused on counting numbers of meetings held and people reached, while the programme is putting effort in trying to understand changes in the underlying causes of violence, but this work is very difficult to report on in the results framework. Lack of tools to measure behaviour change coupled with a lack of time force people to count numbers at activity level rather than measuring actual change.</p> <p>The results framework was reviewed in September 2021 by the M&E consultant and suggestions were made to further simplify the framework based on availability of data sources. The revised framework proposes to measure only 41 indicators instead of 55 indicators as initially proposed in the 2020 annual report. The MTA team was not provided any data indicating that country-specific indicators were included in the revised framework.</p> <p>The interviewed IPs had limited understanding of the results framework and were not satisfied by how they have to report on progress made. Interviewed IPs found reporting formats insufficiently clear with over-emphasis on financial reporting, and underemphasis on reporting on qualitative challenges and progress. However, it was mentioned by another stakeholder that the lack of reporting on qualitative</p>	

challenges may also be due to a lack of overall understanding on the results framework. This is also in line with findings as noted above, indicating that the ToC and results framework may need to be better tailored, developed and communicated for a more common understanding.

Key findings:

- While the RUNOs consider the Theory of Change useful as a comprehensive framework to address VAWG, key informants from the government and IPs find that it does not sufficiently reflect the social and cultural context of PNG.
- Data gaps identified in the baseline do not seem to be addressed by the results framework for PNG.
- Most interviewed informants find that the results framework and its indicators do not accurately reflect actual progress made in terms of behaviour change and impact.

Recommendations:

2. During the design of Phase 2, the Programme Coordinator and M&E Specialist of the PMU should organise a workshop with RUNOs, IPs, CSG members and government representatives involved in the monitoring of Spotlight funded interventions. With the support from M&E officers and GBV specialists, they should review the ToC, ensure that it is thoroughly contextualized and generate a common understanding of the ToC and its link to the indicators and targets of the global performance monitoring framework. One of the outcomes of such a workshop could be a subsidiary national M&E framework with indicators that are considered by IPs as relevant to their activities and context while maintaining the link to the global framework. The revised framework should also aim to address the data gaps as identified by the baseline as well as reflect upon how qualitative data on behaviour change can be better captured.

6A. BEFORE COVID-19: Have all relevant circumstances and risks been taken into account to update the intervention logic? If there are delays, how important are they and what are the consequences? What are the reasons for these delays and to what extent have appropriate corrective measures been implemented? To what extent has the planning been revised accordingly?

☒ **Very Good - Good**

☐ **Problems**

6B. AFTER COVID-19: What are the consequences of COVID 19? To what extent have appropriate corrective measures been implemented? To what extent has the planning been revised accordingly?

☐ **Serious deficiencies**

Before COVID-19

The risk matrix of the Programme Document and its update in the 2020 Annual Report are comprehensive. Risks which were rated as highly likely and with a high impact include contextual risks such as deeply entrenched and inequitable social norms about GBV and increased resistance to change, insecurity in specific geographic regions, high vulnerability to environmental disasters and subsequent disease outbreaks, and cultural traditions such as the “wantok”³ which supersedes the application of existing rules and regulations. At the programme level, high risk factors include ambitious targets especially for interventions implemented by CSOs with limited capacity, delays to implementation due to a slow start-

³ Wantok means “one talk”, or the language of a given tribe or clan to which an individual belongs. The Wantok system is the traditional welfare system that developed around that tribe.

up process and limited infrastructure, whereas at the institutional level important risk factors included internal challenges within government which may disrupt or delay programmes, limited implementation of legislation and lack of political will to translate political commitments into actions. The mitigation measures are considered appropriate but were not able to mitigate all the identified risks.

Programme delays were experienced soon after the programme was launched, but most interviewed informants and survey respondents attributed them to the State of Emergency (SOE) orders and associated regulations of COVID-19 containment, including periods of lockdowns and mass vaccination efforts. Key informants and survey respondents also commented on funding delays which have affected programme implementation and are linked to the ambitious targets and limited capacity of CSO implementing partners (see question 9). The political gridlock with Parliament being adjourned for several months or effects of heavy rainfall and tidal waves were not mentioned as factors directly affecting programme implementation.

After COVID-19

While the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic were not anticipated in the CPD, the programme faced many difficulties during the first six months of implementation as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in State of Emergency measures being put in place on the 24th of March, just two weeks after the official launch of the programme. The pandemic affected the programme implementation as physical group gatherings were restricted, capacity development activities for CSO and government implementing partners had to be conducted virtually, staff and consultant recruitment were delayed due to unclarity regarding border restrictions, government counterparts, such as the health and police workforce, were actively working on the COVID-19 response and essential services such as courts were shut down, including for GBV survivors.

The revised results matrix of the 2020 Annual Report included COVID-19 as a high risk leading to increased levels of violence and limited reach as a result of the lock-down. Proposed mitigation measures included providing specific COVID-19 GBV in emergencies (GBViE) guidance including Dignity Kit Guidance for front-line responders through the GBV Steering Committee (GBVSC), close monitoring of the interventions, conducting a continuous reprioritization exercise to ensure focus remains on those interventions which can still take place, supporting implementing partners with IT equipment and trainings on use of virtual platforms.

The RUNOs together with the CSRG have reprioritised the joint annual workplan, in light of the COVID-19 restrictions and the revised workplan and budget was approved by the CSC in June 2020. This reprioritization was based on a report prepared by the Country Team on how COVID-19 was affecting the implementation of the programme. It highlighted that a total of 23 interventions were postponed during the first two quarters of 2020 for a total amount of USD 700,000. Most of these interventions affected were under Pillar 3 (prevention activities) and Pillar 4 (service delivery activities).

RUNOs have also raised an additional USD two million from Australia, Japan, EU and the UNDP Response Facility Resources to address immediate impacts on women and girls, and jointly coordinated the COVID-19 response through the Protection Cluster and associated GBV and Child Protection sub-clusters. Existing Spotlight Initiative interventions have also mainstreamed COVID-19 response interventions through support to counselling services, safe houses, correctional services, and behaviour change programmes. A large majority of online survey respondents and interviewed stakeholders acknowledged that the COVID-19 response generated delays in programme implementation. However, as the workplan was reprioritised shortly after the programme was launched, it has been possible to continue with programme implementation using the proposed adaptations.

Key findings

- The PNG Spotlight Programme Document includes a comprehensive risk assessment with appropriate mitigation measures. While the effects of COVID-19 were not included in the initial risk assessment, appropriate measures were taken shortly after the programme launch and a revised annual workplan was approved by the CSC in June 2020.
- Most interviewed stakeholders and respondents to the online survey noted that the State of Emergency (SOE) orders and associated regulations of COVID-19 containment have affected programme implementation, however, the revised workplan has been able to help reprioritize and adapt interventions accordingly.
- Despite early adjustments to the context of COVID-19 control measures, implementation delays occurred because of priority shifts among key government partners and travel restrictions.

Recommendations

3. During the no-cost extension of Phase 1, the Spotlight Initiative partners should analyse obstacles to timely implementation due to overstretched staff capacity in government ministries and departments, including but not limited to the COVID-19 response, and develop a plan to address this in a possible Phase 2 of the programme.

C. Effectiveness

**7. To what extent has progress towards output targets been achieved?
Is the quality of the outputs satisfactory?**

☒ **Very Good - Good**

☐ **Problems**

☐ **Serious deficiencies**

Output target achievement

The PNG Programme monitors progress towards the achievement of outcomes with 41 indicators at the output level. Initially the programme established 55 indicators, but these were reduced to 41 in September 2021 (see question 6). Targets for each indicator as well as first year milestones and first year achievements were published in an annex to the 2020 Annual Report. The achievement of milestones for the first year was analysed with data submitted to the global performance monitoring framework indicating mixed progress ranging from 44% achievement of milestones under Outcome 2 to 88% under Outcome 6. First year milestone achievements are summarised graphically in Annex 3. However, many of these milestones were set at zero and only limited conclusions can therefore be drawn from the analysis.

Second year performance data from the global monitoring database were not available to the MTA team. The PNG Spotlight Programme team, however, provided the MTA with the results matrix master copy (dated January 17th, 2022). The matrix included 20 of the 41 output indicators and data for 18 of these. Achievements of these 18 indicators against the Phase 1 output targets that were published in the annex to the 2020 Annual Report are summarised in Table 3. These data should, however, be considered preliminary as they had not yet been validated by the National Steering Committee.

Table 4. Preliminary data on Phase 1 output target achievement

Indicator (abbreviated)	Target	Cumulative results	% Achieved
1.1.1 Number laws and/or policies responding to the rights of women and girls in line with international HR standards	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated GBV Operational Plan National Youth Policy Draft Law on Protection of Human Rights Defenders Women's Health Protection Bill 	100%
1.1.3 Number of draft laws and/or policies which have received significant inputs from women's rights advocates	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Law on Protection of Human Rights Defenders 	33%
2.1.1 Number of government institutions that develop strategies, plans and/or programmes to prevent and respond to VAWG	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NDOH National Health Plan (2020) 3 Provincial administrations NDOE CSE Plan OCSF Prevention of Violence Prog. 	50%
2.1.3 Number of strategies, new plans and programmes of other relevant sectors (health, social services, education, justice, security, culture) that integrate efforts for EVAWG	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National health plan (2020) 3 Provincial strategies Clinic guidelines for SGBV SOPs for FSCs OCSF Prevention of Violence Prog. Comprehensive Sexual Education Plan 	500%

2.1.6 Number of key government officials trained on human rights and gender-equitable norms, attitudes and behaviours	424 (Incl. 180 women)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 422 (not disaggregated by sex) 	100%
3.1.1 Existence of a draft new and/or strengthened CSE	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DoE: Draft CSE Plan 	100%
3.1.2 Number of young women and girls, young men in programmes that promote gender-equitable norms, attitudes and behaviours	800,000 (disaggregated)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020: 1,204 (disaggregated) 2021: 1,202,700 (not disaggregated) 	150%
3.2.2 Number of people reached by campaigns challenging harmful social norms and gender stereotyping	600,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020: 6,146 2021: 200,000 	34%
3.2.4 Number of communities with advocacy platforms established and/or strengthened	44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22 	50%
3.3.5 Number decision makers with strengthened awareness of and capacities to advocate for VAWG	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020: 15 2021: 0 	25%
4.1.3 Existence of national guidelines in line with the guidance and tools for essential services.	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BMP School Guides in 30 schools 	0%
4.1.6 Number of government service providers who have increased knowledge and capacities to better integrate VAWG response	300 (incl. 140 women)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 110 (not disaggregated by sex) 	25%
4.2.3 Existence of strategies for increasing the knowledge and access to services for women and girls.	6 strat. that include LNOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobile clinic strategy Health Service Access Strategy (FSCs and Youth Friendly Clinics) Inter-sectoral accessibility strategy (referral protocols) 	50%
5.1.4 Number government personnel from different sectors, including service providers, with enhanced capacities to collect data on VAWG	Total: 269 Women: 106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020: 1 2021: 156 (not disaggregated by sex) 	58%
5.2.1 Number of knowledge products developed and disseminated	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020: 1 2021: 8 	50%
6.1.4 Number of groups with strengthened capacities to network and jointly advocate for ending VAWG	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020: 0 2021: 20 	167%
6.2.1 Number of supported women's right groups using appropriate accountability mechanisms for advocacy around ending VAWG	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020: 0 2021: 20 	167%

6.3.1 Number of groups representing groups facing multiple forms of discrimination/marginalisation that have strengthened capacities	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2020: 0 • 2021: 20 	167%
--	----	---	------

On a purely mathematical basis, average output indicator achievements by outcome area varied from 25% for outcomes under Pillar 4 to more than 200% under Pillar 2. This calculation is, however, based on results of less than half of the output indicators in the results framework. The general observation, however, is that while the programme suffered from implementation delays at the start due to COVID-19 related restrictions as well as changes in personnel at the level of the PMU and RUNOs in 2021, progress has picked up in the second half of 2021.

Quality of outputs

Interviewed informants were asked about their perception of the quality of outputs and in almost all cases stated that these were in line with expectations. However, nearly all interviews were conducted with informants who were responsible for overseeing or implementing the activities, and the data are therefore not objective.

Key findings

- The MTA had insufficient quality assured M&E data to quantitatively assess the programme's progress towards achievement of targets at this time. Partial data shared by the country team, however, indicates that progress of outputs towards the set targets has picked up in the second half of 2021.
- It was not possible to assess the quality of the outputs, but interviewed informants were satisfied with the quality of outputs in almost all cases.

Recommendations

4. The Country Team should start a discussion among RUNO programme staff towards the development of a deeper analysis of reported outputs that can provide additional evidence for quality, for instance by measuring and reporting achievements in knowledge or changes in attitudes about VAWG among people exposed to programme activities (see also recommendation 4).

8. Are the outputs still likely to lead to the expected outcomes? To what extent has progress towards the outcome targets been achieved?

☒ **Very Good - Good**

☐ **Problems**

☐ **Serious deficiencies**

Progress against the approved workplan by outcome area

As described under the previous evaluation question, the available performance data were limited and did not allow for the assessment of current progress towards outputs in quantitative terms. To respond to this evaluation question in a qualitative manner, we analysed the 2020 annual report, the draft 2021 annual report, the M&E framework as well as KIIs and online survey responses.

According to the interviewed key informants, the delivery of the work plan was on track. For community level activities, some IPs reported long periods of delays before funding was made available which created

pressure to implement the interventions at a fast pace once they received funding. These funding delays are linked to the ambitious targets and limited capacity of CSO implementing partners (see question 6 and question 9). The programme has contributed to important achievements in the past two years. Under Pillar 1, the government has increased its commitments of EVAWG in response to the GBV Parliamentary Committee's by holding its first ever inquiry on GBV and by allocation of over 7 m Kina for GBV programming in the 2022 National Budget. This funding will now be used to recruit a full-time staff for the National GBV Secretariat in 2022 (with Spotlight technical support). Under Pillar 2, the capacity of public GBV structures at provincial level has been significantly improved with GBV government focal points appointed in 8 target provinces (Oro, ESP, Simbu, EHP, Jiwaka, WHP, Enga and SHP), GBV Action Committees formed in 8 provinces (Simbu, Jiwaka, Eastern Highlands, Enga, Western Highlands, East Sepik and Oro), and the first Provincial Council for Child and Family Services was established in Enga. Under Pillar 3, awareness on GBV has been increased at a large scale with various stakeholder groups, for example through the behavior change campaign "Changing the Headlines" which reached 2.7 million people. Significant progress has also been achieved in engaging young people on SRHR and GBV (see Table 4 below). Under Pillar 4, the Spotlight Initiative contributed to strengthening GBV case management by improving referral pathways and to increasing the access of GBV survivors to new and existing prevention and response mechanisms. Under Pillar 5, the capacity of government stakeholders to collect and analyse disaggregated data on VAWG has been strengthened. The launch of the Primero case management database was another important result. Under Pillar 6, different interventions to strengthen civil society and the women's movement have been delivered. The organization of the National CSO forum in December 2021, for instance, was an important milestone. The key achievements and obstacles for each pillar are mapped out in more detail in Table 4 below.

Table 5. Key achievements and obstacles by Pillar

	Pillar	Key achievements in Phase I	Issues arising / obstacles to address in remainder of Phase I and Phase II
	Outcome 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Special Parliamentary Committee held their first ever inquiry on GBV in May 2021 and tabled a report in Parliament with 71 recommendations for action by the Government in August 2021. - The Constitutional and Legal Reform Commission facilitated the National Executive Council to start the official development of the Human Rights Defenders Protection policy. This is the first milestone towards the development of the Human Rights Defenders Protection Bill. - A closed workshop was held to consult sector stakeholders on the draft of the Women's health and protection bill. - The passing of the National Youth Policy and subsequent participation of PNG youth and government stakeholders in participated the National Youth Policy Interpretation Workshops to develop regional action plans for its five-year implementation. Policy implementation inputs have been formalised for the Social Order Sector (SLOS) and National Executive Council (NEC) approval. 	<p>Although progress was made under Pillar 1, the proposed timeframe for completing the targets is unrealistic given the lengthy processes necessary for legislative and policy reform, the lack of existing structures in PNG, and the human resource capacity.</p> <p>In Phase 2 the outputs and activities under Outcome 1 should be examined and more realistic targets set.</p>

<p>Outcome 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The National Budget allocated funding of K7.93 million (approx. US\$1.4 million) for National GBV Secretariat programming. - The Support provided for the development and launch the Government's first National Gender Based Violence Secretariat(NGBVS) website was developed and launched. - In the first half of 2021, more than 150 provincial GBV stakeholders were engaged to discuss GBV responses in 13 provinces. - Provincial teams supported to develop GBV strategies and budget submissions and establishment of new GBV action committees in eight seven provinces. - Numerous state servants and volunteers training on harmful gender norms and GBV referral pathways. - Purple Ribbon Campaign on Domestic Violence carried out and increased calls to phone counselling services by 40 percent. - Establishment of provincial council for child and family services (PCCFS). 	<p>COVID-19 impeded the pace at which activities could be completed, especially at provincial level within the health sector, as services and staff were occupied by the pandemic. The lockdown measures enforced during the period of the national emergency and consequential increase of GBV, including a decrease in referral pathways due to lack of access to services, made it challenging to implement activities as planned. For phase 2, it is recommended to plan further trainings on GBV case management to consolidate capacity gains.</p>
<p>Outcome 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Behaviour change campaigns reached 2.7 million people with the multi-media campaign "Changing the Headlines". - Over 4500 young people participated in Comprehensive Sexuality Education and over 6300 were engaged in peer-to-peer exchanges on SRHR and GBV. 21,765 young people received GBV and SRHR services. - Development of a Youth Submission to the Special Parliamentary Committee on GBV Inquiry. - Establishment of the national Y-PEER network, a national inter-network youth network of 55 youth organisations and groups from seven provinces. - Development of national five-year CSE plan for advancement of gender transformative CSE for in and out of school youth through tertiary. - Over 15,000 community members engaged through the in- and out-of-school community-based programmes. - Over 9000 children benefit from improved parenting skills after the roll out of the Parenting for Childhood Development Programme. 20,133 men, women and children reached the Community Conversations programme using the SASA model. - KAP survey on VAC and VAW conducted in four provinces and will be used to inform a National 	<p>While good progress has been made under this outcome, challenges were a general mistrust of authorities and distrust of information coming from leaders as well as information thought to be influenced western ideals. This has been a challenge to progress under both outcome 3 and 4. This is exacerbated by a lack of functional literacy skills for access to media, including social media.</p> <p>Acceptance and perceptions on GBV continue to be conservative among certain groups, including service providers and church workers. It will be important to explore whether additional training sessions for service providers and champions of positive deviance will be required.</p>

	SBCC strategy and address issues of community mistrust on VAC and VAW messaging.	
Outcome 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A total of 300 duty bearers (community leaders, policy officers, etc.) received training to improve the quality of their services to survivors of GBV. Promotion of accreditation of counselling courses through MoU for delivery of 6-month counselling course by 3 different entities. 26 counsellors trained thus far. Development of 8 provincial multi-year Family Support Centre Action Plans. Completion of a functionality and service readiness assessment of Family Support Centres using WHO GBV Quality Assurance Tool. Almost 5000 women and girls were supported at safe shelters through case management and repatriation services and with food and sanitary supplies through partnership with Femili PNG. 	The coordination between CSOs and the provincial government entities have proven to be challenging. In many places, the IPs still operate in separation from and are not known by the government representatives. Effective coordination mechanisms are not yet in place.
Outcome 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of data management standards and information sharing agreement into referral pathway SOPs adopted by ENB Provincial Authority. 18 government and civil society participants supported to participate in the kNOWVAW prevalence data course. Launched Primero-protection management system to collect administrative data on child protection with provisions to also collect GBV data at national level, and thereafter in NCD. GBV administrative data management workshops in NCD and E Online police case management database launched to assist the Policy Family and Sexual Violence Unit in Port Moresby better track GBV cases. 	Lack of internet connectivity and issues with codification of data due to varying application of terminology (e.g., DV v. FV) have created challenges to implementation and integration of data management systems. Misalignment between GBV and CP social protection framework have challenges coordination and potential integration of GBV and CP administrative data management systems.
Outcome 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over 100 civil society representatives participated in a National Forum on Gender Equality and Human Rights and called for the endorsement and approval of State-Civil Society Partnership Policy to access funding directly from the government. The Business Coalition for Women (BCFW) expanded its reach to work with 7 more companies to raise awareness around sexual harassment at workplace, awareness on FSV, referral pathways and support services, including development of organizational FSV policy. 	While good progress has been made under Outcome 6, there have been significant challenges in implementing the CSO capacity hub. Due to staff changes, Oxfam spent time on capacity building of their new staff which delayed and reduced activities implemented under the hub. RUNOs also showed gaps in coordinating the connection of their CSO partners to Oxfam. The results of the CSO capacity strengthening have not yet led to sufficient improvement in programme reports.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of the CSO capacity Development Hub to strengthen institutional and technical capacities of 15 CSOs. Seven local and grassroots women's human rights organisations engaged under the Women Peace and Humanitarian Fund (WPHF) supported to procure key operational equipment and to access ongoing guidance on financial management, compliance, reporting, and development of implementation plans. Setting up of a WhatsApp group to connect all CSOs working under Spotlight and the Women, Peace and Humanitarian Fund. This has allowed to share information on upcoming events, on progress and challenges. 	<p>The hub might evolve into a promising practice for CSO capacity building, but it is yet to be seen whether or not the trainers – Oxfam and Care – will have the right tools and approach to build the capacity of CSOs partners in an effective and sustainable way.</p> <p>In the design of Phase 2, we suggest drawing on the experience gained in the first phase to conceptualize the approach (including a monitoring and evaluation framework) and to ensure the availability of high quality training materials.</p>
<p>Key findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The delivery of the workplan was reported to be by and large on track. The programme has achieved important progress and achievements under all pillars. Challenges and learning have been documented and reflected on in the annual reports. The CSO capacity hub is a potentially promising approach, but has been delayed and it is not possible to assess at this stage to what extent it will achieve effective, efficient and sustainable results. 		
<p>Recommendations</p> <p>5. Recommendations to tackle specific challenges are available in Table 4 above (in the right column).</p>		

<p>9A. Do the government, implementing partners or RUNOs have sufficient capacity (financial, human resources, institutional) to ensure that implementation is going according to plan?</p> <p>9B. Are there any obstacles/bottlenecks/outstanding issues on the partners' or government side that are limiting the successful implementation and results achievement of the Initiative?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Very Good - Good</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Problems</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Serious deficiencies</p>
<p>Budget execution</p> <p>The budget analysis is based on the financial data from quarter 3 of 2021. The data were extracted from the MPTF Gateway.⁴ The analysed data were still under revision from the global Secretariat and several anomalies were still being investigated. As per the quarter 3 data, the budget delivery (expenditure and commitments) was at 57% for all RUNOs combined (see Table 5 below). UN Women had the highest expenditure rate at 78% whereas UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA reported lower expenditure/commitment rates between 46% and 50% respectively. In December, however, according to the interview with the RCO the budget execution had made significant progress and the release of the remaining funds for the Phase I had been approved.</p>	

⁴ The MTA reports only use data from global platforms which have been validated by the Secretariat. These might differ from the monitoring data used at country level.

“So, we have now received the full last tranche for the program for the first phase which you are now evaluating or reviewing. And we want to go on to the second phase. The good news really is that we got all the Phase 1 money now released to us which again shows that we have achieved previous targets. Otherwise, this money wouldn't have been released to us. So, I think we've done fairly well in terms of implementation.” [Key informant interview, RCO]

Table 6. Budget execution by end September 2021

	Budget	Expenditure	Commitment	% spent or committed
UNDP	3,757,449	1,445,160	281,268	46%
UN Women	4,722,030	1,729,061	1,957,466	78%
UNFPA	3,982,112	1,453,284	533,820	50%
UNICEF	3,218,408	1,343,916	241,899 ⁵	49%
Total	15,680,000	5,971,421	3,014,453	57%

Absorption capacity and other obstacles limiting successful implementation

Government

The state agencies participation in the Spotlight Initiative is multi-layered including national, provincial and district level. Key partners of the Spotlight Initiative are the Department for Community Development and Religion (DfCDR), the Department of Justice and Attorney General (DJAG), the National Department of Education (DOE), the National Department of Health (NDOH), the Provincial Health Authorities (PHAs), the Office of Child and Family Services (OCFS) and the national and provincial GBV Secretariats. The perceptions on the institutional and human capacity of the involved government entities vary. Some key informants and online survey respondents perceive it to be adequate while others wished it was stronger given their role in the programme. There is consensus, however, that the government lacks resources to implement and sustain the actions of the Spotlight Initiative.

“I think the biggest challenge is lack of government funding. I mean, there's so much work we've been doing in terms of setting up the services and setting up policies. But the moment we stop - unless there is momentum and leadership, and most importantly, money in the government to do these things, then it's not going to go forward. It's just the reality of it.” [Key informant interview, RUNO]

That stated, it should be noted that the establishment to the new GBV budget allocation from the government has shown some progress in this area.

At provincial level, substantial institutional capacity and human resource gaps have been reported for state agencies, such as the Community Development Divisions. Resources to support overhead costs (office space, internet, electricity, vehicles, laptops, data communication etc.) were critically lacking and it was observed that government stakeholders were obliged to use their personal assets to be able to participate in interventions.

“We are doing our best to help our key partners identify the directives or key areas to implement your programs. So, in terms of helping them to identify resources, whether they need office spaces or vehicles of their own or other, you know, overhead supports, whether it's electricity or data communication, so things like that a lot of them are lacking. You know, most of them are using their own personal resources to actually provide support to the work we are doing under Spotlight.” [Key informant interview, RUNO]

⁵ UNICEF uses a different mechanism to report on commitments compared to other RUNOs which explains why the commitments are generally lower.

The interviewed key informants from the government were critical of the fact that UN funding is channelled mainly through CSOs as in line with SI principles. This channelling of funds was found to make sense in the context of PNG, but has also led to frustration at the level of government partners. In their perception, the funding bypasses the government instead of enhancing its capacity and commitment to lead the work on EVAWG.

“Spotlight concentrates more on CSOs while the government agencies suffer from lack of resources and capacity. Government agencies should have been given the priority because we have programmes in place and these programmes must be supported.” [Key informant interview, Government]

“We appreciate what Spotlight has done so far. However, it would have been a lot better if the Spotlight Initiative could support government agencies.” [Key informant interview, Government]

CSOs

Key informant interviews and the online survey responses from UN agencies reported substantial capacity gaps at the level of CSOs partners. To ensure that activities were executed, UN interviewees reported that they had to invest extensive amounts of their time for technical support and for explaining financial and other reporting requirements. Most of the IPs were also observed to lack basic working equipment and facilities and were not able to deliver at the level of quality and speed required by the Spotlight Initiative. One of the online survey respondents summarized that it was *“unrealistic for the vast majority of CSOs in PNG and their capacity to implement quality programming at the required burn rate.”* The level of effort required for CSO strengthening has often overstretched the capacity of the RUNOs. One stakeholder reported that the 18% PMC limit created challenges in RUNOs ability to provide adequate support to CSOs. Other key informants perceived that the Spotlight Initiative’s requirement of allocating substantial budget amounts to CSOs was too ambitious for the context of PNG.

“We've encountered a lot of challenges along the way. In the process of our technical support and administrative support, we've realized a lot of our partners lack capacity, especially from our CSOs in the sense that they don't have the appropriate operational systems in place to enable them to implement the activities. So a bulk of our work consists of capacity strengthening to our CSOs.” [Key informant interview, RUNO]

“I think a real challenge has been the minimum amount to be dedicated to civil society organizations. I totally agree that there should be a minimum allocated to civil society organizations. But the reality in PNG is that if you want to partner with numerous, new civil society organizations, you need the staff and the time to work with them, so that they have the support they need to do the job. Spotlight asked us to have those partnerships and to give that money to civil society organizations which is totally fair...but the programme does not allow for the time or the staffing in order to do that properly, which makes program management very difficult.” [Key informant interview, RUNO]

To address CSOs’ capacity gaps, Oxfam International has been contracted to implement a CSO capacity building hub to strengthen the institutional and technical capacity of CSOs. As part of this work, Oxfam has been tasked to work with 18 CSOs which are mainly based in the Highlands and Momase region. Institutional restructuring and staff change in Oxfam as well as the COVID-19 pandemic have compromised its ability to provide support to the intended level during the first year of the programme. In partnership with the Women Peace and Humanitarian Fund (WPHF), the CSO capacity hub was extended with the recruitment of Care International to pursue the same work as Oxfam with another additional seven CSOs. Despite these investments in CSOs’ capacity on decreasing GBV, partners continue to struggle with financial management and with meeting requirements for liquidation of resources and results reporting.

Key informants from CSOs expressed critical views on the extensive UN requirements for tendering and reporting which were perceived to be cumbersome and of little added value for them. According to them, the programme was too complex and ambitious. “The UN wants too much”, was a common perception. That notwithstanding CSOs mostly reported to be satisfied with the capacity strengthening and institutional support provided by the RUNOs.

“Generally, during the establishment of the programme UNDP worked closely with us ensuring that all stakeholders worked in partnership and tasks were achieved. They ensured that we understood what we were required to do.” [Key informant interview, CSO]

RUNOs

The institutional and technical capacity of RUNOs was estimated to be fair or good by most key informants and online survey respondents. There was less consensus regarding the adequacy of RUNO staffing for the programme. Some online survey respondents perceived that RUNOs were sufficiently staffed. This was not corroborated by other online survey respondents and RUNO key informants. They reported that the lack of personnel for civil society strengthening, finance and procurement as well as GBV programming created substantial issues including delays and overburdening of RUNO personnel. This was confirmed by key informants from CSOs who reported delays in fund transfers. The programme internal ceiling of 18% for management costs was perceived as a root cause for the shortages in RUNO staffing.

“All RUNOs are short staffed across all aspects - programme support, finance, technical and programmatic leads. It is a critical shortfall due to the program management costs cap and in light of the scale of the programme and burdensome reporting and financial requirements both from the Spotlight Secretariat as well as internal UN reporting requirements.” [Online survey respondent]

“And I certainly hear this as a challenge in other countries, the cap on program management costs and in particular on staff - given the size of the project and what is expected - is totally unrealistic. We are really, really struggling with staffing shortages, given the scale of the program.” [Key informant interview, RUNO]

Key findings

- According to the Q3 2021 financial data, the programme has achieved a budget delivery (expenditure and commitments) of 56% for all RUNOs combined. Key informants from the RCO, however, reported that the budget execution had significantly increased and reached their budget execution target by end of the year.
- There are different perceptions regarding the technical and human capacity of the involved government entities which ranged from adequate to insufficient. There was consensus, however, that the government lacked financial resources to fully participate in and sustain the Spotlight Initiative. This applies in particular to government agencies at the sub-national level.
- CSO partners have demonstrated lower technical and operational capacity than required by the programme. To tackle this challenge, Oxfam and Care International have been contracted to provide technical and institutional support to IPs through the approach of a capacity strengthening hub.
- RUNOs have also provided extensive support for proposal development, liquidations and reporting to CSOs, but do not have the required human resources to respond to the various needs of their IPs. RUNOs reported human resources gaps in the fields of finance, procurement and GBV.

Recommendations

6. Conduct action research to explore to what extent the CSO capacity building hub covers and sufficiently addresses gaps in technical, financial and institutional capacity of IPs and to analyze whether alternative capacity strengthening models could achieve comparable results. The findings should guide decisions on either how to strengthen the work of the hub or on how to adjust the approach – if necessary – during Phase 2 (PMU, RUNOs).
7. As technical expertise for RUNOs can also be budgeted under outcomes of Phase 2, we suggest implementing a workforce planning exercise in the design process of Phase 2. This will allow for identification of critical gaps and to plan for adequate RUNO staffing for the next phase of the Spotlight Initiative (PMU, RC, RUNOs).
8. To address capacity gaps of government partners at sub-national level, we suggest to integrate key measures and actions in the programme's sustainability plan to address bottlenecks in public services in the prevention of VAWG and in the assistance of GBV survivors. These measures and actions should be identified in a participatory manner and enable government stakeholder to take ownership for EVAWG.
9. Prior to the start of Phase 2, we suggest conducting a mapping of CSO partnerships across agencies to shed light on IP workloads (i.e. those working with multiple RUNOs) and allow for modifications as needed.

D. Efficiency

10. Are the chosen implementation mechanisms (incl. choice of implementation modalities, entities and contractual arrangements) adequate for achieving the expected results?

☒ Very Good - Good

☐ Problems

☐ Serious deficiencies

The programme budget (not including management costs) is split into five delivery mechanisms: 34% of the budget are transferred to CSOs⁶, 8% are payments to individual consultants, 5% are payments to a consultancy company, 18% are designated to the government and 35% are classified as “other”. The requirement of the Spotlight Initiative to channel 50 to 70 percent of CSO funding to national and grassroots organisations has, thus, not been met. Considering the low capacity of CSOs in the country, however, this seems appropriate. The proportion of payments classified as “other” is high compared to other programmes.

The RUNOs operate according to their own internal procedures. For working with CSOs, the UN National Implementation Modality (NIM) is applied. Funds are disbursed to implementing partners once activities have been completed and narrative reports have been sent to the RUNOs. These reports feed into the programme reports. New disbursements to partners are initiated once their reports are approved. CSOs partners are contracted as either IPs or grantees.

According to the 2020 annual report, 31 CSOs were contracted under the Spotlight Initiative; 19 as IPs and 12 as grantees. Two of them have signed contracts with two RUNOs. Femili PNG signed contracts with both UN Women and UNDP. The National FSVAC has been contracted as an IP by UN Women and UNFPA. All but three of the CSOs were classified in the category “women-led/ women’s rights organisation or feminist CSO”. There was no information for three of the IPs in this category. The majority of the CSOs (20) were categorised as grassroots organisations, eight as National CSOs and three as international organisations. To enable such a substantial number of grassroots organisations to join the Spotlight Initiative, some of them were offered to apply for small grants. Of the amount awarded to CSOs in 2020, 28% was disbursed to local and grassroots organisations, 21% to the international organisation and the remaining proportion to the National CSOs. Two additional CSOs were recruited in 2021, one international NGO and one additional local organisation.

The Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee (FSVAC) has been categorised by the Spotlight Initiative as a national CSO. There was some confusion on the status of FSVAC, as it is a sectorial committee of the Consultative Implementation and Monitoring Council (CIMC), an independent entity administered by the Institute of National Affairs. The CIMC is a semi-government organization and brings together over 200 civil society, private sector and government partners to develop policy, and influence and monitor government decision making for the long-term development of Papua New Guinea. However, technically it is legally part of INA, an NGO with core and project funding coming from a series of bilateral, multilateral and non-governmental development partners. That stated, its link with the government should be properly reflected.

The budget allocated to the government is executed through Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) which means that the UN agency implements the activities directly without channelling the funding through the partner institution.⁷ As discussed under Question 9, this had led to frustration at the level of government partners but seems justified considering the country context.

⁶ According to the 2020 annual report, funding transferred to CSOs were increased to 35.5%

⁷ <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPChapter.aspx?TermID=f3136f23-5ced-45d8-89a0-c7b6b56b5229>

Staffing levels for Spotlight and Management Cost

The ceiling for programme management cost is set at 18% of the overall budget for the Spotlight Initiative at the global level. In PNG, the management costs are 17% according to the revised budget approved by the global operational steering committee. The number of UN personnel contributing to the programme delivery is 22 as per the revised AWP for 2021; 10 staff are fully funded and 12 personnel are partially funded by the Spotlight Initiative. Three of the RUNOs recover costs for both programmatic and operational support under the programme, which is a good practice. UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF's respective budgets include allocations for programme specialist support, M&E and coordination as well as for operations functions such as finance management, procurement and administration. UN Women only recovers personnel costs for programme specialists, coordination and management, but its budget does not include funding for operational programme support such as finance, procurement or administration which is surprising considering that the agency is the largest fund recipient of the four RUNOs.

Key findings

- The PNG programme has not met the requirement of allocating 50% of the programme budget to CSOs, but it has made substantial efforts to implement the Spotlight Initiative's Grassroot Action Plan in a very challenging context. By the end of 2020, RUNOs had recruited 31 CSOs as IPs. Most of them are new UN partners and classified as grassroot organisations.
- The management costs for the Spotlight Initiative are at 17% in PNG which is below the threshold of 18% set for country programmes. The number of staff fully and partially funded by the programme is 22 which seems rather low for a programme of this size. UN Women has not budgeted for administrative and finance support to the programme execution.

Recommendations

10. As recommended under the previous evaluation question, we suggest to implementing a workforce planning exercise for RUNOs for Phase 2. This will allow identification of critical gaps and to plan for adequate cost recovery of operational support to the Spotlight Initiative (PMU, RUNOs).

11A. How effectively is the Initiative managed?

11B. How effectively is the Programme managed? Are the governance and management mechanisms for the Initiative at national level adequate and functioning as planned? Do partner government and other partners (please consider CSO and EU Delegation) in the country effectively participate in these mechanisms?

☐ Very Good - Good

☒ Problems

☐ Serious deficiencies

Global Secretariat

According to key informants (RUNOs), the PNG technical team has built good relationships with the Global Secretariat. The Secretariat was described as supportive and helpful for finding solutions and for providing operational guidance. On several occasions, they linked up the PNG team with a programme team in another country which had been confronted with and found solutions for similar problems. It was also positively noted that the Secretariat had become less rigid regarding the use of global templates and other requirements and more adapted to country specific needs.

"They (the Secretariat) are always willing to respond to our, you know, to our concerns. [...] We have also reached out to them, you know, around the issues of the NCSRG compensation, because this came up as a caveat when we realized the level of effort that these members of the

civil society reference group were putting into the program. They've been happy to share with us and connect us with the experiences of other countries." [Key informant interview, RUNO]

Governance mechanism

Country Steering Committee (CSC)

In June 2019, an interim Country Steering Committee was set up and became permanent once the programme was approved. The CSC was co-chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister and the UN RC until April 2021. Since then, the Deputy Prime Minister has been replaced by the Attorney General of the DJAG. As per the Spotlight Initiative guidelines, the CSC includes representatives from the EU delegation, four heads of UN Agencies, representatives from ministries, including National Planning, Community Development, Justice and Attorney General, Health, Education, Provincial Affairs and Police Constabulary. There is also a representative from the Business Coalition for Women and three nominated members from the Civil Society Reference Group (CSRG). Its first meeting as permanent CSC was organized in June 2020. To date, four meetings have been held. The participant lists show that the UN participants outweigh the total number of other stakeholder categories. This should be monitored closely by the RCO. In some of the other country programmes, representatives from the government and EUD perceived an overrepresentation of the UN in the CSCs. A review of the meeting minutes indicated that the CSC fulfilled its purpose of approving key programme documents, progress sharing and problems solving as well as monitoring of managerial actions. This was confirmed by key informants from the UN who perceived the CSC to be effective and were satisfied with the engagement from government and CSRGCS-NRG representatives. That notwithstanding, it was also highlighted that convening the CSC had been challenging due to the busy schedules of its members.

"I'd say the steering committee as such is very effective. It meets at least twice a year. It is what a steering committee is supposed to be. It is a high-level committee which looks at the progress and makes high level decisions, you know, annual work plans, and so on and so forth. It gives high level guidance on specific areas. And I believe the steering committee, especially since it is well attended and well prepared, and there's a high level of ownership and leadership from the government, I think, is a very effective mechanism." [Key informant interview, RCO]

The Civil Society Reference Group (CSRG)

The design phase of the programme was accompanied by an interim CSRG. Its members had been recommended by the RUNOs for their expertise on EVAWG. The interim CSRG met twice in 2019 to discuss, review and provide recommendations to the draft of the Country Programme Design (CPD) document. According to the annual 2020 report, their recommendations were accepted and integrated in the final draft of the CPD. The members of the permanent CSRG were designated by a Selection Committee with members from the local CSOs, the National Research Institute and the UN. Selection criteria were carefully designed to ensure the representation of all regions, of marginalized groups and of youth. As a result of the process, 17 members were selected. Its member composition aligns strongly with the Leave No One Behind (LNOB) principle. The female/male ratio is 15 to 2, and eight members work for CSOs which are IPs, seven members work for CSOs which have no contractual relation with the programme. There was no information provided for the institutional affiliation for two of the CSRG members so it was not possible to assess whether they are part of the IPs or not. The Spotlight Initiative has facilitated regular meetings of the CSRG. This has been challenging, in particular during the first COVID-19 lockdown, but also in 2020 due to the limited access to internet of some members for virtual meetings. Due to these difficult circumstances, not all CSRG members were able to participate in the meetings. Another challenge was the compensation for members who invested substantial amounts of their time for the work of the CSRG. To support members for their work for the Spotlight Initiative, it was decided to contract members with extensive time commitment as consultants, to pay full DSA to all members for their participation in the

CSRG meetings and to provide all members with a monthly communication and data allowance. The CSRG was also supported to develop and start the implementation of their work plan to fully operationalize their role. The work plan is funded by the Spotlight Initiative. They have also received support from the RUNOs for the preparation of their input to the CSC. In the four meetings of the latter, at least one representative from the CSRG was represented (see previous section). Key informants from the RUNOs had positive perceptions on the work of the CSRG. According to them, it had provided important guidance to the programme and was perceived as a “soundboard” and an “active space”. This was not corroborated by key informants from the government, IPs and the CSRG members themselves. The interviewed key informants from the CSRG were not able to explain the role of the CSRG and what it actually does. None of them was able to provide meaningful insights on the work of the Spotlight Initiative. In their perception, the UN speaks a “different language”, the funding through UN agencies is complicated to access and they were not sufficiently associated with the work done by the IPs. Although CSRG members are not necessarily meant to be IPs, there is a perception among members who have not been selected as IPs struggle to understand what their role is. These non-IP CSRG members perceive it as unfair that their own work at community level is not supported.

It is likely that the three interviewed key informants from the CSRG are not representative of all its members. But it is still concerning that some of their members have no understanding of their role at the MTA of the programme. Key informants from the government and CSOs also observed that CSRG members had low levels of ownership for their work and were mostly acting under the directive of the facilitating UN agencies.

“The question of the civil society reference group - it's basically made up of members of civil society. It was supposed to comment on how they view the implementation of Spotlight activities in their locations. It's made up of members from within those sectors, disability, transgender, people living with HIV, rural women, male advocates... but up to today, it's driven by the UN. [...] How free is the group, how much control do they have? [...] This particular group is a ticking-the-box-activity because it's an activity that has to be set up in all implementing countries under Spotlight.” [Key informant interview, Government]

Management of the Programme

For programme coordination purposes, the following structures have been put in place:

- The Programme Management Unit (PMU) which includes the Spotlight Coordinator and Technical Specialist, a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist, a Communications Specialist and a Programme Associate. The four PMU members are co-located at the RCO and meet on a regular basis.
- Each RUNO that leads on one pillar has appointed a pillar lead staff. The pillar lead works closely with the PMU and is responsible for ensuring that all RUNOs deliver coherent and coordinated interventions under the respective pillar. Their task is also to ensure effective coordination with the other pillar leads to avoid siloes.
- To streamline actions and to ensure coherence across RUNOs, five Technical Working Groups (TWGs) have been set up. There is one for each Pillar, except for Pillar 1 and 2 which are joint in one working group and for Pillar 6. The latter does not have a TWG as it is implemented by UN Women only. The other RUNOs are board members for the CSO capacity hub which keeps them involved in the work under Pillar 6. The TWGs are led and facilitated by the RUNO Pillar lead. They do not have a set meeting frequency. There is a body of core participants from RUNOs and the PMU and further stakeholders are invited on an ad hoc basis if the meeting agenda requires it. The working group for Pillar 1 and 2 has met the most regularly and has become a platform for ensuring coherence across

all pillars. The TWGs for Pillar 3, 4 and 5 have met sporadically (e.g., for the preparation of specific outputs such as the campaign under Pillar 3). While Pillar 6 does not have a TWG, the RUNOs exchange on a regular basis on its interventions as they are all members of the Board for the CSO capacity building hub.

- At UN senior management level, the Heads of Agencies are regularly convened to provide high-level strategy direction to the PMU and six pillars. These meetings are chaired by UN Women as the technical lead agency.

The programme has not established a regular coordination mechanism for bringing together IPs and the government at the national level. Meetings have been organized on an ad hoc basis and associated government and CSO partners when needed. RUNOs also organize individual meetings with their IPs. The absence of an established regular coordination mechanisms with partners at national level is a gap of the PNG programme. At provincial level, the Spotlight Initiative has initiated provincial level strategies and mechanisms to enhance the coordination. GBV Action Committees (GBVAC) were established in Simbu, Jiwaka, Eastern Highlands, Southern Highlands, Western Highlands, Hela, Enga, and East Sepik.

Key findings

- The CSC has met on a bi-annual basis and fulfilled its purpose in approving key documents and providing high level guidance to the programme.
- The Spotlight Initiative has set up an inclusive CSRG and invested substantial efforts to support it for organizing its meetings and for preparing their work plan. The CSRG is represented in the CSC to represent civil society. While RUNO key informants perceived the CSRG to meet its objectives, the interviewed CSRG members struggled to understand the purpose of their work and demonstrated low levels of ownership for the programme.
- While effective internal coordination structures have been set up at UN level, there are no coordination mechanisms at the national level that bring IPs together on a regular basis to discuss progress and challenges. This is a critical gap that needs to be addressed to provide IPs and government partners with regular spaces for contributing to steering the action.

Recommendations

11. The coordination mechanisms of the programme need to be more inclusive of national partners. It is recommended to set up a national coordination structure such as the technical committees in other country programmes. This should build on the Government's efforts to coordinate stakeholders, for example, on the GBV council established by the Secretary of DfCDR. To foster government ownership at province level, it is also recommended to capacitate them to set up quarterly coordination meetings at province level (PMU, RUNOs).
12. To ensure that all CSRG members understand the content of the Spotlight Initiative and the purpose of the CSRG, we recommend conducting an anonymous online feedback survey with all members to explore their understanding of the Spotlight Initiative, the role of the CSRG and recommendations on how to improve and contribute to its role. This should allow identification of the actions required to strengthen the understanding and ownership of individual CSRG members. These actions should include a CSRG-led process on how to elect new members as replacement for those who have been inactive for longer periods.

<p>12. Are the chosen implementation and coordination mechanisms (a “new way of working”, in line with UN Reform) contributing to efficiency?</p>	<div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Good - Good </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Problems </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Serious deficiencies </div>
<p>PMU: RCO & UN Women</p> <p>The set-up of the PMU, the RUNO pillar leads, focal points and the Technical Team is described under the previous evaluation question. Online survey respondents and key informants agreed that the PMU effectively coordinated and facilitated the collaboration between the different stakeholders until the resignation of three key positions of the PMU between April and July 2021. Key informants appreciated, for example, that the PMU made an MS Teams drive available to all RUNO personnel working on the programme for document upload and sharing. It includes all programme documents, but also a shared event and travelling calendar. This tool has been an easy and effective way to manage knowledge and to streamline communication. The PMU also actively encouraged the use of the global COSI platform.</p> <p>After the departure of the three PMU members in Q2 2021, their positions were temporarily filled by consultants and existing team members until their replacements had been recruited. Some key informants perceived that the quality of coordination and stakeholder engagement significantly decreased since the change of staff at the PMU. The key informant from the EUD, for instance, deplored that he had not heard from the Spotlight Initiative for six months albeit his attempts to contact the PMU. According to him, there had been no engagement of the EUD since the departure of the Spotlight Coordinator. This information was not corroborated by the UN.</p> <p>UN Team: RUNOs</p> <p>Key informants and online survey respondents agreed that RUNOs collaborate well and intensely. Apart from regular meetings, their collaboration is also facilitated through a WhatsApp group which connects personnel working on the programme from all four RUNOs. The purpose of the group has been information sharing, reminders about deadlines and upcoming events as well as sharing of interesting media coverage related to GBV in PNG. It is also used to celebrate success and post encouragements to foster the team spirit. It was highlighted that the collaboration of RUNOs to deliver the Spotlight Initiative was work intensive and demanding. One online survey respondent wrote, for instance: <i>“Balancing effective coordination without overburdening RUNOs with meetings continues to be a challenge”</i>. This was corroborated by other RUNO key informants who also reported a high workload amidst a challenging operating environment. There is no doubt that the programme has been demanding on RUNO and PMU personnel. Their efforts, however, have succeeded in setting up and implementing mechanisms that demonstrate how integrated programming can lead to greater efficiency. One example is the joint expression of interest and calls for proposals which allowed RUNOs to set up a resource efficient mechanism with harmonized templates and processes. It made applications easier for CSOs which only had to submit one application instead of filling out different applications for the involved UN agencies. The RUNOs also facilitated joint trainings to interested CSO applicants which reduced the number of training sessions to be delivered. This was followed by a joint selection process based on harmonized selection criteria. The process also allowed efficiency gains for engagement with CSOs who had been selected by more than one UN agency. The IP Femili PNG, for example, was contracted jointly by two RUNOs which agreed to share operational costs. Meetings with Femili PNG have also been carried out jointly to ensure coherence and to explore potential synergies.</p> <p>The creation of the CSO Capacity Development Hub, supporting all Spotlight CSO partners across all four UN agencies is another example of how the PNG programme operationalized integrated programming.</p>	

While the initiative has experienced some delays and difficulties due to COVID-19 and institutional changes within the selected CSO partner (Oxfam), there is no doubt that the joint approach to CSO capacity strengthening is a promising practice with great potential to maximizing the efficiency of joint programmes.

The Spotlight Initiative in PNG also jointly engaged all four RUNOs for supporting the organization and roll out of the first National Summit on Ending Gender based Violence in November 2020. This included the development of a joint event budget, coordinated technical assistance as well as one-UN communication and visibility actions. This integrated approach of facilitating the event allowed the four RUNOs to effectively harness their networks and bring in their respective technical expertise for both greater effectiveness and efficiency.

Key findings

- The PMU was reported to deliver effectively on their mandate until the departure of its three of its four staff in the period from April to July 2021. Since their departure, key informants observed a decreased effectiveness of the PMU and the EUD has been insufficiently engaged.
- The Spotlight Initiative has been demanding on RUNO teams, but they managed to develop and implement integrated programme mechanisms which led to greater efficiency and more coherent stakeholder engagement (CSO and government).

Recommendations

13. As recommended under question 4, the PMU should strengthen its engagement with the EUD and should prepare regular updates for the delegation (PMU).

E. Sustainability

13. Is sufficient capacity being built so that local actors, such as government as well as CSOs, the women's movement and groups representing women and girls that face intersecting forms of discrimination, will be able to manage the process by the end of the Initiative without continued dependence on international expertise?

☒ **Very Good - Good**

☐ **Problems**

☐ **Serious deficiencies**

The programme does not yet have a sustainability plan or an exit strategy. A sustainability plan will be developed as part of Phase 2. In the online survey, the 16 respondents had mixed perceptions on whether sufficient expertise was being built by local actors to manage the process by the end of the programme without international expertise. For each stakeholder group (central government, local government, CSOs, local and grassroots organisations and women's organisations), there were some respondents who perceived that sufficient capacity was being built while there were others who felt the opposite. In the key informant interviews, interviewees from all stakeholder groups shared concerns regarding the sustainability of the programme. For some key informants from the central level government, the extensive focus on CSOs has been at the disadvantage of government entities. In their perception, the support from Spotlight was insufficient and will not allow the government to be sufficiently capacitated to continue the Spotlight Initiative after the withdrawal from the UN.

"Nothing has been initiated to sustain the programme after Spotlight leaves. In addition, Spotlight has done little work in terms of implementation with state agencies. Spotlight on the other hand is focusing more on the CSOs in its initiatives in the elimination of violence against women and girls. Spotlight programmes won't be sustained as the government agencies are not supported in the planning and implementation of the programme." [Key informant interview, Government]

In addition to that, substantial capacity gaps - as described under evaluation question 9 - were reported for both CSOs partners and the government entities, in particular at the provincial level.

While sustainability planning and the further capacity strengthening of CSOs need to be a strong focus in Phase 2, it is important to acknowledge that – in terms of sustainability - the programme has achieved highly promising results albeit its short implementation period. The following examples were highlighted by key informants:

- Services structures and capacity of service providers have been strengthened which will allow sustainable improvements of service provision to GBV survivors.
- At the national level, the establishment of the Special Parliamentary Committee on GBV in 2020 with the mandate to investigate GBV related issues was a promising milestone. In 2021, the Committee submitted a landmark report on GBV in PNG to the National Parliament which included over 70 recommendations for the government. It is understood that the Spotlight team are now working with the Chair on a motion to make the Committee permanent.
- The Government has committed funding from their own national budget for EVAWG.
- The government from Australia and New Zealand have joined the CSC to stay informed on EVAWG in PNG. They have also expressed interest in funding programmes against GBV in the country after the Spotlight Initiative through their own funding instruments. Similar interests were expressed by the EUD.
- At community level, key informants observed an increasing acceptance to speak about GBV and harmful traditional practices and to accept the harm they created. In some localities, survivors are

less afraid to speak out and seek help and there is more understanding for their situation. This observation has not yet been confirmed by a formal evaluation.

- Under Pillar 5, the adopted data management standards and SOPs and the online case management database to assist the police Family and Sexual Violence Unit in Port Moresby to monitor GBV cases will be available to the government beyond the duration of the programme.

Key findings

- No sustainability plan or exit strategy has been developed at the end of the first phase; it will be developed as part of Phase 2. Nevertheless, promising results, despite a short implementation period, were highlighted.
- While the PNG programme has made important contributions for strengthening the structures and capacity of local partners for reducing VAWG, the weak overall capacity of public structures and CSOs puts the sustainability of achievements at risk. Considering the country context, however, it cannot be expected from a GBV programme to initiate sustainable changes within a short timeframe.

Recommendations

14. During the development of the sustainability plan, it is recommended to ensure strong ownership of local actors (national CSOs and the government). The actions of the sustainability plan should be integrated in the programme work plan and need to be fully funded by the Spotlight Initiative or other confirmed funding sources (PMU).
15. To increase the sustainability of the programme, we recommend that the EUD invests in the Spotlight Initiative beyond the four years of lifespan of the programme.
16. Phase 2 should maintain investments in capacity strengthening for national and local CSOs to ensure that these organisations have the capacity to manage activities without international expertise (PMU, RUNOs).

F. KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. PROGRAMME DESIGN

Main findings

- The Spotlight PNG Country Programme design addresses national development priorities, supports relevant sectoral policies and plans, is based on local evidence and complementary to the existing national commitments and programmes implemented by government and CSOs for addressing VAWG.
- Participatory multi-stakeholder planning during the design phase included a wide range of government officials and CSOs. While the consultative process was much appreciated, some stakeholders noted that more time should have been allocated to the design phase.
- The programme is aligned with the principles of the Spotlight Initiative which are reflected in activities under the six programme pillars.
- The programme design process was evidence-based and participatory, including government officials, representatives of national and provincial GBV service providers, as well as national and local CSOs, representing various beneficiary groups such as youth, people with disabilities and survivors of GBV. Concerns raised during these consultations have informed programme interventions.
- Institutional beneficiaries consulted as part of the MTA welcome the interventions supported by the Spotlight Initiative. Support provided to GBV survivors along the referral pathway is particularly appreciated and addresses the needs of ultimate beneficiaries.
- Formal and informal feedback mechanisms exist and foster openness and dialogue. Feedback from CSO and government implementing partners is fed back to the CSC through representation by the CSRG and government departments.
- While the RUNOs consider the Theory of Change useful as a comprehensive framework to address VAWG, key informants from the government and IPs find that it does not sufficiently reflect the social and cultural context of PNG.
- Data gaps identified in the baseline do not seem to be addressed by the results framework for PNG.
- Most interviewed informants find that the results framework and its indicators do not accurately reflect actual progress made in terms of behaviour change and impact.

Recommendations

1. During the design of Phase 2, the Programme Coordinator and M&E Specialist of the PMU should organise a workshop with RUNOs, IPs, CSRG members and government representatives involved in the monitoring of Spotlight funded interventions. With the support from M&E officers and GBV specialists, they should review the ToC, ensure that it is thoroughly contextualized and generate a common understanding of the ToC and its link to the indicators and targets of the global performance monitoring framework. One of the outcomes of such a workshop could be a subsidiary national M&E framework with indicators that are considered by IPs as relevant to their activities and context while maintaining the link to the global framework. The revised framework should also aim to address the data gaps as identified by

the baseline as well as reflect upon how qualitative data on behaviour change can be better captured.

2. GOVERNANCE:

Main findings

- Government partners are committed to the programme and to ending VAWG. These commitments are observed in the Special Parliamentary Committee on GBV as well as the commitment to allocate national funding to the GBV Secretariats. Some interviewed informants, however, believe that more attention should be paid to delivering interventions at provincial level.
- Civil society organisations demonstrate commitment to the Spotlight Initiative but face geographic and cultural challenges. Lack of resources, trust and support from local decision makers were cited as important barriers for the delivery of their work.
- The four RUNOs are also highly committed and contribute human resources and coordination and technical expertise. Changes and gaps in personnel at the RUNOs and PMURCO has however affected continued progress in programme delivery as well as communication with the EUD.
- High-level commitment from the EUD was observed and appreciated. However, lack of communication between the programme secretariat and the EUD in the last six months have limited further contributions from the EUD.
- The CSC has met on a bi-annual basis and fulfilled its purpose in approving key documents and providing high level guidance to the programme.
- The Spotlight Initiative has set up an inclusive CSRG and invested substantial efforts to support it for organizing its meetings and for preparing their work plan. The CSRG is represented in the CSC to represent civil society. While RUNO key informants perceived the CSRG to meet its objectives, the interviewed CSRG members struggled to understand the purpose of their work and demonstrated low levels of ownership for the programme.
- While effective internal coordination structures have been set up at UN level, there are no coordination mechanisms at the national level that bring IPs together on a regular basis to discuss progress and challenges. This is a critical gap that needs to be addressed to provide IPs and government partners with regular spaces for contributing to steering the action.

Recommendations

2. The PMU should renew its engagement with the EUD and should continue and improve preparation of regular updates for the delegation, for example by including a clear schedule to determine when these updates are due so that all RUNOs are prepared and can provide quality and relevant inputs. Also, face-to-face updates at the technical level could be considered to revamp engagement (PMU). The coordination mechanisms of the programme need to be more inclusive of national partners. It is recommended to set up a national coordination structure such as the technical committees in other country programmes. To foster government ownership at province level, it is also recommended to capacitate them to set up quarterly coordination meetings at province level (PMU, RUNOs).

3. To ensure that all CSRG members understand the content of the Spotlight Initiative and the purpose of the CSRG, we recommend conducting an anonymous online feedback survey with all members to explore their understanding of the Spotlight Initiative, the role of the CSRG and recommendations on how to improve and contribute to its role. This should allow identification of the actions required to strengthen the understanding and ownership of individual CSRG members. These actions should include a CSRG-led process on how to elect new members as replacement for those who have been inactive for longer periods.

3. PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

Main findings

- The capacities and strategic priorities of UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNICEF are well aligned with the six pillars of the Spotlight Initiatives.
- The assignment of responsibilities activities, outputs, outcomes and pillars to specific RUNOs is coherent and grounded in their institutional capacity, experience and expertise.
- The Spotlight Initiative has harnessed existing UN mechanisms to operationalise the UNDS reform and put in place structures and processes to deliver the programme in an integrated fashion. Coordination structures have been put in place through the PMU and the technical coherence oversight. Key actions are planned and implemented jointly, and the programme's visibility has been promoted through joint communication using the Spotlight brand..
- According to the Q3 2021 financial data, the programme has achieved a budget delivery (expenditure and commitments) of 56% for all RUNOs combined. According to key informants from the RCO, however, the budget execution had significantly increased and reached their budget execution target by end of the year.
- There are different perceptions regarding the technical and human capacity of the involved government entities which ranged from adequate to insufficient. There was consensus, however, that the government lacked financial resources to fully participate in and sustain the Spotlight Initiative. This applies in particular to government agencies at the sub-national level.
- CSO partners have demonstrated lower technical and operational capacity than required by the programme. To tackle this challenge, Oxfam and Care International have been contracted to provide technical and institutional support to IPs through the approach of a capacity strengthening hub.
- RUNOs have also provided extensive support for proposal development, liquidations and reporting to CSOs, but do not have the required human resources to respond to the various needs of their IPs. RUNOs reported human resources gaps in the fields of finance, procurement and GBV.
- The PNG programme has not met the requirement of allocating 50% of the programme budget to CSOs, but it has made substantial efforts to implement the Spotlight Initiative's Grassroot Action Plan in a very challenging context. By the end of 2020, RUNOs had recruited 31 CSOs as IPs. Most of them are new UN partners and classified as grassroots organisations.
- The management costs for the Spotlight Initiative are at 17% in PNG which is below the threshold of 18% set for country programmes. The number of staff fully and partially funded

by the programme is 22 which seems rather low for a programme of this size. UN Women has not budgeted for administrative and finance support to the programme execution.

- The PMU was reported to deliver effectively on their mandate until the departure of its three of its four staff in the period from April to July 2021. Since their departure, key informants observed a decreased effectiveness of the PMU and the EUD has been insufficiently engaged.
- The Spotlight Initiative has been demanding on RUNO teams, but they managed to develop and implement integrated programme mechanisms which led to greater efficiency and more coherent stakeholder engagement (CSO and government).

Recommendations

4. Conduct action research to explore to what extent the CSO capacity building hub covers and sufficiently addresses gaps in technical, financial and institutional capacity of IPs. The findings should guide decisions on how to strengthen the work of the hub and on how to re-adjust the approach – if necessary – during Phase 2 (PMU, RUNOs).
5. As technical expertise for RUNOs can also be budgeted under outcomes of Phase 2, we suggest implementing a workforce planning exercise in the design process of Phase 2. This will allow for identification of critical gaps and to plan for adequate RUNO staffing for the next phase of the Spotlight Initiative (PMU, RCO, RUNOs).
6. To address capacity gaps of government partners at sub-national level, we suggest to integrate key measures and actions in the programme's sustainability plan to address bottlenecks in public services in the prevention of VAWG and in the assistance of GBV survivors. These measures and actions should be identified in a participatory manner and enable government stakeholder to take ownership for EVAWG.
7. Prior to the start of Phase 2, we suggest conducting a mapping of CSO partnerships across agencies to shed light on IP workloads (i.e. those working with multiple RUNOs) and allow for modifications as needed. For Phase 2, we suggest to implementing a workforce planning exercise for RUNOs. This will allow identification of critical gaps and to plan for adequate cost recovery of operational support to the Spotlight Initiative.
8. As recommended under governance as well, the PMU should strengthen its engagement with the EUD and should prepare regular updates for the delegation (PMU).

4. PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS:

Main findings:

- The PNG Spotlight Programme Document includes a comprehensive risk assessment with appropriate mitigation measures. While the effects of COVID-19 were not included in the initial risk assessment, appropriate measures were taken shortly after the programme launch and a revised annual workplan was approved by the CSC in June 2020.
- Most interviewed stakeholders and respondents to the online survey noted that the State of Emergency (SOE) orders and associated regulations of COVID-19 containment have affected programme implementation, however, the revised workplan has been able to help reprioritize and adapt interventions accordingly.

- Despite early adjustments to the context of COVID-19 control measures, implementation delays occurred because of priority shifts among key government partners and travel restrictions.
- The MTA had insufficient quality assured M&E data to quantitatively assess the programme's progress towards achievement of targets at this time. Partial data shared by the country team, however, indicates that progress of outputs towards the set targets has picked up in the second half of 2021.
- It was not possible to assess the quality of the outputs, but interviewed informants were satisfied with the quality of outputs in almost all cases.
- The delivery of the workplan was reported to be by and large on track.
- The programme has achieved important progress and achievements under all pillars.
- Challenges and learning have been documented and reflected on in the annual reports. The CSO capacity hub is a potentially promising approach but has been delayed and it is not possible to assess at this stage to what extent it will achieve effective, efficient and sustainable results.
- No sustainability plan or exit strategy has been developed at the end of the first phase; it will be developed as part of Phase 2. Nevertheless, promising results, despite a short implementation period, were highlighted.
- While the PNG programme has made important contributions for strengthening the structures and capacity of local partners for reducing VAWG, the weak overall capacity of public structures and CSOs puts the sustainability of achievements at risk. Considering the country context, however, it cannot be expected from a GBV programme to initiate sustainable changes within a short timeframe.

Recommendations:

9. During the no-cost extension of Phase 1, the Spotlight Initiative partners should analyse obstacles to timely implementation due to overstretched staff capacity in government ministries and departments, including but not limited to the COVID-19 response, and develop a plan to address this in a possible Phase 2 of the programme.
10. The Country Team should start a discussion among RUNO programme staff towards the development of a deeper analysis of reported outputs that can provide additional evidence for quality, for instance by measuring and reporting achievements in knowledge or changes in attitudes about VAWG among people exposed to programme activities (see also recommendation 4).
11. Recommendations to tackle specific challenges are available in Table 4 under Question 8 (in the right column).
12. During the development of the sustainability plan, it is recommended to ensure strong ownership of local actors (national CSOs and the government). The actions of the sustainability plan should be integrated in the programme work plan and need to be fully funded by the Spotlight Initiative or other confirmed funding sources (PMU).
13. To increase the sustainability of the programme, we recommend that the EUD invests in the Spotlight Initiative beyond the four years of lifespan of the programme.

14. Phase 2 should maintain investments in capacity strengthening for national and local CSOs to ensure that these organisations have the capacity to manage activities without international expertise (PMU, RUNOs).

G. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Spotlight programme documents (essential documents)	Availability
Country Programming document as approved by OSC	Y
Country Budget as approved by the OSC (may also include revised budget)	Y
Spotlight Country Programme Snapshot	Y
Inception report	NA
Annual report (January 2020 – December 2020)	Y
Annex A Country Report (included in the Annual Report)	Y
Ad hoc (2 nd Tranche) report (may also include provisional narrative report – 2 pager)	Y
Spotlight Initiative financial information on the MPTF Gateway	Y
Knowledge management workplan	Y
National CSO Reference Group workplan	Y
CSO Reference Group Bios	Y
Communication workplan	Y
Stories directly from the Calendar	Y
Other documents	
PNG Demographic Health Survey 2016-18	
UNDP Human Development Report 2020	
Papua New Guinea National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence (2016-2025)	
Country programme document for Papua New Guinea (2018 – 2022) Executive Board of the United National Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services (2017)	
Spotlight CSO Capacity Hub Advisory Board TOR	
CSC meeting minutes for June 2020, April 2021, August 2021	
SC Presentation January 2022	
Spotlight PNG Steering Committee TORs	
Technical Working Group meeting minutes Pillar 1 & 2	

ANNEX 2: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

	Stakeholder group	Institution / organisation
1	EU Delegation	Programme Manager
2	RCO	Resident Coordinator
3	RUNO	UN Women Country Representative
4	RUNO	UN Women Head of Programme
5	RUNO	UN Women Spotlight Programme Manager
6	RUNO	UNFPA Programme Manager
7	RUNO	UNICEF Chief of Child Protection Programme
8	RUNO	UNICEF IP Representative
9	Government IP	National Youth Development Authority
10	Government IP	Provincial Secretariat GBV Coordinator
11	Government IP	Department of Education Guidance Officer
12	Government IP	Department of Justice and Attorney General
13	CSO IP	Evangelical Lutheran Church
14	CSO IP	Femili PNG
15	CSO IP	Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee
16	CSO IP	Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee
17	CSO IP	Oxfam Programme Manager
18	CSO IP	Oxfam Gender Justice Coordinator
19	CSRG	CSRG Member New Guinea Island
20	CSRG	CSRG Member Momase Region
21	CSRG	CSRG Member National Capital District
22	CSRG	FGD: 5 Members of the Highlands Region CSRG

ANNEX 3: ACHIEVEMENT OF INDICATOR MILESTONES IN 2020

