Independent Evaluation
UN Development Assistance Framework (2012 – 2017)
UN Country Team in Papua New Guinea

June 2016

Consultant Team
Ann Lund
Betty Lovai

Acknowledgements

List of acronyms

AFPs	Agencies, Funds and Programmes
ARB	Autonomous Region of Bougainville
DaO	Delivering as One
DNPM	Department of National Planning and Monitoring
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
EMG	Evaluation Management Group
GoPNG	Government of PNG
LDC	Least Developed Country
LLGs	Local Level Governments
LMIC	Lower Middle Income Country
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MPTF	Multi Partner Trust Fund
MTDP	Medium Term Development Plan
MTDP	Medium-Term Development Plan
NHDR	National Human Development Report
PCC	Program Coordinating Committee
PLWHIV	People Living With HIV
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PNGDSP	Papua New Guinea Development Strategic Plan
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
RBM	Result-Based Management
RCO	Resident Coordinator's Office
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIB	Special Interventions Branch
UNCP	United Nations Country Programme
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNEDAP	United Nations Evaluation Development Group for Asia and the Pacific
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNOCHA	United Nations Organization Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance
UPR	Universal Periodic Review

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012-2017 is a partnership agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG). The agreement has supported aid harmonisation, alignment and coordination and is supported by a combination of core, non-core and the PNG UN Country Fund resources. The total PNG UN Country Fund resource base is close to USD 73,000,000 since 2009, of which USD 59,500,000 or 82 percent has been contributed between 2012 and 31 May, 2016. 90 percent of UNDAF inter-agency outcome indicators are completed (20 percent) or on track (70 percent) with a 79 percent average expenditure rate from 2012-2105. The UNDAF 2012-2015, extended to 2017 to align with the GoPNG's new Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP) II 2016-2017, was drafted at a time of significant political instability and sought to respond to the challenges of service delivery realised in implementation of the 1995 Organic Law on Provincial Governments and Local Level Governments and Decentralisation. The MTDP's purpose is to implement the PNG Development Strategic Plan (PNGDSP) 2010-2030, and to achieve the goals of the PNG Vision 2050, a forward looking post 2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) focused development agenda. PNG is moving from Lower Middle Income Country (LMIC) to Middle Income Country (MIC) status and there is considered to be an ongoing level of fragility (see para 12) that requires understanding, having impacted on the nation's development of its government systems and institutions, and its ability to meet its obligations under the ratified/acceded to international human rights instruments.

This evaluation concentrates on the outcome level of the UNDAF Results Framework with a focus on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. It is utilisation focused and takes into account the changing development context of PNG, the end of the MDGs, where PNG's achievement against targets are minimal, and the Post 2015 Development Agenda.

The analysis and consultations of the evaluation conclude that the UNDAF is, overall, a flexible framework, which respond to issues arising through the annual monitoring process. Many of the key most current government strategies and policies have however been developed since the UNDAF's formulation, including the MTDP II, National Strategy for Responsible Sustainable Development, PNG Development Cooperation Policy and Planning & Monitoring Responsibility Act. Therefore, the volume of new and competing policy continues to grow presenting challenges for alignment and prioritisation. The UN's focus in PNG is considered relevant to its comparative advantage, however in the context of planning limited or no available data reduces the ability of the UN and its partners to draw on an evidence base to identify need, to target programmes based on demand and to determine impact. Never the less there is a call for the UN to re-evaluate its focus on implementation to consider, in the coming 2018 – 2022 UNDAF cycle, how to maximise its comparative advantage. Conclusions of the evaluation suggest this is done through an emphasis on strengthening national capacities; neutral convening of partners, brokering partnerships; providing high quality technical expertise; supporting objective monitoring and evaluation; providing impartial policy advice and neutral space for the resolution of political issues; as well as advising and holding national actors to account in relation to international norms and standards and obligations derived from treaties and human rights instruments to which PNG is a party.

In relation to the gender dynamics observed in PNG the UNDAF is considered to be relevant and aligned with national strategies. There is room however to more comprehensively strengthen capacity and mainstream human rights in the UNDAF, as well as integrate gender perspectives to addresses systemic inequalities in human rights monitoring and advocacy. The UN's support for Disaster Risk Management was considered relevant however challenged by reduced in-country specialist resources as a result of UNOCHA's leaving PNG in 2015. UNCHR's withdrawal creating capacity gaps for

---

the protection cluster. Alignment in areas such as Child Protection, Youth and Education have reaped rewards. There is an identified opportunity to expand in areas such as Agriculture, a key sector in PNG, to more effectively respond to the National Agriculture Development Plan. The UN's commitment to the Bougainville peace process was highlighted as significant, as was the ongoing development focus on Bougainville now that both the GoPNG and Autonomous Region of Bougainville (ARB) has a set target date for a referendum on their political future in 2019.

The four UNDAF clusters and 10 inter-agency outcomes are seen to represent the breadth of the UN's programmatic priorities reflecting and contributing to national priorities. Concerns were raised however, as to the coordination, monitoring and reporting burden the ten task team structure represents. The new UNDAF planning cycle presents an opportunity to consolidate the number of outcome areas to increase integrated programming opportunities, streamline coordination structures as well as reduce and rationalise the volume of monitoring and reporting. The ability to monitor results against the UNDAF Results Framework is currently challenged by incomplete baselines, targets and indicators and in some cases a lack of access to verifiable data sets for monitoring. This, and the need to meet MPTF PNG UN Country Fund financial reporting obligations, has resulted in annual monitoring and reporting practices that reflect a combination of both qualitative and quantitative reporting against UNDAF indicators and financial expenditures. Resolution of discrepancies between the two monitoring processes, and addressing the inherent weaknesses in the UNDAF Results Framework were considered a priority.

The Resident Coordinator's proactive leadership approach in application of the principles of Delivering as One is recognised in PNG as playing a vital role and making a positive contribution to building trust and respect for the UN system, and forging enduring partnerships with both Government and development partners. Whilst the UNDAF's coordination and management structures were considered to be well arranged with most task teams demonstrating strong collaboration, there was also considered room to further invigorate both the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) and the Programme Coordinating Committee (PCC) to strengthen management and accountability for UNDAF results. This would build on the change management process already undertaken by the PCC in 2015 to harmonise task team approaches and further integrate strategic coordination as the foundation of the PCC. The PCC is seen as a primary working mechanism for increasing opportunities for joint planning, monitoring and enhanced programme integration. The PSC, co-chaired by the Secretary for the Department of National Planning and Monitoring (DNPM) and the UN Resident Coordinator, is a high level forum for overseeing UNDAF progress and increasing UN and Government dialogue regarding solutions to programme implementation and accountability for results.

Stakeholders called for strengthened internal communication within the UN and between the central and country level, and for the UN to reinstate Quarterly Review Meetings on programme implementation to improve communication with partners. In the same context stakeholders highlighted the importance of the UN strengthening its 'voice' in areas specific to its comparative advantage and the SDG agenda.

Priorities for sustainability in UNDAF implementation were seen to require a matrix approach to support national priorities focused on strengthening systems; developing capacity; building and strengthening institutions; and promoting and recognising the ownership of Government in the development agenda. In this context the UN's commitment to investing in capacity development in the new UNDAF cycle was considered particularly urgent. Continued focus on Human Rights Based Approaches to Programming were reinforced and included ongoing and increased support for the PNG

Human Rights Forum[1], upholding of recommendations emanating from international human rights mechanisms, and commitments to mainstreaming Human Rights, Gender Equality and Environmental Sustainability.

Recognising the nationally led process of localising the SDGs as a means to understand and then reflect the cultural, economic and geographic diversity of PNG in programming allied to a continued understanding of the decentralised nature of PNG's governance and development is considered a central signpost for the new UNDAF planning cycle and ensuring the sustainability of development results.

Lessons learned through the evaluation include the linkage between sustainability of development results and national strategies, plans, policies and development frameworks; partnerships being most successful and enduring when the UN draws on its comparative advantage; coordination enhanced when responsibilities are clearly articulated and delegated; and a strong UNDAF Results Frameworks being central to the ability to monitor and measure the UN's contribution to national development results.

The evaluation concludes with a series of recommendations across the themes of: Planning vision; The need for quality data; Comparative Advantage; Governance and Delivering as One; Strengthened monitoring and reporting; Partnerships; and Capacity Development. The recommendations reflect the findings of the evaluation and provide an opportunity for strengthening of the UNDAF framework in the next cycle and enhancement of the UN's positioning and partnerships in PNG. Additionally, the recommendations highlight existing opportunities to improve the efficiencies and effectiveness of the UN's internal management and coordination structures, reporting and monitoring obligations and ability to deliver interventions with a positive impact under the national and international development goals.

1. Introduction

1.1 UN Development Assistance Framework

1. The UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012-2017 is a partnership agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Papua New Guinea aimed to assist the Government of PNG (GoPNG) achieve its development vision. This agreement has supported aid harmonization, alignment and coordination. UNDAF design reflects the value of the UN's expertise and also creates a platform for integrated cooperation and collaboration between the partnering UN Agencies and GoPNG. The agreement has supported aid harmonisation, alignment and coordination and is supported by a combination of core, non-core and the PNG UN Country Fund resources. The total PNG UN Country Fund resource base is close to USD 73,000,000 since 2009, of which USD 59,500,000 or 82 percent[2] has been contributed between 2012 and May 31, 2016. 90 percent of UNDAF inter-agency outcomes indicators are completed (20 percent) or on track (70 percent) with a 79 percent average expenditure rate from 2012 to 2015. The UNDAF sought to establish an ambitious programme aligned with the national priorities of the Government's Medium-Term Development Plan (MTDP 2011-2015). Under the overarching theme of "Supporting PNG to accelerate MDG achievement" the current UNDAF has focused on four key outcome areas: i) Governance for Equitable Development; ii) Social Justice, Protection and Gender Equality; iii) Access to Basic Services; and iv) Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management.

---

[1]Operative since 2011

[2] Source: http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/PG100

2. The UNDAF 2012-2015, extended to 2017 to align with the new MTDP II 2016-2017 at the request of the GoPNG, was drafted at a time of significant political instability with attributes similar to that of a fragile state including low levels of service delivery to a dispersed population, with only seven percent of the population able to access the electric grid and reticulated water. The Asian Development Bank Report 2012 highlighted development constraints at that time of the UNDAF's development, including public dissatisfaction with widespread social problems, leadership issues, a lack of good governance, poor service delivery, non-existent public information at the provincial, district and local levels; and the challenges of service delivery under the 1995 Organic Law on Provincial Governments and Local Level Governments and Decentralisation. It was within this environment of instability and with limited analysis of the political environment that the UNDAF was established.

3. The key strategies that underpin the UNDAF are capacity development, the promotion and protection of human rights and the application of human rights-based approaches to programming, the promotion of low carbon growth and climate change resilient development, the decentralisation and strengthening of civil society, the promotion of evidence-based monitoring systems, the mainstreaming of gender equality and opportunities for women and fighting HIV and AIDS and other communicable diseases. The UNDAF Action Plan is the instrument through which the UN planned to establish partnerships with relevant development partners, as well as mobilise financial resources to ensure sustainable programme delivery. At the time of finalizing the UNDAF the programmatic interventions were calculated as having a total value of approximately US$180 million[3], of which US$45 million (25 percent) was needed as additional funding raised through joint mobilisation efforts.

4. 'Delivering as One' (DaO), adopted in PNG in 2006 as a 'self-starter' country in the UN reform agenda, aimed to bring together UN agencies to enhance efficiency, effectiveness and coherence to collectively contribute to assisting the GoPNG achieve its development aspirations. Five pillars were determined under which all UN Agencies operate. The UNDAF represents one of the five PNG DAO pillars:

1. One Programme, UNDAF 2012-2017
2. UN Budgetary Framework, including PNG UN Country Fund
3. Joint Communication and Advocacy, UN Communications Group
4. Joint UN Operations, UN Operations Management Team
5. UN House (not yet existing)

Even with joint UN operations aspirations still to be fully realised PNG is considered amongst the most successful DaO countries globally and scores highly in the United Nations Development Group tracking system for implementing the DaO standard operating procedures.

5. There are 15 resident and non-resident [4] UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes operating in PNG with a total of 245 staff, namely: UNICEF; UNDP; UNFPA; WHO; UN Women; FAO; UNAIDS; UNESCO; UNCDF; OHCHR, IOM; IFAD; UN Habitat: UNHCR; and ILO. The UN has its operations based in the capital, Port Moresby, and has a field office in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville (ARB). The national stakeholders working in partnership with the UN Agencies are many[5] with the primary counterpart being the Department of National Planning and Monitoring (DNPM).

---

[3] UNDAF 2012 - 2015

[4] IFAD, UNHCR, UNESCO, UNHCR are non-resident agencies

[5] See detailed annex listing all relevant partners/stakeholders

1.2 The Development Context – UN alignment

6. PNG is a lower middle-income country and as of 2011 became the 7th fastest growing economy in the world due to strong growth in the mining, extractives and resource sector. It has a population of 7.2 million[6] spread across 461,690 square kilometres. Seventy two percent of PNG's land mass is uninhabited with only 30 percent arable land. PNG remains one of the world's most ethnically diverse countries with over 850 indigenous languages, constituting 15 percent of the world's languages. Despite being among the fastest growing economies 85 percent of the population still lives in traditional societies in rural areas with 40 percent under the age of 15. Ninety-seven percent of PNG's land is under customary ownership with most people meeting their basic needs through subsistence agriculture. Approximately three percent of the land is state-owned limiting the Government's capacity for development, however mineral deposits deeper than six feet are considered state property[7] and as a result land rights remain an issue of controversy. The need for the people of PNG to fully benefit from the renewable and non-renewable resources within the country, both on the land as well as beneath it has been highlighted as a human development priority[8].

7. PNG achieved independence from Australia in 1975 and adopted the decentralisation system at that time. The reform measures to the decentralisation system since 1975 involved the introduction of the organic Law on the Provincial Governments and the Local Level Governments on 19 July 1995. This reform aimed to improve delivery of services, particularly in rural areas, in an effort to increase participation in government at the community and local levels; decentralise powers and responsibilities to local levels; increase funding to local level governments; relocate public servants from urban areas to districts and stations nearer to the majority of people in rural areas; reduce the number of elected politicians; and reduce mismanagement or misuse of funds. The Constitutional and Law Reform Commission's study on service delivery in six provinces in 2009 highlighted that the entire system of governance was weak. The break down in the delivery of government services at the provincial and local level government levels has been attributed to a lack of coordination, monitoring and supervision of the operations at the provincial and local level governments; the political, legal, and administration structure and mechanism for delivering services to the rural population not being responsive to the needs of the rural population; a lack of capacity and a lack of decisive political leadership at the provincial, district, and local levels; weaknesses at various levels of structure and process; and challenges of decentralisation linked to capacity issues and inconsistent resource flows.

8. Since independence eight national elections have been conducted with the latest taking place in July 2012. A 2001 peace agreement ended the civil war on Bougainville Island and the ARB was subsequently established giving greater autonomy. The first ARB elections were held in 2005. Peace building, recovery and development have become a national priority with the UN identified as a key trusted partner in that process.

9. From 2009 the Government launched a series of strategic plans to create an enabling environment to guide present and future development opportunities, address internal and external threats, socio economic challenges, and to accommodate alignment and integration of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These plans include the PNG Vision 2050; PNG Development Strategic Plan (PNGDSP) 2010 – 2030; Medium Term Development Plans (MTDP) 2001-2010, 2011-2015, and 2016-2017 and the National Strategy for Responsible and Sustainable Development (2014). The purpose of the MTDP

---

[6] 7,275,324 million people – 2011 population census

[7] Summary Report MDGs 2015 pg 7

[8] 2014 National Human Development Report
http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2014_png_national_human_development_report.pdf

is to implement the PNGDSP 2010-2030 to achieve the goal of the PNG Vision 2050. This calls for the government, through public service machinery, donors, development partners, CSOs and faith based organizations, to review and align their strategies and work plans reflecting development strategies and targets in the PNGDSP 2010-2030. The UN in PNG has mapped out the extent of alignment between the UNDAF clusters and outcomes (inter-agency outcome areas) and the GoPNG strategies and policies as outlined below.

UNDAF clusters	Inter-agency outcome areas; task team	Alignment – GoPNG strategies	Task team composition
1: Governance for Equitable Development	1. Governance - Parliament and local governance - Financial inclusion, management and transparency	PNG Vision 2050; PNG DSP 2010-2030; National Financial Inclusion Policy 2014-2015	UNDP, UNCDF, UNICEF, ILO
	2. MDGs and Population and Aid Coordination - Aid effectiveness - MDG advocacy and monitoring - Population and development - Evidence based and participatory policy making, planning & budgeting	MTDP 2011-2015, 5.10; 5.13	UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA
	3. Peacebuilding and rule of law- Bougainville	MTDP 2011-2015, 2016-2017; PNG Vision 2050; PNG DSP 2010-2030	UNDP, UNCDF, UNAIDS, OHCHR, UNFPA, UNHCR[9], UNICEF, UN Women, WHO, IOM
2: Social Justice; Protection and Gender Equality	4. Promotion and Protection of Human Rights - Increased compliance with human rights obligations	MTDP 2011-2015, 3.2, 5.5	OHCHR, UNICEF, IOM, UN Women, WHO, UNAIDS, ILO, UN Habitat, IOM, UNDP
	5. Gender equality and Women's Empowerment - Women in Leadership - Gender Based Violence - Women's Economic Empowerment	Directive Principles of the National Construction, National Goals 1 and 2	UN Women, OHCHR, UNFPA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WHO, IOM, FAO, UNAIDS
	6. Child Protection - Children at risk of violence, exploitation & abuse access protection	PNG Vision 2050 Pillar 6 & MTDP 3.2, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.5	UNICEF, ILO, IOM
	7. HIV & AIDS (JUNTA) - Strengthening national capacity to deliver on the goals of the National HIV/AIDS strategy	PNG National HIV & AIDS Strategy 2011-2015	UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, UN Women, WHO
3: Access to Basic Services	8. Health - Maternal and Child Health - Health Systems strengthening - Communicable diseases (including water and sanitation)	National Health Plan, 2011-2020, KRA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8	WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, IOM
	9. Education	Universal Basic Education Plan 2010 - 2019	UNICEF, UNESCO
4: Environment and Disaster Risk Management	10. Environment, climate change and sustainable livelihoods Disaster risk reduction, preparedness and response	PNG's Fourth Directive Principle National Constitution MTDP 2011-2015, 3.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.7, 5.8 & 5.14	UNDP, IOM, FAO, UNEP, UN Habitat, UNICEF

Table 1: Alignment of UNDAF with national development strategies and policies.

---

[9] not present in the country since 2013

10. The UN in PNG has played a lead role in supporting the GoPNG in adopting and implementing the MDGs since commencement of the localisation process in 2004. PNG remains one of a small number of countries globally that have not been able to report attainment of any of their MDG targets due to data constraints. MDG reporting cited weak implementation frameworks and targets not monitored or evaluated periodically as the main causes [10]. The country has however, in 2015, reported mixed progress, with achievements reported in halting and reversing HIV and malaria as well as increased enrolments in primary and secondary education[11]. Strategic approaches to the MDGs were not formulated prior to the development of the national strategic instruments outlined above and this is considered to have impacted on the country's ability to attain MDG targets within the global timeframe. In addition, accurate reportage is hampered by a lack of verifiable data. MDG Progress Reporting in 2015 indicates that PNG has made progress considering its late commencement of the MDG process, and has localised the MDG targets and indicators, which are included in the MTDPs. PNG began its localisation process in 2004 by translating the MDG agenda into 15 tailored targets and 67 indicators. In 2010, this was revised further to 22 targets and 90 indicators[12].

MDG	Target	Status
1 ERADICATE EXTREME POVERTY AND HUNGER	Target 1A. Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day	Off track
	Target 1.B Increase population engaged in money making employment as a proportion of the employed	Off track
	Target 1 C. Halve, between 1990 and 2015 the proportion of people who suffer from hunger	Off track
2 ACHIEVE UNIVERSAL PRIMARY EDUCATION	Target 2A. Ensure that by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.	Off track
3 PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY AND EMPOWER WOMEN	Target 3.A. Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2015, and in all levels of education no later than 2015.	Off track
4 REDUCE CHILD MORTALITY	Target 4.A. Reduce by two thirds between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate	Off track
5 IMPROVE MATERNAL HEALTH	Target 5.A. Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio	Off track
	Target 5.B. Achieve by 2015 universal access to reproductive health	Off track
6 COMBAT HIV/AIDS, MALARIA AND OTHER DISEASES	Target 6.A. Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS	Off track
	Targets CI. Have halted and begun to reverse the incidence of Malaria	Off track
	Target CII. Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of tuberculosis.	Off track
	Target CIII Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of other major diseases (lifestyle diseases)	Off track
7 ENSURE ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY	Target 7A. Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.	Off track
	Target 7.C. Halve, by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.	Off track
	Target 7.D. by 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million informal settlement dwellers.	Off track
8 A GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR DEVELOPMENT	Target 8.A. Address the special needs of the least developed countries.	Off track
	Target 8B. Address the special needs of the least developed countries.	Off track
	Target 8.F. In cooperation with the private sector in PNG, make available the benefits of new technology especially in information and communication.	Off track

Table 2: Millennium Development Goals 2015[13]

[10] The Future We Want, Post 2015 Development Agenda Country Consultations, pg 19.

[11] PNG MDGs Final Summary Report 2015, Department of National Planning and Monitoring

[12] The Future We Want, Post 2015 Development Agenda Country Consultations pg 19.

[13] PNG MDGs Final Summary Report 2015, Department of National Planning and Monitoring

11. PNG has 22 provinces, 89 districts, 313 local level governments and 6,131 wards each with differences and situational variations in terms of development status, resources, capacity and development challenges. The decentralisation concept was developed to devolve power to the local levels and enable greater participation and ownership in the political process. However decentralisation has presented its own challenges including the challenge of needing to reduce inequality at the national level given the differences between, and situational variations across, the provinces. The 2014 PNG National Human Development Report notes that whilst central government policy making and fiscal control remains strong, implementation and service delivery is limited by weak capacity amongst line government agencies and the subnational service providers, which leads to inefficiencies in the public service and facilitates corruption.

12. The GoPNG has acceded/ratified six of the international human rights core treaties however its commitment to treaty reporting remains very low with overdue reports for all the treaties. In 2011 the GoPNG issued a standing invitation to the UN Special Procedures, independent human rights experts with mandates to report and advise on human rights from a thematic or country-specific perspective. In 2010 there was a visit from the Special Rapporteur on Torture. This was followed by visits from two other UN Special Rapporteurs at the invitation of the GoPNG in 2012 and 2014 to monitor and report on relevant human rights thematic issues. Some of these recommendations were endorsed by the GoPNG. In 2011 the GoPNG also started its first Universal Periodic Review (UPR) cycle. Out of 146 recommendations received the GoPNG supported 115. Important legal and policy developments were adopted in compliance with those recommendations. Despite these positive developments there is currently a disconnect between the adoption and the implementation of recommendations and obligations under human rights treaties and other mechanisms; a lack of government coordination of the human rights mechanisms in PNG; and a lack of consistent reporting. The UPR process continues to present recommendations, which complement treaty obligations to which the GoPNG is a party as well as recommendations of UN Special Procedures. The most recent UPR in May 2016 related 161 recommendations to be considered for potential action by the GoPNG. PNGs current human rights reporting status is:

Cooperation with treaty bodies[14]	
Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD)	Second report overdue since 1984
Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR)	Initial report overdue since 2010
Human Rights Committee (HRC)	Initial report overdue since 2009
Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)	Fourth report overdue since 2014
Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC)	Combined second and third reports overdue since 2008
Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)	Initial report overdue since 2015

Table 3: Status of Human Rights reporting

13. There is a level of fragility in PNG that requires understanding so as to consider both achievements and challenges. Fragility in this sense refers to the OECD expanded definition of Fragile States that moves beyond the traditional definition focussed on conflict affected states to reference SDG 16 "Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable

---

[14] Compilation prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21, Papua New Guinea, A/HRC/WG.6/25/PNG/2, 7 March 2016

and inclusive institutions at all levels"[15] and the five indicators of: 1) violence, 2) access to justice, 3) accountability and inclusive institutions, 4) economic inclusion and stability, 5) the capacities to prevent and adapt to social, economic and environmental shocks and disasters. Currently there are very few consistently high performing and effectively functioning government systems in PNG. As a result, individuals and organizations have low expectations of the government. In planning for the next UNDAF, there is a need to reflect on this reality, and to commit to undertaking the necessary political analysis, institutional capacity analysis, and a concurrent assessment of resource implications. In addition, and at the strategic prioritisation stage of UNDAF planning and formulation, there is a need to consider how to ensure predictability; how to support systems strengthening; and what needs to be done differently to support positive transformation rather than put undue pressure on overburdened or weak institutions and systems.

2. Key Features of the UNDAF Evaluation

2.1 Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope

14. The evaluation of the UNDAF 2012 – 2017 was guided by the following Terms of Reference:
    1. Assessing the relevance and contribution of the UNDAF to national development results and MDG achievement given the PNG context.
    2. Identifying the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution and assess how the UNDAF has been implemented, answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks supporting greater accountability to UNDAF stakeholders.
    3. Generating a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations logically linked to the findings and conclusions. These recommendations will include specific guidance on how to implement, monitor and evaluate the SDGs in the next UNDAF cycle.

15. The evaluation concentrates at the outcome level and focusses on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact (to the extent possible) and sustainability moving into the next UNDAF cycle, as well as the process of supporting localisation and mainstreaming of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The criteria are outlined as follows:

   A. Relevance – of the UNDAF in relation to the issues it was designed to address as well as their underlying causes in the context of national policies and strategies.
   B. Effectiveness – of the UNDAF implementation and performance in terms of progress towards agreed UNDAF outcomes. Identifying lessons learned for future programming, particularly how the UN can best contribute to mainstreaming and localising 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda.
   C. Efficiency – of the UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework.
   D. Impact – of the UNDAF on the lives of the poor, vulnerable and marginalized in PNG, notably in the realization of MDGs and MTDP.
   E. Sustainability – to what extent results achieved and strategies used i) contribute to national development, and ii) the added value of UNDAF for cooperation among individual Agencies, Funds and Programmes (AFPs).

2.2 Approach and Methodology

---

[15] OECD, States of Fragility 2015: Meeting post 2015 Ambitions, The Development Assistance Committee, Enabling Effective Development

16. This evaluation was undertaken by an independent international consultant as team leader and an independent national consultant. It aims to inform the planning of the next UNDAF cycle and seeks to demonstrate accountability for the delivery of results during the current UNDAF cycle. The evaluation design took into account the changing development context of the country, the end of the MDGs having reached zero target attainment despite progress made, and the Post 2015 Development Agenda. The cross referencing and triangulation of evidence was undertaken through taking initial findings from questionnaire, in individual and group interview and seeking confirmation from both the desk review of relevant literature and available data as well as presenting in focus groups involving a wider and more diverse target audience for further dialogue, validation and conclusion. This also applied to taking the initial findings to the field level and checking monitoring outcomes with relevant task teams and monitoring coordinators.

17. The approach for the evaluation has been utilization focused with semi structured interviews, discussions and a guiding questionnaire giving importance to the evaluation being of particular use to its intended users, namely the UN system, the GoPNG and their partners. The primary focus of the evaluation has been to ensure that the findings and the process itself inform decisions and improve performance.

18. An evaluation matrix, outlined in Annex 4, represents the framework for the review of relevant literature, telephone and in person interviews, questionnaire, focus group discussions, consultations in Port Moresby and a field visit by the evaluation team leader to Goroka. Given the time constraints, the staggered recruitment of the national evaluation consultant (originally to be two positions commencing at the start of the consultancy) and the low response rate to the survey, interviews commenced prior to the in country mission and continued as part of an in country programme of consultation.

19. The limitations of the evaluation include a low response rate to the evaluation questionnaire; an incomplete UNDAF results framework, which has limited reporting of results against baselines and targets and analysis of results against the MDGs, and the overall lack of data and subsequent limited quantitative monitoring of the UNDAF at the outcome level. The methodology as a result was modified to give greater emphasis to interviews including key government partners, plans for a comprehensive field visit and incorporation of focus group discussions per cluster with a diverse range of development actors in PNG.

20. The evaluation report, by way of its structure, seeks to present the country context and the current environment for development. It presents the findings from the consultations and analysis against the five evaluation criteria of relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact and sustainability, prior to presenting conclusions, lessons learned and detailed recommendations.

3. Findings

3.1 Relevance

21. At the time the UNDAF 2012-2015 was developed, alignment with government development strategies and policies was a challenge, due to the absence of an enabling environment. The PNG context was considered fragile (ref para 13) and whilst the Vision 2050 was drafted along with the MTDP (2010-2015) and the DSP (2010-2030) there was limited continuity across these government strategies. As a result, the UN's positive engagement in strategic planning and the relevance of the UN's programme priorities to the country, different elements of the UNDAF were aligned to different strategic documents of Government and in some cases (as is the case of Gender) to the National

Constitution. On this basis there is no shortage of government strategies with which to align programmes and the UNDAF as a whole provides clear pathways for strategic planning, encouraging positive alignment between government strategies and the UNDAF. The issue, however, is considered to be the lack of coordination between government departments, ministries and other stakeholders, compounded by varying levels of commitment, therefore implementation of their strategic priorities is affected and coordinated approaches to development overall is compromised, including implementation of the UNDAF.

22. The UNDAF is considered to be a flexible if not overly ambitious document that has the capacity to respond to issues arising, to at least some extent, through the annual monitoring process including the high level UN – GoPNG dialogue under the PSC. Many of the current government strategies and policies have been developed since the UNDAF's formulation, and therefore the volume of new and competing policy continues to grow presenting ongoing challenges for alignment and prioritisation. Upon the formulation of the latest MTDP 2016 -2017 the UNDAF was extended at the request of the GoPNG and revisions at the output level[16] sought to respond to the evolving national planning environment. It was at this point that output indicators were strengthened to be more in line with the changing national policy environment and the ongoing work under the UNDAF contributing to national outcomes.

23. The UN's presence and focus in PNG is considered relevant because of its comparative advantage to address the country's development challenges and support the achievement of national and international development goals. It is acknowledged that the UN, in comparison to donors and private sector entities, is not considered a large financial partner volume wise in PNG however there are clear comparative advantages in convening, aligning with national plans, policies and strategies and playing a leading role in developing a unified capacity development response that contributes to achieving development objectives. With often inadequate or no data available, the ability to draw on an evidence-based approach to identify need and to target programmes based on demand and in turn to report on them is limited.

24. As the economic context of PNG continues to change from Lower Middle Income Country to Middle Income Country status, the perceived continued relevance and comparative advantage of the UN through its UNDAF is not the volume of its financial resources but rather its ability to mobilise global and local technical expertise; its ability to convene and broker; to establish neutral forums for dialogue, to undertake policy advocacy, manage knowledge and develop capacity; as well as advise and hold national actors accountable in relation to international norms and standards to which PNG is a party.

25. Given the existing and continued disparity between men and women, boys and girls in PNG the UNDAF is considered relevant and aligned with national strategies with the UN's response to gender identified as more coherent than the national response. As highlighted in the evaluation consultations these disparities are often driven by inequality of opportunity, low levels of representation of women in high level political positions, cultural and traditional practices and norms which limit opportunities for women, the burden of childcare and the care of other family members at home. The UNDAF positively addresses the underlying causes of gender inequality, namely high rates of gender based violence; a lack of participation in decision making and few women in parliament; and promotes gender equality and women's empowerment. The National Constitution states that men and women are equal. The PNG MTDP 2011-2015 acknowledges that gender inequality is a severe threat to future development stating that gender based violence is an impediment to effective progression towards achieving the objectives of PNGDSP

---

[16] There was no revision at the outcome level

2010-2030 and Vision 2050, and identifies gender as a cross cutting issue. However, the MTDP II has no reference to women's empowerment requiring specific strategies to address the gaps in the national response to gender equality and the empowerment of women- this has constrained alignment of the Gender task team with specific national plans. Gender related project responses currently involve direct project implementation and stakeholders called for the UN's direct involvement in project implementation to be revised in the future to ensure the UN's comparative advantages of technical advice, developing capacity, policy advocate and knowledge manager can be maximised in the PNG context. The continued project implementation role of the UN must be considered in relation to the capacity, positioning and comparative advantage of implementing partners to ensure that where direct implementation is taking place the UN is best positioned to deliver concrete results and has a clear plan to develop capacity and embed sustainability as a priority objective.

26. Despite the GoPNG being reported as frank and open in dialogue with the UN in relation to human rights, it has no specific central human rights policy. The linkages between the UN and Government's human rights priorities are captured in individual department policies. Gender and Human Rights are not explicitly mainstreamed across all UNDAF outcome areas. The perception that human rights is a separate outcome rather than a cross cutting operational driver that can help achieve better and more effective sustainable development was noted, both at the GoPNG and UN level, creating a potential barrier to mainstreaming and potentially reducing the overall effectiveness and impact of interventions through the prism of duty bearers upholding rights holder's realisation of their human rights, including gender equality.

27. Whilst mindful that the National Human Rights Commission is not yet established due to a lack of sufficient political will and prioritisation, delays in setting up the relevant structures and apportioning appropriate funds, there is also an absence of education and consistent follow up of the UN's commitment and normative responsibilities for human rights in the PNG context, presenting opportunities to broaden, deepen and strengthen the UN's commitment to actively progressing its normative responsibilities for human rights in the PNG context. This is illustrated by the requests for the UN to include capacity development and technical support for human rights as well as mainstreaming in all other programme areas in future UNDAF cycles. Support on human rights to date was reported as based on needs assessments and consultations with stakeholders so as to respond to the needs of both rights holders and duty bearers. Support to national development priorities is undertaken through a consistent approach with existing obligations of Member States under international law, including international human rights law and standards. Recommendations from the last UPR report to the GoPNG indicated the need to establish the National Human Rights Commission to ensure a lead body responsible for human rights education and training; the need to strengthen the national structure at the highest level and to coordinate follow up and reporting on recommendations; the need to improve capacity in monitoring, gathering, collating, evaluating and managing human rights data; and to develop legislation on disabilities. All of which can be expanded as cross cutting priorities in the future UNDAF including (on the basis of consultations held) issues of juvenile justice and child protection, which the government has not yet responded to adequately and the UN has not yet addressed fully.

28. UNOCHA's withdrawal from PNG in 2015 was highlighted in relation to the continued relevance of the UN's support for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and therefore the challenges posed by UNOCHA's absence at the country level. The UN's changed status in responding to natural disasters, in contrast to the perceived priority for the UN to remain a trusted DRM partner, requires urgent discussion amongst resident UN partners so as to redistribute roles and responsibilities amongst relevant resident agencies and the UNRC in line with national procedures and to consolidate effective lines of communication with UNOCHA Bangkok that can be clearly outlined in UNDAF 2018-2022.

29. Levels of relevance and alignment in areas such as Child Protection, Youth and Education have reaped rewards primarily because of the linkage and synergy with associated government policy and programme, whereby for example, early childhood priorities are now integrated into the Education Plan 2015-2019. In contrast to a lack of emphasis on agriculture in the current UNDAF, the high percentage of agricultural land (75 percent) and importance of the sector in PNG indicates a lack of prioritisation for alignment against the National Agriculture Development Plan. This represents a clear opportunity for priority consideration in the next UNDAF, which FAO's recent establishment of operations in PNG supports.

30. The UN's former political office for Bougainville demonstrates relevance, where the representative role of the UN as 'honest broker' has contributed to the accomplishment of significant progress in the Bougainville peace process, by facilitating ongoing and neutral dialogue between the Autonomous Region of Bougainville Government and the PNG National Government.

Relevance Summary:
-   The UNDAF is flexible and aligned to multiple strategic instruments therefore harmonisation to be strengthened in the future.
-   The UN's comparative advantage can be matched to country development challenges, however the UN enacting the full extent of its comparative advantage is needed.
-   The ability to demonstrate relevance in more detailed terms is hampered by the lack of data
-   The UN's work in gender equality is strong and needs to be used to address gaps in the national gender response. Likewise, the national Human Rights response will benefit from UN specialised and mainstreamed support.
-   The UN's work as 'honest broker' in the context of the Bougainville peace process is noted as good practice and represents the unique role of the UN.

3.2 Effectiveness

31. The four UNDAF clusters and 10 inter-agency outcomes are considered a strong enough foundation upon which to establish the programmatic priorities of the UN system based on comparative advantage and the needs of national priorities and international development goals. Respondents and interviewees considered that the UN would be less effective if it was not for the common platform of the UNDAF, which seeks to harmonize UN internal and external partnerships as well as future partnership opportunities including those requiring the alignment of UN non-resident agencies.

32. The effectiveness of the UNDAF is measured against 41 inter-agency outcome indicators. UNDAF monitoring in 2015 indicates that two outcomes: Outcome 2. MDGs, Population and Aid Effectiveness, and Outcome 10. Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management were completed. Of the remaining outcomes seven were on track, as follows: 1. Governance for Equitable Development, 3. Peacebuilding and Rule of Law in Bougainville, 4. Human Rights, 5. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, 7. HIV & AIDS, 8. Health & 9. Education, while Child Protection was delayed.

UNDAF Clusters	Inter-agency Outcome	Indicators	Available indicator data	Status of Outcome achievement
Governance for equitable development	1. Governance for equitable development	2	2	On track
	2 MDGs, Population and Aid Effectiveness	3	3	Completed
	3. Peacebuilding and rule of law in Bougainville	2	1	On track
	4. Human Rights	3	3	On track

Social Justice, Protection and Gender Equality	5. Gender equality and women's empowerment	7	2	On track
	6. Child protection	4	4	Delayed
	7. HIV & AIDS	5	5	On track
Access to Basic Services	8. Health	9	3	On track
	9. Education	2	2	On track
Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction	10. Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction	4	4	Completed

Table 4. Summary of UNDAF interagency outcome monitoring reports 2015

33. The review of the current UNDAF Results Framework indicates that 30 out of a total 41 outcome indicators are measurable with 11 indicators missing baseline data. The UNDAF task teams undertook monitoring in 2015 and concluded that the UNDAF is proportionally on track in attaining results at the outcome level with 20 percent of indicators completed (2); 70 percent on track (7); and 10 percent delayed (1). However, this conclusion is impacted by weaknesses in the Results Framework, a lack of clarity in the definition of status markers, and a lack of access to available data on which to accurately assess the status of outcome indicators against established baselines and targets.

UNDAF Outcomes	Inter-Agency Outcome	Overall Assessment	Financial Expenditure (core, non-core, PNG UN Country Fund)
Governance for equitable development	1. Governance	On Track	65%
	2. MDGs, Population and Aid Effectiveness	Completed	89%
	3. Bougainville	On Track	93%
Social Justice, Protection and Gender Equality	4. Human Rights	On Track	52%
	5. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	On Track	71%
	6. Child Protection	Delayed	85%
	7. HIV and AIDS	On Track	68%
Access to Basic Services	8. Health	On Track	66%
	9. Education	On Track	90%
Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction	10. Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management	Completed	88%
Total			**79%**

Table 5: Summary of UNDAF interagency outcome financial expenditure reports 2015

34. Whilst annual financial expenditure reporting to meet the obligations of the MPTF is a mandatory requirement, presentation of collated data related to annual monitoring against UNDAF outcome and output indicators was considered more important as a means to inform ongoing management of implementation of the UNDAF. In particular to inform the annual dialogue within the UN and with external partners, donors and Government. Improvements in qualitative, quantitative and combined financial reporting, of which the PNG UN Country Fund is a key component, was considered a priority.

35. Factors contributing to outcomes not being achieved, are seen to relate to ambitious goal setting and insufficient coordination, collaboration and cooperation between the UN and Government after annual work plans have been agreed.

36. The ability to demonstrate effectiveness is restricted by the lack of clear data within monitoring reports on which to measure results, the clarity of data is restricted by the lack of consistent baselines, targets and indicators in some instances. Australia, as a significant donor to the PNG UN Country Fund, expressed concern regarding the lack of clarity and visibility of progress as well as reduced opportunity to flag and discuss implementation challenges and solutions on a regular basis. Therefore there is a

diminished opportunity to highlight the results of the partnership between the UN and Australia, and a call on the UN to paint a stronger strategic picture of its joint work in PNG. Australia was looking for a whole of UN commitment to strengthened M&E and a discussion around strengthening the technical clarity of reporting. Respondents highlighted the urgent need therefore for the future UNDAF to prioritise development of a quality monitoring and evaluation framework with indicators linked to baseline data and established data sources for tracking, ideally accessed through national data collection mechanisms. Such a future consolidated M&E approach is seen as the means to establish the foundation of an evidence base from which the Government and development partners can confidently measure results. Localisation of the SDGs also presents an opportunity to target SDG priorities in the next UNDAF and include relevant indicators in the UNDAF M&E Framework to track SDG related progress.

37. The Office of the UN Resident Coordinator's (RCO) receives dedicated coordination resources through the PNG UN Country Fund and as a result has attracted a number of International experts to its team. The role and quality of work emanating from the RCO team was acknowledged and their role in collating reports from sectors and preparation of the annual synthesis report was recognised. However overall strengthened M&E, resulting from investment in UN capacity in M&E including data collection and analysis, supporting the presentation of evidence based annual monitoring of results is needed in the next UNDAF cycle. Rationalisation of the overall UNDAF Results Framework with fewer inter-agency outcomes was also considered to present a more reasonable work load for collation and presentation of reports, freeing up valuable time to implement innovative solutions to capacity development around M&E including the expansion of participatory processes and outcome mapping.

38. The UNDAF governance structure includes a Programme Steering Committee (PSC) at the highest level comprising the co-chairs of UNRC and Government[17]. The PSC did not meet in 2014 and as a result there was a lack of a suitable forum within which the UN and Government could jointly assess annual UNDAF implementation. This resulted in there being minimal joint strategic consideration of the four UNDAF outcome areas at the leadership and partner level. This challenge was addressed in 2015 through a change management process which brought renewed focus and participation at the PSC level including renewed UN–GoPNG commitment to joint oversight of UNDAF implementation progress, and annual dialogue and review processes.

39. Joint programmes are considered by those working in PNG to be an effective means to develop integrated approaches around areas of national development priority, maximising opportunities for joint planning and monitoring as well as joint resource mobilisation. Joint programmes are seen as a way to engage non-resident agencies and to ensure their alignment, maximising the contribution of their specialised technical knowledge and reducing fragmentation. The incentives to participate in joint programming or joint programmes are, however, considered minimal and shrinking partly as a result of the earmarking of funds by donors contributing to the PNG UN Country Fund. Whilst consultations ascertained that donors are earmarking funds to ensure attainment of programme results and rates of implementation the negative impact of earmarking warrants dialogue between the relevant donors (particularly Australia) and the UN to identify the root cause of favouring earmarking, to determine if earmarking is addressing those needs and, where necessary, to develop mutually agreed strengthened monitoring and reporting arrangements for the PNG UN Country Fund. The goal being to increase overall effectiveness, reduce the negative impact of the practice of earmarking funds, strengthen joint monitoring and increase a One Programme environment that supports joint programming that maximises the participation of small and large, resident and non-resident agencies on the basis of comparative advantage.

---

[17] Secretary, Department of National Planning and Monitoring

40. Respondents expressed concern that there is a lack of cross sector discussion around integrated approaches at the UNDAF outcome level, narrowing the focus and strategic vision of the UN's work in PNG. This was considered to be due to agencies and government primarily engaging and focusing monitoring accountability at the interagency task team level in only one of any ten technically focused task teams, rather than at the cluster and cross sectoral level. A renewed strategic focus of the Programme Coordinating Committee is considered a solution, reinforcing the value of the PCC as the primary working mechanism for UNDAF joint planning, monitoring and enhancement of programme integration with a focus on cross sectoral coordination, synergies and identification lessons learned, challenges and corresponding mitigation strategies.

Effectiveness Summary:
- Four clusters and 10 inter-agency outcomes reflect programme priority needs, however reduction in the number of outcomes would have a positive effect on integrated approaches, streamlined coordination, volume of reporting and time commitments of staff.
- The UNDAF governance structure requires strengthening at the PCC level to ensure high level engagement and dialogue between UN and Government ongoing.
- 30/41 indicators are measurable with multiple baselines missing therefore UNDAF monitoring negatively impacted by weaknesses in the Results Framework and a lack of clear data.
- Annual financial reporting provides data however needs strengthening to allow useful aggregation of results at the outcome level and clarity between UNDAF and MPTF reporting.
- Localising of the SDGs will help tailor and inform UNDAF planning including understanding and factoring in geographic priority.
- Joint programmes are seen as an effective means to develop integrated programmes – dialogue is needed to ensure the negative impact of earmarking funds is mitigated and opportunities for joint resource mobilisation and programming increase.

3.3 Efficiency

41. Externally the development environment in PNG is considered 'crowded and political'. The ability to follow through on agreements forged with partners is impacted by the high turnover of partner interlocutors and restricted communication, often also leading to duplication of programme and project responses as a result of limited information exchange between partners.

42. Despite this complicated development environment, the UN in PNG has had success in forging external partnerships including public private partnerships to align with agreed sectoral priorities. This has been particularly successful when the technical focus is clear, for example in child protection and in the case of early childhood education that brought together a partnership between the Departments of National Planning and Monitoring, Health and Community Development along with Digicel, National Broadcaster- EMTV, Freelance and organizations working with children and people with disabilities.

43. It was recognized that joint programming and coordination are universally difficult. As a Delivering as One country PNG scores highly in implementation of the 15 core elements of Delivering as One[18], with remaining coordination and efficiency elements to be established related to Business Operations. The UNDAF represents the UN's coordination and partnership framework. The four UNDAF clusters are addressed

---

[18] As monitored by the UN Development Group Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) Tracker
https://doco.cartodb.com/viz/400c6996-00c1-11e6-8c8b-0ea31932ec1d/embed_map

through a set of ten inter-agency outcomes supported by ten individual task teams responsible for implementation of a set of defined outputs. The task teams are the main vehicle for coordination with some meeting more regularly than others and some more rarely. Task teams operate under a common Terms of Reference that outlines the operating role of the task team under the UNDAF implementation and management arrangements (task team leaders are members of, and inform, the PCC), the frequency of meetings (at least quarterly) and the strategic and programmatic focus of the task teams. Overall feedback received through consultations indicated that the coordination structure for the UNDAF was thought to be very strong yet also overly complex with the number of task teams representing a significant meeting and reporting burden for agencies, with not enough staff to service the mechanism. In real terms in many cases agency representatives have responsibility over several task teams multiplying reporting obligations across three to four task teams with responsibility for monitoring delivery across the same. In some cases agencies are members of up to eight of the ten task teams with the coordination value of 10 focused teams diminished when the time commitment means that some groups don't meet regularly due to unmanageable workload associated with the commitment. The efficiency of the task teams is dependent on the capacity and commitment of the lead agency. Task teams do, however, currently discuss and agree aligned annual work plans with relevant government partners and engage with government in annual monitoring and reporting. The Gender task team is considered a particular success story in this regard with a regular schedule of monthly meetings established throughout the year. A contributing factor, and lesson learned worthy of note, being the dedicated coordination role explicitly stated within staff TOR responsible for provision of coordination services to the task team.

44. Through consultations there was a call for rationalization of the overall number of task teams (currently 10) under UNDAF outcome areas in the next UNDAF coordination structure, as a means to reduce the volume of coordination, monitoring and reporting whilst increasing opportunities for integrated planning, joint resource mobilisation, and the mainstreaming of normative priorities as a means to increase efficiency.

45. Barriers to strengthened efficiency in relation to programme implementation are seen to be more related to the Government side, specifically to the need for consistent leadership by the relevant Government departments as well as stronger coordination between the different departments. On the UN side there is a need for coordination structures that allow for and result in enhanced engagement across task teams, particularly for inter disciplinary responses to development priorities and for response to cross cutting issues such as climate change; child protection; gender and human rights.

46. The Resident Coordinator's proactive leadership approach to application of the principles of DaO is recognised as making a positive contribution to building trust and respect for the UN system. Overall the RC's leadership approach is considered to have forged effective partnerships between the UN and other partners, including the UN's key development partners and the GoPNG.

47. The Gender task team, as mentioned, is an example of a well-functioning task team where the positive impact of allocating dedicated coordination resources has positively impacted the effectiveness and efficiency of the outcome area. Gender mainstreaming was not prevalent prior to 2014 but in 2016 the UN is reviewing how to scale up through use of the Gender Scorecard as part of the UNDAF planning and formulation cycle. The Gender task team involves nine UN agencies and is the largest task team. Gender audits undertaken through use of the Gender Scorecard focus on results of gender mainstreaming and efficacy of coordination for gender. The Gender task team is the only task team with a specifically dedicated staff member responsible for coordination, in addition to the task team leader and deputy.

48. Stakeholders called for stronger internal coordination between UN agencies and programme areas to reduce the external perception of fragmentation. The UN in PNG is noted as continuing to play an implementing role creating confusion regarding the UN's role in comparison to that of other project/programme partners. It was felt that the UN should review its priority for direct implementation and expand its modalities to respond to the identified comparative advantage of the UN system, namely: strengthening national capacities; monitoring and implementation of international norms and standards; convener of partners; technical expertise; policy advice and role as a global knowledge network; and providing neutral space. The UN's work, therefore, should concentrate on strengthening and capacitating an enabling environment at the institutional level with implementation whereby the UN determines its role based on consideration of the UN's comparative advantage and that of partner local and international organizations with potentially greater capacity and flexibility to take up or expand lead implementation roles.

49. Stakeholders expressed concern regarding the disruptive effects on partnership and programming when a UN agency lacks internal communication between central (HQ) and country levels and where there is a lack of decentralised decision making within an agency. This is particularly evident with regard to decision making related to agency derived project resources and the timely allocation of funds. During the consultations several stakeholders identified examples where decision making is disconnected from the country context, which leads to poor communication between an agency and its stakeholder partners, continuing to impact the relevant allocation of resources, partnerships and programme implementation.

50. There was a call to reinstate the Quarterly Review Meetings on programme implementation to strengthen coordination and information sharing between the UN and its partners. The Quarterly Review Meetings were seen to help with the identification of duplication as well as gaps thereby allowing partners to resolve issues in a more timely and collaborative manner. The UN's role, therefore, in collaboration with other actors, is to convene partners and broker solutions, common approaches and reduce duplication.

51. The task teams were, overall, considered to be effective in sharing information and establishing networks with appropriate people involved from Government. Task teams were generally seen to have potential as a means to identify opportunities for joint programmes and strengthened coordination.

52. It was recognised that UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes are working in an increasingly competitive environment for the identification and mobilisation of programme resources, which has had a negative impact on momentum in joint programme development. As a result, it was felt there is less sharing and collaboration and a more competitive approach to other UN agencies and reduced interest in coordinating with other UN agencies to mobilise funds for joint priorities.

53. Connection with Government varies from one task team to another. The capacity of individual Government departments has significant influence on levels of coordination and the forging of meaningful and effective partnerships. This is then mirrored on the UN side in relation to UN agency collaboration across the four UNDAF clusters. Further consideration needs to be given as to how to facilitate stronger cross sectoral partnerships across government departments and with other partners to strengthen joint programming that responds to national priorities. In this context respondents were particularly mindful of the paradigm for future development to 2030 framed by the interconnected nature of the SDGs and expectations for integration and joint approaches in the future UNDAF the incorporate both traditional (multilateral and bilateral donors) and non-traditional partnerships inclusive of the private sector.

54. Stakeholders raised the importance of the UN strengthening its 'position and voice' as a priority, so as to be recognised as a stronger partner in areas where it has comparative advantage in relation to other partners. Development partners acknowledged the UN's coordination structures and their substantive representation of the UN's comparative advantage. They do not, however, see the UN positioned to the extent possible as a lead player in the priority clusters of the UNDAF in the wider development context. For example, even in the area of gender where the UN has comparative advantage and mobilises considerable resources for gender, the US Embassy has taken a lead role in organizing the annual Gender Forum. It is considered that a major component of coordination is positioning the UN and strengthening its position and voice in key areas of comparative advantage with the UN's communication and advocacy strategies in the future addressing these priorities and the linkages to the DaO agenda.

Efficiency summary:
- The UNRC's role has been instrumental in increasing trust for and position of the UN
- The UN in PNG scores highly at the global level as a DaO self-starter country
- High turnover and limited communication often results in duplication of programme and projects
- The UN in PNG has been successful in forging partnerships to respond to sectoral priorities
- Stakeholders call for strengthened internal coordination of the UN. Rationalisation of inter-agency outcomes and therefore the number of task team will strengthen the network and increase integrated planning, joint resource mobilisation and mainstreaming of normative responsibilities
- Reinstating the Quarterly Review Meeting of stakeholders was requested as a means to facilitate cross sectoral partnerships across government and with other stakeholders.

3.4 Impact

55. "The issue is not that there is no impact, the issue is that we are unable to demonstrate impact"[19]. The ability to measure the impact of the UNDAF at both the outcome and output level is weakened due to the poor quality of the UNDAF Results Framework and a limited evidence base from which to draw data so as to measure and attribute results. Quantitatively, it is easier to demonstrate that more services are available, however much harder to demonstrate the impact of those services (child protection for instance) if baselines, targets and measurable indicators are not in place.

56. Discussion around impact and the ability to measure impact in the future focused on the need for both internal UN and external national data collection and data management to be strengthened, and for a balance of quantitative and qualitative monitoring to be established and maintained. The future inclusion of storytelling (at the output level and for outcome mapping) in qualitative analysis and participatory programming processes was considered to be an important element of monitoring impact on the lives of the poor, vulnerable and marginalized in the PNG context, reflecting the strong oral and storytelling culture of the country. Such a focus was also seen to appropriately reflect a more human rights based approach to programming and monitoring and evaluation supporting an inclusive and participatory engagement with stakeholders that is empowering, moving away from a purely abstract approach built around difficult to capture and measure quantitative indicators.

57. The UN is not a 'big player' in dollar terms in PNG but is however considered to be an important partner by government and stakeholders, particularly with regard to technical

---

[19] From stakeholder consultations

advice, global experience and knowledge as well as advocacy around the international normative agenda and the role of convening and brokering relationships between development partners, government and civil society. A consistent approach and method applied across projects contributing to a more effective monitoring and evaluation system, over time, will help to mitigate the challenges currently experienced in measuring and demonstrating the impact of programmes under the UNDAF.

58. Stakeholders felt strongly that the UN needed to prioritise investment in capacity development responses to strengthen data gathering, management and performance measurement systems. These expectations matched plans outlined by the Department of National Planning and Monitoring to strengthen data gathering and management associated with the anticipated demands for monitoring the SDGs and the UN's Data Revolution. In terms of innovation, the use of UNICEF's Rapid Pro was highlighted and could be explored, in addition to the UNDP Family Sexual Violence Action Committee digital monitoring tools.

59. Impact in realization of the MDGs has been minimal due, in part, to the late adoption of the MDGs by the GoPNG in 2004 and the lack of capacity to analyse and quantify results. Definite progress has been made towards MDG realization in spite of the inability to report attainment of any MDG targets. Despite the late adoption and on the basis of commitments enshrined within the UNDAF the UN Resident Coordinator has contributed to the functioning of infrastructure that will eventually contribute to the determination of impact of the SDGs in PNG. The UN Resident Coordinator co-chairs an MDG National Steering Committee with membership including heads of government departments, key technical and development partners, with the role of oversight of implementation of the MDGs and reports to the National Executive Council. Under the National Steering Committee an MDG Technical Working Group has been established, chaired by the Secretary of the DNPM. This brings together government sectors as well as technical and development partners responsible for MDG goals, targets and indicators. An MDG Core Group sitting under the MDG TWG provides secretarial services with support from the UN Country Team. To support integration of the MDGs into its normative functions the GoPNG has established a dedicated unit known as the Special Interventions Branch (SIB) within the DNPM. A UN technical adviser based in the DNPM is responsible for monthly reviews of programmatic issues through an inter-agency forum that generates further MDG focused discussion with the UN and other bilateral and multilateral technical and development partners through the Development Partners Roundtable Forum that is also co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator. This is a structure that needs to be given due consideration in the country context analysis linked to planning the UNDAF 2018-2022, inclusive of support for future monitoring of results against the SDGs.

Impact summary:
- "The issue is not that there is no impact – the issue is we're unable to demonstrate it"
- The UN remains an important partner for Government and Stakeholders
- The poor quality of the UNDAF Results Framework and lack of verifiable data make demonstrating impact challenging. There is an urgent call for strengthened M&E.
- Strengthening of participatory methodologies for programme development and monitoring, inclusive of 'story telling' particularly important in monitoring the impact of the UN's work on the lives of the poor, vulnerable and marginalised.
- There is an overall priority for the UN to support national capacity to monitor the SDGs and to build national capacities to undertake analysis.

3.5 Sustainability

60. Administrative and personnel changes combined with political instability in PNG has contributed to lower levels of capacity to implement within the GoPNG, limited skilled and experienced personnel, reduced funds, and inconsistency of management within government institutions. These factors have affected the sustainability of development results.

61. The UN is seen to be mitigating the negative effects of the instability, which has otherwise contributed to delays in programme implementation and affected the potential for interventions to successfully continue without external support. Investment for sustainability requires equal priority given to building and strengthening institutions; developing capacity; strengthening systems; and promoting and recognizing the ownership of Government for the development agenda.

Strengthening systems	Developing capacity
Building and strengthening institutions	Promoting and recognizing the ownership of government to the development agenda

Table 6: A matrix approach to building sustainability

62. As informed through consultation the UN's forward looking priorities for ensuring sustainability are broadening partnerships, ensuring long term capacity development responses strengthening coordination to avoid duplication of projects and considering the longer term outlook of programmes beyond the political cycle or a single political mandate of government so as to tailor the matrix approach outlined above (Table 6). With this perspective, the UN is encouraged to position the next UNDAF cycle of 2018-2022 within the longer term 15 year development timeframe of the SDGs and the relevant national development frameworks (PNGDSP). With this longer term outlook the UN tailors its contribution to the longer term development agenda, setting realistic programme targets accordingly, and embedding reasonable expectations for capacity development, institution building, leadership and ownership.

63. It was highlighted that this needed to include the application of a risk management approach, acknowledging and taking into consideration the specific nature of the PNG development environment. Strengthened communication strategies to ensure the positive story of the UN's contribution to the sustainable longer-term development of PNG whilst advocating the normative agenda of the UN system in PNG were considered an important component of the UN's agenda.

64. The GoPNG is addressing human rights issues through the Human Rights Forum[20] chaired by the Department of Justice and Attorney General. The Forum enshrines Human Rights Based Approaches and has established ownership and participation from national actors. The UN's ongoing support to the Forum is a priority and a means of ensuring consistency and sustainability of approaches to human rights. Consultations reinforced that the UN needs to undertake further work internally, to mainstream Human Rights, Gender, and Environmental Sustainability across all outcome areas to establish an agreed interdisciplinary and cross sectoral approach for implementation across programmes and in work with Government. The next UNDAF will be required to outline the implementation details.

65. The UN's recognition of and alignment to the nationally led localisation of the SDGs Post 2015 is central to the UN System's ability to ensure the priorities established and results achieved through the UNDAF guides cooperation amongst individual UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes and contributes to national development and the sustainability of development results. Localisation is the means through which the UN can agree upon a

---

[20] Operative since 2011

set of priorities aligned to national plans and strategies as a contribution at the provincial and district levels, tailoring support to the local context and UN's comparative advantage. Enhanced understanding of and support to the Government's decentralisation approach building up the sustainability of interventions and targeting support to where it is most needed as per the SDG principle of reaching the unreached first and leaving no-one behind. The process allows for the identification of relevant institutions, shaping the matrix approach (table 6) to respond to specific need, focusing on the strengthening of partnerships.

66. The UN Resident Coordinator's role as co-chair of the Development Partners Roundtable is recognized as instrumental in forging partnerships and positive linkages between the UN, development partners and the Government. The UN has continued to ensure and adopt a clear agenda through the UNDAF to address sustainability but also influence a coordinated approach to sustainability with development partners and Government through agreed aid management practices[21].

67. Weak institutions in the PNG context compromise the sustainability of programme results. Whilst PNG is rich in policies, implementation is variable and capacity development at all levels is considered a priority so as to improve effective implementation of development policy. The mainstreaming of sustainability measures across the life of the UNDAF and its programmes is a priority. Reduced sustainability is evident where there is no transfer of skills to counterparts, where capacity development is not aligned with a national framework, plan or strategy and where the link between capacity development, institutional strengthening and the enabling environment is not clearly established as part of a long term capacity development response. The planning and measuring of skills transfer across the UNDAF programme period is needed and key to this is the stability of contract staff in their assigned programmes, reducing disruption and building working relationships and trust. One off initiatives are considered less valuable and effective in terms of developing capacity and enhancing sustainability. Capacity development should consist of an approach that addresses the individual, institutional and environmental levels to enhance the overall utility for programme delivery and embed knowledge and understanding across not just individuals but institutions and a strengthened enabling environment of PNG. Sustainability of interventions, particularly capacity development, is recognised as being enhanced when they are clearly delivered under a national framework, and have been integrated as a core and agreed approach reflecting demand driven interventions.

68. Stakeholders emphasized the need for the UN's future strategies and programmes to reflect an understanding of the processes and structures of the decentralisation agenda in PNG, as well as the promulgation of the Organic Law. In this context the UN's contribution to sustainability is linked to continuing to build on and work through existing government systems, frameworks and strategies.

69. To be able to determine sustainability development results need to be measured, therefore monitoring of programme results requires a commitment to the continuous strengthening of monitoring frameworks and capacities, as well as development, management and expansion of the existing evidence base.

70. Bringing together civil society and political leaders to support planning of the next UNDAF and development priorities at the local level was a direct request from

---

[21] Under the PNG Development Cooperation Policy (2015) and Planning & Monitoring Responsibility Act (2016).
http://www.planning.gov.pg/images/dnpm/pdf/latest_pub/102_PNG%20DevelopmentCooperationPolicyFINAL%20MasterCopy%2025Feb2016.pdfgpo.pdf

http://www.planning.gov.pg/images/dnpm/pdf/PlanningAct2016.pdf

stakeholder consultations on both the civil society and Government side. Civil society stakeholders, in particular, requested the UN to exert its convening power to engage civil society and political leaders in direct dialogue and exchange. Whereas bilateral donors tend to engage with civil society and political leaders separately, and bilaterally, the UN was requested to play an instrumental role in facilitating dialogue aimed at strengthening longer-term national partnerships.

71. Sustainability is considered to be particularly contingent upon dialogue across sectors to ensure integrated approaches, however currently cross sector coordination is only partially in place. Literacy, for example, remains an issue in relation to sustainability on the basis that when literacy rates are low it is harder for key populations and groups to understand development issues and to engage effectively. Likewise, Access to Justice needs to focus on basic education to improve the potential for sustainability. Increased information sharing and joint programming across UNDAF inter-agency outcomes was considered a means to expand and strengthen interdisciplinary responses to development challenges, particularly in a decentralised development context. Such an approach was considered central to an SDG focused response whereby the SDGs promote an interconnected agenda as a means to address development challenges reinforcing gains in one goal with corresponding gains in another. This mutually reinforcing approach will benefit the overall sustainability of all UN interventions and support to achievement of national development priorities in PNG.

Sustainability Summary:
- Political instability, administration and personnel changes have contributed to lower levels of capacity to implement – all effecting the attainment and sustainability of development results
- Maintain RCs role as co-chair of the Development Partners (DP) Roundtable and lead DP dialogue through introduction of strategic development priorities onto the agenda, including: SDGs, civil society dialogue, innovative partnership opportunities
- Matrix approach to sustainability needed comprised of: strengthen systems; develop capacity; build and strengthen institutions; promote and recognise government ownership of the development agenda
- UNDAF 2018-2022 to be planned and placed within the 15-year timeframe of the SDGs and the PNGDSP – aligning with localisation, reflecting the interconnected agenda of the SDGs in programming and increasing geographic prioritisation
- Strengthening M&E to be able to measure results remains an overarching priority
- Priority for UN support for Human Rights Forum and the mainstreaming of Human Rights, Gender and Environmental Sustainability

4. Conclusions and lessons learned

4.1 Conclusions

72. The UNDAF 2012-2017 demonstrates alignment, focus and flexibility in a complex and often challenging development environment, where limited political analysis accompanied its development with majority number of national strategic development strategies and policies to which it is now aligned not yet articulated in 2011 when it was first formulated.

73. The UN Resident Coordinator has played an instrumental role in strengthening aid coordination in PNG, positioning the UN system as a convener of development partners and establishing relationships of trust with the GoPNG and development partners.

74. It is acknowledged that UNCT leadership of UNDAF monitoring in partnership with government will increase opportunities for partner engagement and strengthen relationships with development partners, civil society and the private sector. It will also contribute to strengthened results based management and raise awareness of the UN's contribution to national development results, advocacy and monitoring of the normative agenda.

75. The UN system operates within complex coordination structures that function to a large extent yet are not seen to engender integrated or interdisciplinary approaches to programming, resource mobilisation or partnership building. Reduction of the number of inter-agency outcomes (10) has been promoted as a means to increase integrated planning and monitoring of UNDAF and the identification of opportunities for joint programmes where it makes good sense to do so. In addition, such a reduction contributes to a rationalization of the UNDAF results matrix and a reduction of the coordination, monitoring and reporting burden. This enables a heightened focus on the quality of indicators and data sources used leading to more accurate, reliable and practically useful M&E for both programmatic learning and accountability purposes.

76. The UN is called on to give due consideration to the comparative advantage of partner organizations and undertake a shift from prioritising implementation to an expansion of modalities that reflect the UN's perceived comparative advantage in the development context, namely technical advisory support, capacity development responses, broker/convener, adviser on the normative agenda and monitoring and implementation of international norms and standards as well as provision of expertise and experience as a global knowledge network.

77. The mainstreaming of Human Rights Gender and Environmental Sustainability is considered a cross cutting priority across the UNDAF, integral to programming that responds to the localisation and decentralisation of the SDGs, being sure to incorporate the unfinished business of the MDGs embodying the commitment to "leave no one behind".

78. Finally, the future monitoring of the UNDAF's contribution to development results relies on the establishment of results frameworks with baselines, targets and monitoring indicators, that are supported by identified, and existing, data sets. The UN, in collaboration with the GoPNG and relevant development partners, must commit to support the capacity development needs associated with the establishment and ongoing management of national data systems focused on monitoring and analysing development results.

4.2 Lessons Learned

89. The evaluation of the PNG UNDAF 2012-2017 has identified a number of lessons learned in addition to the recommendations presented below. They are:

- Sustainability of results and demand driven approaches that require national ownership and promote inclusive and participatory processes are best achieved when the UN's planned development interventions are linked to national plans, policies and development frameworks and ensure compliance with international human rights norms and standards. These priorities increase the strategic positioning of the UN's contribution to the long term development agenda of PNG, reducing the propensity for ad hoc and piecemeal responses.

- Consideration of the UN's comparative advantage in the context of the new SDG environment increases opportunities to ensure relevance in the PNG context.

- Where responsibilities for coordination are clearly defined and delegated it positively reflects in efficient coordination mechanisms of the UNDAF, timely programme implementation and quality monitoring and reporting.

- An UNDAF Results Framework with poor or non-existent baselines, targets, indicators or means of verification has widespread negative impact on the UN's ability to monitor and evaluate results and thus meaningfully demonstrate impact of programmatic interventions. This leads to a lack of satisfactory reporting which in turn presents challenges for the UN in meeting the expectations of supporting donors or providing the necessary information to both the UN and government to support timely management of the UNDAF and ongoing accountability for challenges faced in seeking to achieve results.

5. Recommendations

Planning Vision
1   Set the new UNDAF five-year planning frame of 2018 -2022 within the longer-term 2030 vision, factoring in the MDG unfinished agenda, establishing realistic and attainable goals and targets informed by the conclusions and priorities drawn from SDG localisation activities of Government.

Quality data systems and strengthening monitoring and reporting
2   Prioritise investment in capacity development focused on strengthening data gathering, monitoring and management systems linked to national obligations for monitoring the SDGs, harmonised with the priorities of the Department of National Planning and Monitoring.

3   Establish an UNDAF Results Framework, comprised of a reduced number of outcomes/inter-agency outcomes, with stronger baselines, targets and results indicators linked to verifiable data sources, to increase opportunities for cross sector and integrated programming, and to reduce the coordination, monitoring and reporting burden on staff and agencies working in a complex programming environment.

4   Review UNDAF monitoring and reporting practices to respond to donor requests for stronger combined annual monitoring, inclusive of but distinct from MPTF reporting obligations that inform UN partner dialogue's pin pointing of bottlenecks and agreement on solutions to be implemented in the following year.

5   Instigate a dialogue regarding the current practice of earmarking funds within the context of the PNG UN Country Fund with the relevant donors (primarily Australia) to identify the root causes/need for earmarking and the means of mitigating the negative impacts on joint resource mobilisation and integrated programme planning, in support of strengthened Fund management arrangements and accurate reporting of programmatic attainment rates.

6   Include story telling in future programme planning, monitoring and evaluation plans in relation to outcome mapping and at the output level as a complimentary activity to strengthen qualitative data gathering reflecting priority for and value of participatory processes, the oral culture and traditions of the country and to ensure a more gender responsive and human rights based approach to programme implementation including inclusive and participatory M&E and programming practices.

Comparative Advantage
7   Undertake an analysis of the UN's comparative advantage against identified country development needs for the period 2018–2022. The analysis is to be undertaken with

consideration for the shifting responsibilities of the UN and the contrasting medium to long term responsibilities of Government and civil society, particularly with regard to project/programme implementation and the demands and opportunities for PNG as an emerging Middle Income Country.

Governance and Delivering as One

8   Review the current UNDAF governance structure to rationalize the number of inter-agency outcomes and corresponding task teams, to increase opportunities for joint programme planning that reflects the inter linkage of the SDGs. Revive the Quarterly Review Stakeholder Meetings and give renewed strategic focus to the Programme Steering Committee to ensure management and accountability by the UNCT and designated Government counterparts.

9   Ensure non-resident agencies align with and engage in the rollout, programme development and ongoing monitoring of the UNDAF.

10 Address concerns raised by stakeholders regarding fragmented internal coordination of agencies so as to mitigate the negative effects on country level programme prioritisation and the allocation of funds.

11 Take note of the positive outcomes attributed to the dedicated coordination support assigned to functioning task team, to be replicated as an efficient means of improving overall coordination of UNDAF implementation and monitoring.

12 Commence development of a Business Operations Strategy Framework for the UN in PNG in support of harmonised Common Business Services, in parallel with UNDAF planning.

Partnerships

13 Continue to support the UNRCs role as co-chair of the Development Partners' Roundtable Forum as a means to continue to influence SDG focused discussion at the bilateral and multilateral development partner level with consideration for national planning structures and processes. Building on the UN's success in leading development partner dialogue in PNG and rights-based good practice engaging with the private sector and mapping existing civil society organisations (including non-government organisations; faith based organisations and community based organisations) to identify and discuss new and innovative partnerships.

14 In the context of the convening and policy advocacy role of the UN, "reaching those furthest behind first" and "leaving no one behind", develop specific strategies to bring the voice of civil society and representatives of specific vulnerable and marginalised groups to the decision makers and politicians, with a specific focus on the vulnerable and marginalised with special consideration for Men having Sex with Men, People Living With HIV, transgender people and sex workers, indigenous peoples/traditional landowners, and persons with disabilities.

15 Ensure maintenance plans and budgets are either negotiated and agreed with local authorities or responsible beneficiaries at project completion stage or factored into projects to mitigate the redundancy of new systems as a result of lack of resources for maintenance. Whilst it is anticipated districts will increasingly have adequate resources (District members of Parliament being allocated 15M per district) capacity development, development planning, and budgeting is needed to ensure the consistent flow of funds to the highest priority development needs.

Capacity Development

---

16 Mainstream capacity development responses across the UNDAF 2018-2022 for both rights holders and duty bearers. This includes consideration of forging the necessary partnerships during the life of the programme to ensure sustainability over the longer term. Consideration for the specific capacity development needs of civil society as implementing partners and all levels of Government working in a decentralised governance system, in line with national development priorities being integral to the 'how' of the next programme cycle in terms of contributing to the achievement of national development objectives.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Consultancy: UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader

Location:	Port Moresby, capital of Papua New Guinea with travel to the districts if/when required.
Application Deadline:	January 15
Additional Category:	UNDAF Evaluation
Type of Contract:	Individual Consultant
Project:	UNDAF 2012-2017 End of Programme Evaluation
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date:	February 1st
Duration of Initial Contract:	Maximum of 35 Working Days

Background

The UN Country Programme (UNCP) in Papua New Guinea is a 'self-starter' for the Delivering as One (DaO) approach, since 2006. This approach has been built on the key elements of results-based management (RBM) such as a focus on performance management, alignment of the UNCP Results and Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks with national policy, strategic documents and planning frameworks, and building on the comparative advantage of the UNCT's strategic position in Papua New Guinea (PNG). In line with this approach the current United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) cycle outlines the strategic programme framework for the UN in PNG and is accompanied by an UNDAF Action Plan that operationalising the UNDAF strengthening partnership between the UN system and the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG).

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) provided the basis for the UN's strategic positioning and support to national development plans while the UNDAF Action Plan introduced new ways of providing assistance in line with ongoing UN Reform as well as the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. Both the UNDAF and Action Plan aim to simplify and harmonize the UN's contribution to national development, ensure alignment with GoPNG priorities and to utilize national systems and procedures for programme delivery to reduce transaction costs.

The current UNDAF and Action Plan were originally planned to be for a four year period (2012-2015). However, following a GoPNG request, the UN extended the UNDAF for a further two years (from 2015 to 2017). The agreement to extend the UNDAF was in order to align with GoPNG's Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP) 2 2016-2017. Upon agreeing to extend the current UNDAF cycle in 2014 the UN team, together with a representative from PNG's Department of National Planning and Monitoring (DNPM), reviewed progress against the existing UNDAF and made some changes to the plans and expected outputs, which remain closely aligned to GoPNG priorities for the period up to 2017.

The UNDAF was themed as 'Supporting PNG to accelerate MDG Achievement' and the following development pillars were identified and agreed upon by the UN and GoPNG as priority outcome areas in support of the GoPNG's MTDP Plan 2011-2015:

1. Governance for Equitable Development
2. Social Justice, Protection and Gender Equality

3. Access to Basic Services
4. Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management

The key strategies underpinning the UNDAF are capacity development, the promotion of human rights and the application of a human rights-based approach to programming, the empowerment and strengthening of civil society, promotion of evidence-based monitoring systems, mainstreaming of gender equality and opportunities for women, and fighting HIV and AIDS and other communicable diseases.

The United Nations Country Team in PNG, in collaboration with its GoPNG partners, is currently in the process of preparing an End of Programme UNDAF Evaluation, which will serve as a major input for the planning process of the next UNDAF cycle and an accountability tool for the delivery of results during the current UNDAF cycle. This is a joint evaluation being co-managed by the UN and DNPM.

The UNDAF evaluation will seek to be independent, credible and useful, and will adhere to the highest possible professional standards in evaluation including the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation. The evaluation will be responsive to the needs and priorities of the UN system and GoPNG and engage the participation of a broad range of stakeholders.

A short-term Evaluation Team composed of an Evaluation Team Leader, Evaluation Specialist and National Evaluation Consultant is therefore to be deployed to conduct an independent, evidence based evaluation of the 2012-2017 UNDAF as per the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Terms of Reference.

Duties and Responsibilities
Under the general supervision of the UN Resident Coordinator, delegated, on a daily basis, to the Evaluation Manager (M&E Specialist- Resident Coordinator's Office) and in close cooperation with the Evaluation Management Group (consisting of UN and Department of National Planning and Monitoring representatives), the consultant- taking due consideration of the relevant United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards of Evaluation- shall have overall responsibility for conducting and managing the evaluation and producing the deliverables outlined in the ToR:

- *Overall coordination and management of the Evaluation Team to deliver on the expected outputs;*
- *Lead the evaluation process in a timely manner;*
- *Lead the development of a prioritised and sequenced the inception report including harmonized evaluation plan outlining methodology and timeline;*
- *Identify additional support needs that may be required for conducting the evaluation;*
- Lead the Evaluation Team in conducting a thorough desk review;
- Lead the Evaluation Team in conducting field visits to the project sites identified and collect data;
- Lead the Evaluation Team in conducting key informant interviews, focus group discussion, surveys, questionnaires etc. for data collection as needed;
- *Produce the UNDAF evaluation draft and final reports, responsible for quality assurance and timely submission of the report to the EMG, UN RC office and the UNCT;*
- Lead the Evaluation Team in conducting stakeholder consultations including, a validation workshop followed by presenting the UNDAF evaluation results and ways forward upon submission and approval of the final report; and
- *Ensure a gender-sensitive, as well as human-rights based approach.*

Management and coordination of the Evaluation Team will be delivered in line with the parameters set out in the UNDAF evaluation ToR and the Evaluation Team's inception report, including harmonized evaluation plan. The Evaluation Team Leader is responsible for quality assurance of the work of Evaluation Team members and ensuring strict adherence to the UNEG Norms and Standards of Evaluation. Payment of the Team Leader is based on the delivery of outputs quality assured and accepted outputs as described in the evaluation ToR.

The Evaluation Team leader will work in close collaboration with the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Management Group in focusing the evaluation on lessons learned for the next UNDAF cycle, potential approaches and entry points for mainstreaming the Sustainable Development Goals into the next UNDAF and assessing the relevance and contribution of the UNDAF 2012-2017 to national development results.

Deliverables:
1. **Inception report-** The Evaluation Team will collect data using the proposed methodologies: desk review, observation, interviews and focus group discussions including participation of relevant stakeholders within DaO. The Evaluation Team will develop a full methodology and survey instruments and an Evaluation Plan as part of the Inception Report which will include a stakeholder stake map, the final list of evaluation questions, the evaluation matrix, the overall evaluation design and methodology, a detailed description of the data collection plan for the field phase, and a description of the roles and responsibilities of the individual team members.
2. *A PowerPoint presentation highlighting the main components of the final inception report, reflecting the comments provided by the EMG and key stakeholders, to be presented to the EMG and the UNCT.*
3. **A PowerPoint presentation** and stakeholder meeting to share and explain findings to stakeholders after data collection phase has ended.
4. *Draft UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Report. The Evaluation Team will write a draft UNDAF report and a proposed action plan for implementation of evaluation recommendations (ANNEX 5), keeping in mind the proposed structure of the final UNDAF report (ANNEX 2) distributing to members of the EMG for review and comments. The revised draft report shall thereafter be submitted to the UNCT and Steering Committee with a validation workshop being held to validate the preliminary findings and recommendations.*
5. *Final UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Report. The final report should be based on two rounds of commenting on draft evaluation reports, taking into account potential comments from the Steering Committee, EMG and the UNCT. The final version will be submitted in English to the UN Country Team and Steering Committee through the Resident Coordinator for review by the Steering Committee. It will include a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations logically linked to the findings and conclusions, and identify lessons learnt to improve the strategies, implementation mechanism, and management of the next UNDAF as well as a proposed Action Plan for the next programme cycle. There will be clear guidance provided on mainstreaming the SDGs into the next UNDAF cycle.*

Competencies
- Substantive knowledge of development issues, especially related to the four outcome pillars of the 2012-2017 UNDAF as well as strong understanding of and

experience with gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights as cross-cutting development themes.

- Specialized experience and/or methodological/technical knowledge, including some specific data collection and analytical skills, particularly in the following areas: understanding of human rights-based approaches to programming; gender considerations; Results Based Management (RBM) principles; logic modelling/logical framework analysis; quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches.
- Excellent knowledge of the UN system and UN common country programming processes
- Demonstrated knowledge of Delivering as One
- Challenges and sensitivity in terms of the political context of Papua New Guinea.
- Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice.
- Previous experience working in Papua New Guinea or similar settings in the region is an advantage.
- Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills.
- Excellent presentation and drafting, report writing skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.
- Fluency in written and spoken English is essential.
- Knowledge of Tok Pisin, or other local languages, is considered an advantage.

Required Skills and Expertise
- *The successful candidate will have an Advanced Post-graduate degree (Masters and equivalent) in one of the following disciplines: international relations, political science, international development, governance and public policy, social sciences, evaluation or a related subject.*
- *A minimum of ten years of functionally-related professional evaluation experience including documented previous experience in managing and leading complex UNDAF evaluations.*
- *Strong knowledge, understanding and experience in integrating gender sensitive and human rights based approaches into evaluations.*

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK (UNDAF) 2012-2017 END OF PROGRAMME EVALUATION
December 2015
Terms of Reference
UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation
United Nations Papua New Guinea - Delivering as One

I. BACKGROUND

1.1 Development Context

Papua New Guinea (PNG) achieved independence from Australia in 1975 and is home to 7,275,324 million people according to the 2011 National Population and Housing Census. This figure was a 40% increase from the population count captured in the 2000 Census. PNG has experienced strong GDP growth since 2010 however the 2014 National Human Development Report (NHDR) notes that 'there is a widespread perception within the country that the extractive-based form of development has not been inclusive or reached as many Papua New Guineans as it could and should have'. In 2014 PNG was ranked 157th out of 187 countries in the Human Development Index placing in the low human development category- this represents a fall of four places from the 153 rank achieved in 2011.

The country faces a range of complex challenges including service delivery to a diverse, dispersed and mostly rural population spread over 600 islands, poor accessibility to parts of the country, high logistical costs and supply management difficulty. In 2012 only 7 per cent of the population had access to the electric grid and reticulated water, and two-fifths of health/sub-health centres and rural health posts had no electricity or essential medical equipment.

Another challenge faced by the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG) and development partners is the relatively high level of crime and violence in PNG contributing to a high cost of security overheads. In addition to these costs the high rate of crime, including domestic violence, has a long-term social impact constraining mobility and negatively impacting development interventions. The country has also faced periods of political instability including the 2011-2012 constitutional crisis.

PNG has a high level of decentralisation with 22 provinces, 89 districts, 313 Local Level Governments (LLGs) and 6,131 Wards. In May 2012 two new provinces officially came into existence, the Hela Province and the Jiwaka Province continuing the general trend in PNG towards increased financial devolution to provinces, districts and LLGs. The NHDR notes that with the recent trend towards decentralisation 'central government policy making and fiscal control remains strong while implementation and service delivery is limited by weak capacity among both line government agencies and the sub-national service providers. This has led to inefficiencies in the public service, including corruption'.

There are 15 resident UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes (AFPs) operating in PNG of varying sizes each with a specific mandate, capacity and role to play in the development process. During the preparation stage of the UNDAF (2012-2017) the UN Country Team (UNCT) in PNG identified dramatic increases in operational costs as a threat to programme delivery. To mitigate this potential impediment the UNCT developed an operational strategy that focuses on a dual approach of resource mobilisation and reducing operational overheads.

1.2. The Papua New Guinea UNDAF 2012- 2017
The UN Country Programme (UNCP) in Papua New Guinea is a 'self-starter' for the Delivering as One (DaO) approach, since 2006. This approach has been built on the key elements of results-based management (RBM) such as a focus on performance management,

alignment of the UNCP Results and Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks with national policy, strategic documents and planning frameworks, and building on the comparative advantage of the UNCT's strategic position in PNG. In line with this approach the current UNDAF cycle outlines the strategic programme framework for the UN in PNG and is accompanied by an UNDAF Action Plan that operationalising the UNDAF strengthening partnership between the UN system and GoPNG.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) provided the basis for the UN's strategic positioning and support to national development plans while the UNDAF Action Plan introduced new ways of providing assistance in line with ongoing UN Reform as well as the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. Both the UNDAF and Action Plan aim to simplify and harmonize the UN's contribution to national development, ensure alignment with GoPNG priorities and to utilize national systems and procedures for programme delivery to reduce transaction costs.

The current UNDAF and Action Plan were originally planned to be for a four year period (2012-2015). However, following a GoPNG request, the UN extended the UNDAF for a further two years (from 2015 to 2017). The agreement to extend the UNDAF was in order to align with GoPNG's Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP) 2 2016-2017. Upon agreeing to extend the current UNDAF cycle in 2014 the UN team, together with a representative from PNG's Department of National Planning and Monitoring (DNPM), reviewed progress against the existing UNDAF and made some changes to the plans and expected outputs, which remain closely aligned to GoPNG priorities for the period up to 2017.

The UNDAF was themed as 'Supporting PNG to accelerate MDG Achievement' and the following development pillars were identified and agreed upon by the UN and GoPNG as priority outcome areas in support of the GoPNG's MTDP Plan 2011-2015:

1. Governance for Equitable Development
2. Social Justice, Protection and Gender Equality
3. Access to Basic Services
4. Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management

The key strategies underpinning the UNDAF are capacity development, the promotion of human rights and the application of a human rights-based approach to programming, the empowerment and strengthening of civil society, promotion of evidence-based monitoring systems, mainstreaming of gender equality and opportunities for women, and fighting HIV and AIDS and other communicable diseases.

1.3 UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation in the context of Papua New Guinea
The UNCT PNG, in collaboration with its GoPNG partners is currently in the process of preparing an End of Programme UNDAF Evaluation, which will serve as a major input for the planning process of the next UNDAF and an accountability tool for the delivery of results during the current UNDAF cycle. This is a joint evaluation being co-managed by the UN and DNPM.

The UNDAF Evaluation will seek to be independent, credible and useful, and will adhere to the highest possible professional standards in evaluation including the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation. The evaluation will be responsive to the needs and priorities of the UN system and GoPNG and engage the participation of a broad range of stakeholders.

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1 Purpose

The UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation will be completed by May 2016 so as to inform the next programme cycle by generating evidence and lessons learnt based on the assessment of the current performance of the UNDAF outcomes and process. The evaluation will determine how the UNDAF helped UN agencies to contribute more effectively and efficiently to national development efforts, including aligning with GoPNG priorities and strategies and shaping the development agenda. The purpose of the evaluation is twofold, it is a learning tool informing future programming and will also support greater accountability of the UNCT to UNDAF stakeholders.

The primary users of the evaluation will be the UNDAF partners, i.e. the UNCT, GoPNG, donors and partners who support the programmes. The timing of this evaluation is crucial in feeding into the preparation and planning phase for the next UNDAF cycle which is scheduled to commence in the final quarter of 2016.

2.2 Objectives

The objectives of the UNDAF Evaluation are:

1. To assess the relevance and contribution of the UNDAF to national development results and MDG achievement given the PNG context.
2. To identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution and assess how the UNDAF has been implemented, answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks supporting greater accountability to UNDAF stakeholders.
3. To generate a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations logically linked to the findings and conclusions. These recommendations will include specific guidance on how to implement, monitor and evaluate the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the next UNDAF cycle.

2.3 Scope and Key Questions

Given the context described above, the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation will focus on programme relevance, effectiveness and efficiency while also looking at the sustainability of interventions moving into the next UNDAF cycle and the process of mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

While the evaluation will be conducted mainly in Port Moresby, capital of PNG, the Evaluation Team is encouraged to consider including 1-2 field visits in their methodology. When choosing sites to visit, the Evaluation Team should consider the availability of baseline data for these sites, and make the choice of the locations to visit based on the implementation of relevant UN programmes in these areas. The proposed field visits should be presented in the inception report, and should be discussed with the Evaluation Management Group (EMG).

The evaluation will examine the following areas:

A. *__Relevance__* of the UNDAF in relation to the issues it was designed to address as well as their underlying causes in the context of national policies and strategies:
   - Do the UNDAF outcomes address key issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified by GoPNG strategic plans and priorities?
   - To what extent has the UNDAF results matrix been sufficiently flexible to adjust to evolving national policies and strategies (e.g. National Development Plans and Goals, legislative reforms) and changing development circumstances during the current programme cycle?
   - To what extent have the UNDAF outcomes been relevant to internationally agreed goals and commitments guiding the work of UN AFPs?
   - To what extent have human rights principles and standards been reflected or promoted in the UNDAF?

- How can the next the planning phase for the next UNDAF cycle best incorporate the SDGs to ensure that the post 2015 development agenda is fully reflected?
- To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of gender equity and equality and other cross-cutting issues reflected in programming? Were specific goals and targets set and if so have they been met?

B. Assess the ***effectiveness*** of UNDAF implementation and performance in terms of progress towards agreed UNDAF outcomes. Identify lessons learnt for future programming, particularly how the UN can best contribute to mainstreaming and localising the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda:
- What progress has been made towards the realization of UNDAF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of National Priorities and the MDGs? What lessons learnt can be identified and used to guide planning for mainstreaming and localising the SDGs in the next UNDAF programme cycle?
- What are the main factors that contributed to the realization or non-realization of the outcomes?
- Were expected outcomes realistic given the UNDAF timeframe, AFPs' capacities and resources?
- To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context and contributed to streamlining the work of the UN in PNG?

C. Assess the ***efficiency*** of the UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework:
- To what extent and in what ways has the UNDAF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN AFPs?
- To what extent the effectiveness of programme support by individual AFPs been enhanced as a result of joint programming?
- Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNDAF partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and have the arrangements been respected in the course of implementation?
- Have the external and internal structures for programme delivery facilitated the efficient and effective delivery of UNDAF results and reduced duplication?
- Are the funding allocations, task team budgets and overall expenditures aligned with the stated UNDAF priorities and sufficiently targeted to maximise efficiency?

D. To the extent possible, assess the medium term ***impact*** of UNDAF on the lives of the poor, vulnerable and marginalized in PNG, notably in the realization of MDGs and MTDP:
- Determine whether there is any major change in UNDAF and national development indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with UNDAF implementation.
- Identify the contribution the UNDAF has made to working with key strategic partners in reaching the poor, vulnerable and marginalized through UNDAF implementation.
- Based on the human rights and gender equality principles applied during UNDAF implementation what observable or measurable impact has the UNDAF had on human rights and gender equality in PNG to date?

E. Analyse to what extent results achieved and strategies used by the UNDAF are ***sustainable*** (i) as a contribution to national development and (ii) in terms of the added value of UNDAF for cooperation among individual AFPs:
- To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced in government, civil society and NGOs in order to enable these actors to continue achieving positive results without the UN/development partners' support?

- To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?
- Have complementarities, collaboration and /or synergies fostered by UNDAF contributed to greater sustainability of results of Donors intervention in the country?
- Does the UNDAF respond to the challenges of national capacity development and promote ownership of programmes?

III. PROPOSED EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

The UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation will utilise a mixed method approach and be carried out in accordance with UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation and Ethical Standards as well as OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and fully compliant with the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports. The evaluation will be conducted in close collaboration with the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO), UNCT, EMG, the UN's RBM Committee, the United Nations Evaluation Development Group for Asia and the Pacific (UNEDAP) and national counterparts.

3.1. Methodology
Once the Evaluation Team members for the UNDAF Evaluation have been selected, during the inception phase, a thorough preparatory work should be conducted by the team members, including a comprehensive desk review, to define their specific evaluation approach, data collection methods and required evaluation tools. A Harmonized Evaluation Plan will be developed accordingly including qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate the UNDAF implementation and performance and to make recommendations informing the next programming cycle.

3.2 Data Collection
The UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UN and its thematic task teams, GoPNG institutions, CSOs as well as development partners and beneficiaries. Field visits to selected project sites and briefing and debriefing sessions with UN and GoPNG officials, development partners, and civil society are envisaged.

In order to use existing information and avoid duplication, secondary data will be mainly collected from various data sources including a comprehensive desk review and analysis of relevant documents as well as triangulation of different studies. Data is to be presented/disaggregated (by sex, age and location), where possible. Primary data will also be collected from stakeholder key informant interviews, discussions, field visits and consultative processes. At the beginning of the field mission, the Evaluation Team will present the inception report and seek agreement on the evaluation methodology.

3.3 Processes
The evaluation will be conducted in three phases:

Phase 1- Preparation:
- Collection of reference material: The UN RCO, in close consultations with the RBM Committee, will compile a list of background materials, documents, and reports relevant to the UNDAF Evaluation.
- Identification and selection of consultants: The UNCT will jointly identify and select the appropriate consultants for the UNDAF Evaluation Team. The UN RCO will take the lead, jointly with the EMG, in soliciting CVs of available consultants.

- Development of evaluation strategy and design: Prior to the main data collection phase, the UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader will assess the availability of evaluative evidence, and develop an operational plan (a 'Harmonized Evaluation Plan'), which will include a design matrix, data collection and analysis methods and potential sites for field visits.

Phase 2 – Conduct of data collection activities and the preparation of the evaluation reports:
- Desk review of reference material: All Evaluation Team members are responsible for reviewing the reference documents, reports and any other data and information provided by the RCO.
- Main data collection mission: The Evaluation Team will conduct data collection activities as guided by the Harmonized Evaluation Plan. The team will conduct agreed-upon interviews with stakeholders, surveys, questionnaires and site visits etc. facilitated by the EMG.
- Data analysis and reporting: The Evaluation Team will conduct further data analysis based on all information collected, and present the preliminary findings to stakeholders prior to preparing a draft evaluation report. The UNDAF Evaluation Team will write and submit the draft report to the UNCT. The UNDAF Report will be written in accordance with it respective Terms of Reference, the Harmonized Evaluation Plan and other established guidance documents.
- Review of the draft report and finalisation of the report: the draft UNDAF Report will be submitted to key stakeholders for factual correction and feedback. The Evaluation Team Leader, in consultation with the UNCT, will prepare a comment matrix to indicate how the comments were taken into account, and together with the team of consultants, will finalise the UNDAF Evaluation Report. Stakeholder workshops: A meeting with the key stakeholders will be organized in the country, to present the UNDAF Evaluation results and discuss ways forward. UNCT to prepare a Management Response.

Phase 3 - Follow-up:
The UNCT together with the RCO will conduct follow-up activities, as guided by their respective processes and mandates. In the context of the UNDAF Evaluation:
- Organization of a stakeholders' meeting/workshop to validate and refine findings, conclusions and recommendations, discuss dissemination and communication strategies and plan for implementation of evaluation recommendations. The follow-up plan should determine a process for ensuring that lessons learnt are incorporated into the next UNDAF programming cycle.
- Dissemination of the evaluation findings and recommendations.
- Implementation of a follow-up plan, in particular focusing on the design of a new UNDAF cycle.

IV. TEAM STRUCTURE FOR THE UNDAF EVALUATION

The UNDAF Evaluation Team will be led by the UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader (UNDAF Evaluation Expert) and consist of the Team Leader plus a National Evaluation Specialist and National Evaluation Consultant. The Evaluation Team Leader will be an international position and all consultants will be mobilised through the individual contracting modality. The Evaluation Team will demonstrate a high level of capacity and experience with evaluations in the UN context, as well as knowledge and understanding of the four UNDAF outcome pillars

and development context of PNG. The Evaluation Team Leader is tasked with managing and ensuring the quality of the work conducted by Evaluation Team members and has ultimate responsibility for delivering results- they will be responsible for the quality and timeliness of all deliverables and guide and supervise the National Evaluation Specialist and National Evaluation Consultant. Payment of Evaluation Team members is subject to validation of the quality and timeliness of their work by the Evaluation Team Leader.

All consultants shall be charged with incorporating human rights and gender equality assessments into their relevant portfolios. The selected consultants are expected to be independent and should not have been involved in the implementation of the UNDAF (2012-2017) in any of the UN agencies. See ANNEX 4 for outline of required expertise and qualifications of the Evaluation Team.

V. DELIVERABLES

1. *Inception report- The Evaluation Team will collect data using the proposed methodologies: surveys, questionnaires, desk review, observation, interviews and focus group discussions including participation of relevant stakeholders within DaO etc. The Evaluation Team will develop a full methodology and survey instruments and an Evaluation Plan as part of the Inception Report which will include a stakeholder stake map, the final list of evaluation questions, the evaluation matrix, the overall evaluation design and methodology, a detailed description of the data collection plan for the field phase, and a description of the roles and responsibilities of the individual team members.*
2. *A PowerPoint presentation highlighting the main components of the final inception report, reflecting the comments provided by the EMG and key stakeholders, to be presented to the EMG and the UNCT.*
3. *A PowerPoint presentation and stakeholder meeting to share and explain findings to stakeholders after data collection phase has ended.*
4. *Draft UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Report. The Evaluation Team will write a draft UNDAF report and a proposed action plan for implementation of evaluation recommendations (ANNEX 5), keeping in mind the proposed structure of the final UNDAF report (ANNEX 2) distributing to members of the EMG for review and comments. The revised draft report shall thereafter be submitted to the UNCT and Steering Committee with a validation workshop being held to validate the preliminary findings and recommendations.*
5. *Final UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Report. The final report should be based on two rounds of commenting on draft evaluation reports, taking into account potential comments from the Steering Committee, EMG and the UNCT. The final version will be submitted in English to the UN Country Team and Steering Committee through the Resident Coordinator for review by the Steering Committee. It will include a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations logically linked to the findings and conclusions, and identify lessons learnt to improve the strategies, implementation mechanism, and management of the next UNDAF as well as a proposed Action Plan for the next programme cycle. There will be clear guidance provided on mainstreaming the SDGs into the next UNDAF cycle.*

18

VI. ESTIMATED BUDGET

International Consultant	US$
National Consultant(s)	US$
Internal Travel*	US$
Validation Workshop*	US$
Total Budget	US$

* Please note that internal travel and meetings/workshops/stakeholder consultations costings will not be required as these will be calculated according to the experiences of the UN in PNG. Outline proposed meetings, field visits and workshops including number of participants etc. and the costing will be worked out on a basis applicable to all received proposals.

The costs of the UNDAF evaluation will be covered by UNCT's budget and payment of fees will be based on the delivery of outputs, as follows:

- Upon selection and signing of contract: 10%
- Upon satisfactory submission of the inception report: 10%
- Upon satisfactory submission of the draft evaluation report: 30%
- Upon satisfactory submission of the final evaluation report: 50%

UNDAF Evaluation ToR's | Annexes I - VI

ANNEX 1: Management, Roles and Responsibilities

Who: Actors and Accountability	What: Roles and Responsibilities
Steering Committee	- Commission and oversee the evaluation. - Ensure decisions are made on time. - Provide the overall, high level, oversight and approval of the Evaluation process, findings, recommendations and all key deliverables. - Develop a follow-up plan and management response to the evaluation and ensure the implementation of committed actions.
RC Office	- Facilitate solicitation, selection and recruitment of the Evaluation Team members. - Establish the Evaluation Management Group. - Day-to-day management, in close coordination with the EMG (through Evaluation Manager). - Ensure close communication with the Evaluation Team during the whole evaluation process. - Facilitate communication between the Evaluation Team and the SC/UNCT/EMG - Help arrange the travel to the project site and other logistic issues. - Consolidate the feedback on the UNDAF Evaluation reports, and with the Team Leader in a timely manner. - Facilitate dissemination of evaluation reports to stakeholders.
Evaluation Management Group	- Prepare ToR for the evaluation. - Rate and shortlist CVs choosing Evaluation Team. - Contribute to the final selection of evaluation questions. - Participate in the review of the evaluation methodology and provide comments to the Evaluation Team. - Help identify the projects to be visited. - Facilitate access of the Evaluation Team to information sources (documents and interviewees) to support data collection. - Provide technical inputs, comments and quality assurance on the main deliverables of the evaluation, including the design, draft, and final reports.

	• Clarify questions raised during the evaluation. • Monitor the progress of the evaluation and report progress to UNCT. • Safeguard the independence of the evaluation exercise and advise on the quality of the work done by the Evaluation Team. • Assist in the integration of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation into future programme design and implementation. • Approve final report. • Support the UNCT in the development of a management response.
United Nations Evaluation Development Group for Asia and the Pacific	• Provide quality assurance support on evaluation process and tangible deliverables and products. • Provide expertise and guidance as requested by the EMG. • Support the use of global norms and standards in Asia and the Pacific and promote networking on evaluation as a profession across the region.
Evaluation Team	• Have overall responsibility for producing the UNDAF Evaluation Report and for quality and timely submission of the same Report to the UN RC Office and UNCT. • Lead the evaluation process in a timely manner. • Produce the inception report including Harmonized Evaluation Plan outlining methodology and timeline. • Agree final methodology and evaluation focus in consultation with EMG. • Communicate with UN whenever it is needed, particularly the EMG on a regular basis highlighting progress made/challenges encountered. • Conduct thorough desk review. • Conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data. • Conduct key informant interviews, focus group discussion etc. for data collection as needed. • Conduct stakeholder consultations including validation workshop followed by presenting the UNDAF Evaluation results and ways forward upon submission and approval of the final report. • Responsible for producing the UNDAF Evaluation draft and final reports and for quality and timely submission of the report to the EMG, UN RC office and the UNCT.

ANNEX 2: Structure of the UNDAF Report
Title page
Name of programme or theme being evaluated
Country of project/programme or theme
Name of the organization to which the report is submitted
Names and affiliations of the evaluators
Date
Table of Contents
List of acronyms
Executive summary

- A self-contained paper of 1-3 pages.
- Summarize essential information on the subject being evaluated, the purpose and objectives of the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation methods applied and major limitations, the most important findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order. **(Maximum 5 pages)**

(Main Report; Maximum 35 pages)
Introduction
- (Context and national priorities, goals, and methodology, brief description of the results)
- Describe the project/programme/theme being evaluated. This includes the problems that the interventions are addressing; the aims, strategies, scope and cost of the intervention; its key stakeholders and their roles in implementing the intervention.
- Summarize the UNDAF purpose, objectives, and key questions. Explain the rationale for selection/non selection of evaluation criteria.
- Describe the methodology employed to conduct the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation and its limitations if any.
- Detail who was involved in conducting the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation and what were their roles.
- Describe the structure of the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation report.
- A Reflection on the main findings which considers: (a) the results of the desk review of existing documentation available, and (b) the interviews conducted with Heads of UN Agencies, selected senior programme staff, and selected senior Government officials.
- Results by UNDAF Outcome: national progress, specific contribution of UN agencies and resources mobilised etc.

Partnership and collaboration strategy among UNCT and other donors; and evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of UNDAF as a partnership framework
Major Challenges
UNDAF Financial Management
Assessment of M&E process
Findings and conclusions
- State findings based on the evidence derived from the information collected. Assess the degree to which the intervention design is applying results based management principles and human rights based approach. In providing a critical assessment of performance, analyse the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and if possible impact. To the extent possible measure achievement of results in quantitative and qualitative terms. Analyse factors that affected performance as well as unintended effects, both positive and negative. Discuss the relative contributions of stakeholders to achievement of results. Assess how/if the intervention has contributed to gender equality and fulfilment of human rights.
- Conclusions should be substantiated by the findings and be consistent with the data collected. They must relate to the UNDAF objectives and provide answers to the evaluation questions. They should also include a discussion of the reasons for successes and failures, especially the constraints and enabling factors.

Recommendations and lessons learnt
- Based on the findings and drawing from the evaluator(s)' overall experience in other contexts if possible provide lessons learned that may be applicable in other situations as well. Include both positive and negative lessons.
- Formulate relevant, specific and realistic recommendations that are based on the evidence gathered, conclusions made and lessons learned. Discuss their anticipated implications. Consult key stakeholders when developing the recommendations.
- List proposals for action to be taken (short and long-term) by the person(s), unit or organization responsible for follow-up in priority order. Maximum of ten recommendation points.

Follow up Plan
- This may include current UNDAF
- Next UNDAF
- Provide suggested time lines and cost estimates (where relevant) for implementation.

19

Annexes may include the following (maximum 10-15 pages)
- Attach ToR (for the UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation).
- List persons interviewed, sites visited.
- List documents reviewed (reports, publications).
- Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc.).
  - Assessment of the progress by outcomes in relevance to the nationally defined goals.
  - Photos
  - Stories worth telling (Most Significant changes [MSC])
  - List of used documents and persons met.

*The UNDAF Evaluation Report should be developed in accordance with the UNEG "Standards for Evaluation in the UN system", "Norms for Evaluation in UN System and "Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation." Analysis should include an appropriate discussion of the relative contributions of stakeholders to results. It will consider the evaluation objectives as per *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact* and *sustainability of results*, as well as the key issues of *design, focus* and *comparative advantage.*

ANNEX 3: Recommended List of Documents
1. Papua New Guinea Medium Term Development Plan 2 2016-2017
   http://www.planning.gov.pg/images/pdf/MTDP2.pdf
2. Papua New Guinea Development Strategic Plan 2010-2030
   http://www.health.gov.pg/publications/PNGDSP_Final%20Version%20for%20Print.pdf
3. Papua New Guinea Vision 2050
   http://www.treasury.gov.pg/html/publications/files/pub_files/2011/2011.png.vision.2050.pdf
4. The Alotau Accord 2012
   http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/papua-new-guinea-alotau-accord-summary-oneill-gov-priorities.pdf
5. Papua New Guinea National HIV & AIDS Strategy 2011-2015

http://www.nacs.org.pg/attachments/article/74/PNG_NHS_Implementation.pdf

6. Papua New Guinea National Health Plan, 2011-2020
   http://www.wpro.who.int/papuanewguinea/areas/papua_new_guinea_nationalhealthplan.pdf
7. Papua New Guinea National Strategy for Sustainable Development 2nd Edition
   http://www.planning.gov.pg/images/pdf/StaRS.pdf
8. UN Annual Progress Reports and individual agency Annual Reports (2012-2015)
   http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/PG100
   Annual Progress Report 2014
   Annual Progress Report 2013
   Annual Progress Report 2012
9. UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation
   https://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/about_iom/eva_techref/UNEG_Standards_for_Evaluation.pdf
10. UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports
    http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/607
11. UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports
20   *http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/607*

Survey and Studies
Demographic Health Survey 2006
http://phtpacific.org/sites/default/files/surveys_dev_reports/90/files/PNG_DemographicHealthSurvey-2006_2009-07_GoPNG.pdf
The National Population and Housing Census 2011

ANNEX 4: Required Expertise and Qualifications of the Evaluation Team
The Evaluation Team will be composed of three members, an international UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader, a National Evaluation Specialist and a National Evaluation Consultant. Each team member has a separate Terms of Reference attached to their Individual Consultant Procurement Notice for their reference and attention.

The evaluation members must have considerable experience in conducting evaluations and broad knowledge of the four UNDAF Outcome Pillars and cross-cutting issues (gender equality and human rights). The Evaluation Team Leader (UNDAF Evaluation Expert) should have profound knowledge of One UN reform and Delivering as One and experience conducting UNDAF End of Programme Evaluations.

The Evaluation Team Leader should be able to demonstrate:

A. A minimum of 10 years' relevant professional experience in evaluation in developing countries is required.
B. Documented previous experience in managing and leading complex UNDAF evaluations, and a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies.
C. Substantive knowledge of development issues, especially related to the four outcome pillars of the 2012-2017 UNDAF as well as strong understanding of and experience with gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights as cross-cutting development themes.
D. Specialized experience and/or methodological/technical knowledge, including some specific data collection and analytical skills, particularly in the following areas: understanding of human rights-based approaches to programming; gender considerations; Results Based Management (RBM) principles; logic modelling/logical framework analysis; quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches.

E. Excellent knowledge of the UN system and UN common country programming processes.
F. Demonstrated knowledge of Delivering as One.
G. Knowledge and sensitivity in terms of the political context of Papua New Guinea.
H. Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice.
I. Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills.
J. Excellent presentation and drafting, report writing skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.
K. Ability to handle a large volume of work possibly under time constraints.

The National Evaluation Specialist should be able to demonstrate:
L. Minimum 7 years' experience in evaluation in developing countries.
M. Documented previous experience in evaluations in the UN system, and a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies.
N. Substantive knowledge of development issues (in particular, programmatic areas covered by UNDAF in the country) and understanding of the development context of Papua New Guinea.
O. Strong skills and experience in evaluating programmatic areas covered by UNDAF in the country (governance for equitable development, social justice, protection and gender equality, access to basic services and environment, climate change and disaster risk management).
P. Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice.
Q. Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills.
R. Excellent drafting skills and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.
S. Conceptualizes and analyses problems to identify key issues, underlying problems, and how they relate.
T. Ability to build and sustain effective dialogue with main constituents, communicate effectively and sensitively across different constituencies.
U. Ability to handle a large volume of work possibly under time constraints.
V. Fluency in written and spoken English and Tok Pisin.

The National Evaluation Consultant should be able to demonstrate:
W. Proven experience in the field of development cooperation in Papua New Guinea.
X. Experience conducting evaluations in Papua New Guinea, combined with a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies.
Y. Substantive knowledge development issues in PNG and their institutional and social context.
Z. Familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.
AA. Strong inter-personal, teamwork, organizational and interview skills.
BB. Knowledge of Papua New Guinea, its institutions, key development stakeholders and partners.
CC. Ability to build and sustain effective dialogue with main constituents, communicate effectively and sensitively across different constituencies.
DD. Fluency in written and spoken English and Tok Pisin.
EE. Ability to handle a large volume of work possibly under time constraints.

ANNEX 5: Suggested Format of Proposed Action Plan for Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations

Recommendations	Strategy *(how)*	Responsible parties *(who)*	Deadline/ follow-up and note, if any

ANNEX 6: The UNDAF End of Programme Evaluation Process & Timeframe

DATE	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE
October- December 2015	Preparatory Activities:	RCO, UNCT, Evaluation Management Group and RBM Committee
	UNDAF ToR drafted, discussed, finalized & adapted in collaboration with GoPNG.	
	UNDAF conceptual framework & management arrangements organization in place	
	Secretariat to facilitate UNDAF process identified	
	Advertisement and evaluation of short listed consultants	
	Reference checks for shortlisted consultants	
	Contract signed with consultants	
January-February 2016	Consultants on board	EMG, RBM Committee and Consultants
	Finalisation of methodology and Inception Report including Harmonized Evaluation Plan and PPT summary presentation to UNCT and EMG	
	Desk review	
	Participatory data gathering	
	Data analysis and report drafting	
March 2016	Workshop for review of preliminary findings and their shaping	Consultants, EMG and Evaluation Manager
	First Interim Report	
	Review of the report by key stakeholders	
	2nd Interim report (Draft UNDAF Report)	
April 2016	Submission of draft full report	Consultants & Steering Committee, EMG, RBM Committee & RCO
	Validation workshop	
	Final report	

Annex 2 – List of people interviewed

UNDAF Evaluation Individual Stakeholder Interviews	
Organization	**Interviewee(s)**
Resident Coordinator's Office	Roy Trivedy, Resident Coordinator
European Union	Adrien Mourgues, Attaché - Deputy Head of Cooperation
Australian High Commission	Sector Heads
UNDP	Tito Balboa, Chief Technical Specialist, Provincial Capacity Building Programme
RCO & UNDP	Jone Baladrokadroka, Development Peace Advisor & Lawrence Bessie, Programme Coordinator Peacebuilding Fund
WHO	Dr Pieter Van Maaren, WHO Representative & Chair Health Task Team
UNAIDS	Stuart Watson, Country Director & Chair Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
UN Women	Dr Jeffrey Buchanan, Country Representative
UN Women	Beatrice Tabeu, National Programme Specialist & co-chair Gender Task Team
OHCHR	Patrick Castellan, Human Rights Advisor & Chair Human Rights Task Team
UNDP	Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov, Deputy Representative
UNDP	Gwen Maru, Programme Analyst-Environment & Chair Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management Task Team
UNDP	Julie Bukikun, Assistant Resident Representative- Governance & Chair Governance and Bougainville Task Teams
UNFPA	Walter Mendonça Filho, Country Representative (& UNFPA Team)
UNICEF	Asefa Tolessa Dano, Chief Child Protection & Chair Child Protection Task Team
Department of National Planning & Monitoring	Loia Joy Vaira, Acting First Assistant Secretary-Foreign Aid Division Department of National Planning and Monitoring
National Department of Health	Sebastian Roberts, Technical Adviser - Gender & Men's Health
National Department of Education	Joe Logha, First Assistant Secretary - Policy & Planning
BIMA	John Vance, Country Representative

Cluster Consultation- Social Justice, Protection & Gender Equality	
Organization	**Name**
Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary	John Kolopen, Director- Community Policing
Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary	Michael Tibam, Crime Prevention Officer with the Community Policing Directorate
Department of Foreign Affairs	Farapo Korere, Foreign Affairs Officer
Village Courts & Land Mediation, Department of Justice & Attorney General	Miriam Dondo

Constitutional Law Reform Commission	Bernadette Cherake, Senior Legal Officer
Department for Community Development	Isabel Salatiel, Senior Child Protection Officer- Office of Child & Family Services
Department of Justice & Attorney General	Terry Lui
PNG Development Law Association	Dr Moale Kariko, Executive Director
Ombudsman Commission	Patrick Niebo, Team Leader Anti-Discrimination & Human Rights Team
IGAT Hope	Rose Kunjip
IGAT Hope	Alfred Mark
Department of Justice & Attorney General, Juvenile Justice	Paul Wagun
Friends Frangipani	Cathy Kefepa, Executive Director
Department for Community Development	Becky Tarubi
Department for Community Development	Nancy Taule, First Assistant Secretary, Gender Division
Constitutional Law Reform Commission	Dr Eric Kwa
Friends Frangipani	Parker Hou
Kapul Champions	Nick Morea
FHI 360	Miriam Dogimab, Project Director
Hope WorldWide	Quina Ongugo
Hope WorldWide	Jenny Kiap
Oil Search Foundation	George Raubi
Magisterial Services	Dessie Magaru, Deputy Chief Magistrate
Department of Justice & Attorney General	Limawali Yalapin
Department of Justice & Attorney General	Amanda White
National Research Institute	Dr Fiona Hukula
Consultative Implementing & Monitoring Council	Ume Wainetti, National Program Coordinator at CIMC/Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee
Ginigoada	Pastor Mike Field
National Capital District Commission	Kila Fredrik Dick

Cluster Consultation- Access to Basic Services	
Organization	Name
National Department of Health	Mary Kililo, Manager- In Service Training
Marie Stopes PNG	Maarten Van De Reep, Country Director
National Department of Health	Dr Paison Dakulala, Undersecretary for Health
Reproductive Health Training Unit	Miriam O'Connor, Technical Advisor
National Department of Health	Johnny

Cluster Consultation- Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management	
Organization	Name
National Forest Inventory	Roy Banka
IOM	Carol Sasa
IOM	Richard West
National Forest Inventory	John Pena
University of Papua New Guinea	Chalapan Kaluwin
Centre for Environmental Law and Community Rights	Rebecca Melepia
PNG Eco-Forestry Forum	Mary Boni

United Nations Programme Staff Consultation	
Organization	**Name**
UNAIDS	Mahboob Rahman, Strategic Information Adviser
UN Women	Danielle Winfrey, Gender Coordination & Resource Mobilisation Officer
UN Women	Lizzette Soria, Safe Cities Programme Specialist
UNDP	Henry Nema, Programme Analyst-Governance
UNDP	Stephen Liston, Project Manager-Governance
UNDP	Gwen Maru, Programme Analyst-Environment
UNDP	Khusrav Sharifov, Disaster Risk Management Technical Specialist
UNDP	Tamalis Akus, National Coordinator

UNDAF Evaluation Field Visit- Goroka	
Organization	**Name**
Provincial Education Authority	Rex Puraso, Provincial Elementary Coordinator
Provincial Health Authority	Marie Maniha, Goroka District Education Manager
Provincial Health Authority	Tony Basse, Deputy Director- Curative Health Services
University of Goroka, Midwifery School	Paula Puawe, Midwifery Educator at The Uiversity of Goroka
University of Goroka, Centre for Social and Creative Media, School of Humanities	Llane Munau, Postgraduate Student in Communication and Social Change & Lily Herbert, Administrator, Yumi Kirapim Senis Initiative

Annex 3 – UNDAF 2012-2017 Major Partners & Stakeholders

Institution	Task Team(s)
Government & State	
Department of Finance	Governance
National Parliament	Governance
Bank of Papua New Guinea	Governance
Autonomous Government of Bougainville	Governance, Bougainville
Department of National Planning & Monitoring	Sustainable Development Goals, Population & Aid Effectiveness
Department of Justice and Attorney General	Human Rights, Gender, Child Protection
National Department of Education	Gender, Education
National Department of Health	Human Rights, Gender, Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS, Health
National Statistics Office	Sustainable Development Goals, Population & Aid Effectiveness, Education
Department of Foreign Affairs	Human Rights
Department for Community Development	Human Rights, Gender, Child Protection, Education
Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary	Human Rights, Gender, Child Protection
Papua New Guinea Correctional Services	Human Rights, Child Protection
Ombudsman Commission	Human Rights
Immigration and Citizenship Service Authority	Human Rights
National AIDS Council	Human Rights, Gender, Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
National Capital District Commission	Gender, Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
Constitutional & Law Reform Commission	Gender, Child Protection
Papua New Guinea National Council for Women	Gender
Magisterial Services	Child Protection
National Broadcasting Corporation	Child Protection
Provincial Departments of Education, National Capital District, Central, Eastern Highlands, Madang, Enga, Jiwaka	Education
Climate Change Development Authority	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
Conservation Environment Protection Authority	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
Papua New Guinea Forest Authority	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
National Office for the Coordination of Bougainville Affairs	Bougainville
Civil Society	
Milvik PNG Ltd (BIMA)	Governance
Bougainville Women's Federation	Bougainville
Family Support Centre	Bougainville
Nazarene Rehabilitation Centre	Bougainville
Consultative Implementation Monitoring Council	Human Rights, Gender, Child Protection, Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management

Kapul Champions	Human Rights, Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
Friends Frangipani	Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
PNG Development Law association	Human Rights
Ginigoada	Gender
Family Health International	Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS, Health
Marie Stopes PNG	Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS, Health
Save the Children	Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
PNG Christian Leaders Alliance on HIV/AIDS	Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
Oil search Foundation	Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS, Health
Population Services International	Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
Safe Motherhood Alliance	Health
Susu Mama	Health
Reproductive Health Training Unit	Health
University of Papua New Guinea	Health, Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
Cheshire Disability Services	Education
Touching the Untouchables	Education
World Wildlife Fund	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
The Nature Conservancy	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
Eco Forestry Forum	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
National Research Institute	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
Igat Hope	Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS
Development Partner	
Australian High Commission	Human Rights, Joint United Nations Team on HIV & AIDS, Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
European Union	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
Asian Development Bank	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management
JICA	Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management

Annex 4 – Evaluation Matrix

Annex 1. Evaluation matrix			
Criteria	**Primary question**	**Sub-question**	**Data collection method/source**
Relevance	1. To what extent did the UNDAF address issues and underlying causes in the context of national policies and strategies?	1.1 Do the UNDAF outcomes address key issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified by GoPNG strategic plans and priorities?	Interviews Document reviews and cross reference
		1.2 To what extent has the UNDAF results matrix been sufficiently flexible to adjust to evolving national policies and strategies (eg National Development Plans and Goals, legislative reforms) and changing development circumstances during the current programme cycle?	Document review Interviews
		1.3 To what extent have the UNDAF outcomes been relevant to international agreed goals and commitments guiding the work of UN AFPs?	Document review
		1.4 To what extent have human rights principles and standards been reflected or promoted in the UNDAF?	UNDAF monitoring reports Interviews
		1.5 How can the next planning phase for the next UNDAF cycle best incorporate the SDGs to ensure that the post 2015 development agenda is fully reflected?	Interviews/survey
		1.6 To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of gender equity and equality and other cross-cutting issues reflected in programming? Were specific goals and targets set and if so have they been met?	Document review Gender score card UNDAF annual monitoring reports Interview/survey
Effectiveness	2. To what extent has UNDAF implementation contributed to progress towards agreed UNDAF outcomes?	2.1 What progress has been made towards the realization of UNDAF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of National Priorities and the MDGs?	UNDAF annual monitoring reports Document review MDG, national reports
		2.2 What lessons learnt can be identified and used to guide planning for mainstreaming and localizing the SDGs in the next UNDAF programming cycle?	MDG reports UNDAF monitoring reports Interview/survey
		2.3 What are the main factors that contributed to the realization or non realization of the outcomes?	UNDAF monitoring reports Interview/survey
		2.4 Were expected outcomes realistic given the UNDAF timeframe, AFPs' capacities and resources?	Interview/survey UNDAF monitoring reports
		2.5 To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context and contributed to streamlining the work of the UN in PNG?	Interview/survey
Efficiency	3. To what extent is the UNDAF a coordination and partnership framework?	3.1 To what extent and in what ways has the UNDAF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programme of UN AFPs?	Interview/survey Agency reports UNDAF monitoring reports
		3.2 To what extent has the effectiveness of programme support by individual AFPs been enhanced as a result of joint programming?	UNDAF monitoring reports Joint Programme evaluations

			Agency reports
		3.3 Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNDAF partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and have the arrangements been respected in the course of implementation?	UNDAF results matrices Interviews/surveys Joint programme documents/monitoring reports/meeting minutes
		3.4 Have the external and internal structures for programme delivery facilitated the efficient and effective delivery of UNDAF results and reduced duplication?	Interviews/survey
		3.5 Are the funding allocations, task team budgets and overall expenditures aligned with the stated UNDAF priorities and sufficiently targeted to maximize efficiency?	UNDAF documents Budgets Task team reports/budgets Interview/survey
Impact	4. To what extent has the UNDAF impacted on the lives of the poor, vulnerable and marginalized in PNG, notably in the realization of MDGs and MTDP?	4.1 Are there any major changes in UNDAF and national development indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with UNDAF implementation?	Monitoring reports Quantitative review
		4.2 What contribution has the UNDAF made to working with key strategic partners in reaching the poor, vulnerable and marginalized through UNDAF implementation?	UNDAF monitoring reports MDG reports Interviews/survey Joint programme reports
		4.3 What observable or measurable impact has the UNDAF had on human rights and gender equality in PNG to date (based on human rights and gender equality principles applied during UNDAF implementation)?	Gender score card UNDAF monitoring Human Rights reporting Quantitative review of relevant UNDAF indicators
Sustainability	5. To what extent have results achieved and strategies used by the UNDAF i) contribute to national development ii) add value to cooperation among individual AFPs.	5.1 To what extent and in what way have national capacities been enhanced in government, civil society and NGOs in order to enable these actors to continue achieving positive results without the UN/development partner's support?	Interviews with stakeholders/survey National development reports
		5.2 To what extent has institution-building and institution-strengthening taken place in human rights and gender equality terms?	Programme reporting Human rights and gender reporting Gender score cared Interview/survey
		5.3 To what extent have complementarities, collaboration and/or synergies fostered by UNDAF contributed to greater sustainability of results of Donor's interventions in PNG?	Donor reports UNDAF monitoring reports Donor interviews/survey
		5.4 To what extent does the UNDAF respond to the challenges of national capacity development and promote ownership of programme?	UN and stakeholder Interviews/survey

Annex 5 – Data collection questionnaire

UNDAF 2012 – 2017 Evaluation Questionnaire
Papua New Guinea

Please send responses to: annlundwork@gmail.com before Monday 4 April 2016

Introduction

This questionnaire focuses on the four evaluation criteria of Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency and Sustainability. Guiding points will be provided under each criteria to help with the completion of each primary question.
Thank you for completing the survey.

Q 1. What agency or organization do you work for?

| |
| |
| |

Relevance

In this section consider: the Government of PNG strategic plans and priorities; international goals; human rights principles and standards; gender equality.

Q2. To what extent has the United Nations contributed to addressing issues and underlying causes of national policies and strategies since 2012?

| |
| |
| |

Effectiveness

In this section consider: the UN's contribution to national priorities and MDGs/SDGs; lessons learned to support mainstreaming of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); how have the UN's unique roles and mandates been utilised; were outcomes realistic given UN agencies, funds and programmes capacities and resources and the development context in PNG?

Q3. To what extent has UN delivery & strategic positioning lead to the progress of national outcomes?

| |
| |
| |

Q4. What lessons learnt from the MDGs & UN delivery since 2012 could be applied to mainstreaming SDGs in the next UNDAF?

| |
| |
| |

Efficiency

On this page consider: were synergies created between the UN agencies, funds and programmes, government, civil society, development partners?; has programme support been enhanced?; are there joint programmes?; are roles and responsibilities well defined?

Q5. How has the UN functioned as a coordination and partnership building body within the development and humanitarian sector in PNG?

Sustainability

In this section consider: in what way have national capacities been enhanced in government, civil society and NGOs; institution building and strengthening in human rights and gender equality; sustainability of donor interventions; promotion of national ownership of programme.

Q6. How have the strategies used and results achieved by the UN since 2012 enhanced the capacity of development actors in PNG, specifically government departments, civil society, Non Government Organisations (NGOs), Community Based Organisations (CBO)?

- *- END –*
Please send responses to annlundwork@gmail.com by Monday