TEMPLATE 4.4

RUNO ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT



PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF) ANNUAL PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT COUNTRY: Papua New Guinea (DRAFT) REPORTING PERIOD: 1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER

Programme Title & Project Number

Programme Title: Support knowledge-building and understanding of the Bougainville Peace Agreement Programme Number (*if applicable*) MPTF Office Project Reference Number:¹ 00096350

| Recipient UN Orga | nizations | Implementing Par | tners |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| List the organizations that have receive the MPTF Office under this programs | ved direct funding from | List the national counterparts (gover NGOs & others) and other Internation Organizations: Office of the Chief the Government of Papua New Of the Chief Secretary to the Automore Government of Bougainville, Bou for Referendum, ABG Bureau for Communication, ABG Peace Div Bougainville Council of Elders, No media organizations and CSOs (in consultations with both govern | rnment, private, onal of Secretary to Guinea, Office of omous ugainville Office r Media and rision, lational and loca (to be identified |
| Programme/Project B | udget (US\$) | Programme Dura | tion |
| PBF contribution (by RUNO) USD 2,500,000 | | Overall Duration (months) 36 Start Date ² (dd.mm.yyyy) 15 August 2015 | |
| Government Contribution (<i>if applicable</i>) NA | | Original End Date ³ (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>) | 25 August 2017 |
| Other Contributions (donors) (<i>if applicable</i>) NA | | Current End date ⁴ (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>) Subject to discussion for a no cost extension as project commencement was delayed | |
| | | | |

¹ The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to "Project ID" on the <u>MPTF Office GATEWAY</u>

 $^{^{2}}$ The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY

³ As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

⁴ If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed.

Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.

Assessment/Review - if applicable please attach

Yes No Date:

Mid-Term Evaluation Report – *if applicable please attach* Yes No Date:

Report Submitted By

Name: Lawrence Landi Bassie

Title: Peace Building Fund Coordinator Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP Email address: lawrence.bassie@undp.org

PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1 Assessment of the current project implementation status and results

For PRF projects, please identify Priority Plan outcome and indicators to which this project is contributing:

Priority Plan Outcome to which the project is contributing. Creating an enabling environment so that the people of Bougainville are empowered to make informed choices at the Bougainville referendum, and to have increased confidence in the BPA process through access to more objective and accurate information.

Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project is contributing. (2.1) Democratic Governance

For both IRF and PRF projects, please rate this project's overall achievement of results to date: on track

For both IRF and PRF projects, outline progress against each project outcome, using the format below. The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes.

Outcome Statement 1: People of Bougainville are empowered to make informed choices at the Bougainville referendum and to have increased confidence in the BPA process through access to more objective and accurate information and to fora for dialogue and debate on key peacebuilding issues, both within communities and with their political leaders.

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

Output progress

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

GoPNG and ABG reaffirmed their commitment to the peace process through endorsement of a joint referendum work plan and a target date for the referendum 15 June 2019. Joint civic awareness raising on referendum to better prepare Bougainville for the referendum and beyond considered priority. Lead agencies are National Coordination Office for Bougainville Affairs (NCOBA) and Department of Referendum Veterans Affairs and Peace (DRVP). UNDP provided technical support to ABG for strategic planning (Consultant) and production of 30,000 referendum fact sheets now being disseminated. 10,000 copies of BPA were printed for ABG and SMS messages on referendum now reach over 200,000 active mobile phone users in Bougainville. Outreach to communities through radio and mobile television supported by UNDP is also contributing immensely to getting referendum information out in the region and soliciting feedback from listeners. Static Buka Info centre also conveys referendum information to the public.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?

To achieve the project outcome, UNDP provides and still continues to provide support to GoPNG and ABG to better conduct awareness on the BPA and referendum,

monitor progress, train and equip other non-governmental stakeholders to embark on conflict sensitive information dissemination across AROB. Both Governments are now better equipped to roll out awareness and dialogue with the communities. Awareness activities have been rolled out as of third quarter of this year and there are indications of improved Bougainvillean understanding of and confidence in the BPA provisions (17%) to date.

UNDP supported the Joint Referendum Committee to achieve a milestone of developing the first 23 key messages on referendum for public information. In order to disseminate the key message to the Bougainville population, UNDP supported both governments to produce two sets of referendum fact sheets. Although the pidgin version is still work in progress, 30,000 copies of the fact sheets have been printed in English for dissemination. UNDP also printed 10,000 copies of the BPA. All these products were presented to the Bougainville President on 30 Aug. Getting information to communities must be strategic and the DFAT funded Audience Research conducted in 2015 by University of Goroka, revealed that the majority of Bougainvilleans considered mass media such as radio, newspaper and TV fairly trustworthy and this has informed the Awareness Strategy for the Autonomous Bougainville Government, passed by the Bougainville Executive Council in 2016.

ABG's effective and efficient dissemination of information in a geographically challenging environment like Bougainville involves mobile SMS messages sent to people's phones, sustained community conversations and solicitation of feedback by Radio Ples Lain – ABG community cinema outreach and organisation of sporting activities. UNDP partnered with the ABG to support all these initiatives. The project has also supported the SW radio link for ABG to now be able to reach communities across the entire region. ABG provided with 5,000 hand wound and solar transistors to support radio outreach. The information centre in North Bougainville provides Bougainvilleans referendum related information through print and an electronic billboard.

The Bougainville House of Representatives is integrally involved in getting BPA and referendum related messages to their communities. During the last parliamentary sitting in September the BHOR passed a resolution that all 33 constituencies be referendum ready by 2018. UNDP is currently supporting this innovative BHOR constituency outreach strategy, that will ensure parliamentarians pass on accurate and reliable referendum decisions of both governments to their constituents in an open and transparent manner to promote open and frank dialogue. Community Based Monitoring (CBM) activities in M&E, tracks community feedback on SMS messages, Parliaments outreach and women and youth understanding of BPA.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?

This project experienced some delays in the implementation of activities due to ABG human resource capacities and some other priorities of the Media Bureau. It took some time for joint decisions to be made by both Governments on messaging after the political decisions were endorsed at the May JSB. The first set of key messages had to be vetted by National Government through the NCOBA. The ABG Media Bureau has produced many audio-visual materials for awareness on BPA and referendum,

however some of these still need to be vetted by both Governments to be used as civic awareness raising materials. This vetting has to be jointly done by NCOBA and the Bougainville Referendum Communications Committee (BRCC). Sequel to the training for Journalists that were conducted in February 2016 other trainings this year were significantly delayed due to ABG competing priorities and the precarious funding challenges during this reporting period. The next set of joint messages can only be disseminated to the public when they are cleared by a joint meeting of GoPNG represented by NCOBA and the BRCC represented by the Department of Referendum Veterans Affairs and peace. Associated risks that will cause further delays are being consistently monitored and updated. The situation is likely to improve in 2017 with a lot of administrative changes now made in the ABG public service.

Outcome Statement 2:

Rate the current status of the outcome: Please select one

Output progress

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?

Outcome Statement 3:

Rate the current status of the outcome: Please select one

Output progress

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?

Outcome Statement 4:

Rate the current status of the outcome: Please select one

Output progress

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?

1.2 Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender in the reporting period

| Evidence base: What is the | Development and endorsement of the first 23 key messages by |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| | |
| evidence base for this report and | both national government and ABG is evidence of progress. This |
| for project progress? What | resulted from the "Special Extraordinary BRC Meeting" held in |
| consultation/validation process has | Port Moresby in April followed by a JSB endorsement of the |
| taken place on this report (1000 | referendum work plan and political decisions including target |
| character limit)? | date for the referendum. Dissemination of fact sheets with joint |
| | referendum messages is testament of project success in ensuring |
| | Bougainvilleans are empowered to make informed decisions on |
| | the referendum based on accurate and trusted information. |

| <u>Funding gaps</u> : Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit) | PNG is currently facing economic challenges attributable to a myriad of factors, but most notably the drop in global commodity prices. The funding support provided by this project critically complemented budgetary gaps in GoPNG and ABG for referendum preparations and civic awareness raising. The intervention of the PBF funds meant to be catalytic have set the stage for other interventions to progress Bougainville referendum preparations. |
|--|---|
| <u>Catalytic effects</u> : Did the project achieve any catalytic effects, either through attracting additional funding commitments or creating immediate conditions to unblock/ accelerate peace relevant processes? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit) | Although there has not been significant funding from ABG or GoPNG to progress referendum related issues this year under review due to other competing priorities, and the precarious financial challenges both governments are confronted with, the PBF funds have been significantly catalytic in nature in providing the platform for continued and sustained dialogue between both governments on advancing referendum preparations. In addition, Project 1, on Parliamentary Support, will support parliamentarians to lead a 3 months' referendum free awareness campaign in their constituencies. This would mean that the intervention will also add value to outputs and outcomes under this project. Parliamentarians during the Induction Workshop on the 24 November supported by the PBF also made commitments to support the referendum awareness using their constituency grants. |
| <u>Risk taking/ innovation</u> : Did the project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? (1500 <i>character limit</i>) | With the limited access to quality information and informed political discourse at community level, UNDP has strengthened media and localization of information dissemination mechanisms (ABG Communications and Media Division) that are transparent consultative and owned by the government. The ABG communications bureau has been unwilling to accept greater independence from independent actors in the media landscape of Bougainville on dissemination of referendum information and may appear to want to control the message. UNDP continues to suggest that a joint approach that encourages cooperation and collaboration among stakeholders is the most beneficial trajectory for consistent and reliable messaging to recipients. The level of UNDP support and involvement is however consistently informed by our values of neutrality and professionalism. |
| | In addition, some ABG institutions do not see the need to improve communications' skills of staff, or encourage participatory discussions. UNDP has been unequivocal in proffering technical advice on the need for professional training for all staff involved in public information work. The issue of coordination and trust amongst key departments of the ABG dealing with public information dissemination and independent media players still needs to be worked on especially as it pertains to use of awareness raising materials developed. This is important and could be a risk if not handled early as |

| | Bougainville approaches the referendum target date. |
|--|---|
| Gender: How have gender | Bougainville Women Federation (BWF) supports civic |
| considerations been mainstreamed | education. As highly recognised by the Autonomous |
| in the project to the extent | Bougainville Government and the National Government, this |
| possible? Is the original gender | well organised women's organisation has developed a |
| marker for the project still the right | communication plan, supported by UNDP, Bougainville |
| one? Briefly justify. (1500 character | Referendum and Communications Committee and the President |
| limit) | to conduct community conversations and dialogues in the 14 |
| | Districts of Bougainville. Although this activity is not supported |
| | directly under Outcome 2, there is a high level of coherence |
| | between Outcome 2 and the GPI Equality for Progress which is |
| | an Immediate Response Facility (IRF). At all levels of project |
| | implementation there is gender mainstreaming as this project is |
| | gender marker 2. |
| Other issues: Are there any other | The types of messages related to issues of voter eligibility, voter |
| issues concerning project | registration, voting age etc. will be progressed when the IAA to |
| implementation that should be | conduct the Bougainville referendum has been established. This |
| shared with PBSO? This can | project during its course of implementation will continue to |
| include any cross-cutting issues or | contribute in facilitating mechanisms agreed on by both |
| other issues which have not been | governments to get such messages to the public. |
| included in the report so far. (1500 | |
| character limit) | |

1.3 INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT: Using the **Project Results Framework as per the approved project document** provide an update on the achievement of key indicators at both the outcome and output level in the table below. Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation in the qualitative text above. (300 characters max per entry)

| | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of project | Current indicator progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) | Adjustment of target (if any) |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | Indicator Target | | | |
| Outcome 1 Community | Indicator 1.1 | | | | | |
| confidence in the BPA implementati on, autonmy arrangement and the referendum is increased through better | Indicator 1.2 Participation of women and youth in dedicated fora on peacebuilding with their views shared with ABG parliament and inter-parliamentary committees. | 16% of women and youth share peacebuildin g views with ABG and Parliament | 75% of women and youth share peace building views with ABG | 16% of women and youth share peacebuilding views with ABG and Parliament | Baseline indicator is similar with the current indicator progress due to the fact that the baseline report and analysis were released just a month before the annual reporting | The target was revised to meet the baseline provided for by Anglo Pacific Research. |
| awareness of their content and process. | Indicator 1.3 Improved understanding and confidence of BPA provisions by the Bougainville population and political leaders. | 17% of Bougainville ans have confidnce and understandin g of the BPA provisions | 75% of Bougainvillea ns have confidence and understanding of the BPA provisions | 17% of Bougainvilleans have confidnce and understanding of the BPA provisions | Baseline indicator is similar with the current indicator progress due to the fact that the baseline report and analysis were released just a month before the annual reporting | The target was revised to meet the baseline provided for by Anglo Pacific Research. |

| Output 1.1 GoPNG and ABG agree on key messages on the BPA and for the referendum. | Indicator 1.1.1 Quarterly meetings convened by the Referendum Committee in 2015 and 2016 to discuss key messages. | Meetings convened but in line with the JSB agenda | Key messages agreed on by GoPNG and ABG through the Referendum Committee. | First set of Key messages on Referendum endorsed by the JSB in May and now translated to fact sheets being disseminated in AROB | Start up delays on the convening of the joint meetings that were to make key political decisions that will drive joint messaging. | The target is on course |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Indicator 1.1.2 Number of key messages agreed by both governments | None | All joint key messages on the referendum agreed by both governments | 23 key messages endorsed by JSB and now in the public domain | Delays in convening high level meetings where such joint decisions were to be made and endorsed | Target on track with some delays |
| Output 1.2 Accurate and objective user-friendly information on the BPA and the Referendum | Indicator 1.2.1 BPA Awareness materials produced by both governments and are readily available and accessible. | BPA posters and trainings done by government and civil society but limited. | A communicatio ns package agreed and validated by all relevant parties. | BPA awareness raising materials developed and being disseminated | Delays in joint communications mechanisms between both governments in agreeing on joint messages | Target on course with some delays |
| available and accessible. | Indicator 1.2.2Numberofproductstoimprovereportingandbroadcastof | Products developed but majority not vetted. | Conflict sensitive reporting and coverage by the media | 1 Media Training conducted and some referendum awareness raising materials still to be | This has been delay due to the very limited technical support for these activities in 2016 also compounded by the precarious financial challenges of the ABG. Joint government decision on | Target on course with some delays |

| | information/discus | | vetted using joint | materials also contributed to the delay | |
|------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|---|--|
| | sion on and about | | mechanisms. | | |
| | BPA & | | | | |
| | Referendum. | | | | |
| Output 1.3 | Indicator 1.3.1 | | | | |
| | Indicator 1.3.2 | | | | |
| Outcome 2 | Indicator 2.1 | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.2 | | | | |
| Output 2.1 | Indicator 2.1.1 | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.1.2 | | | | |
| Output 2.2 | Indicator 2.2.1 | | | | |
| 0 mp m 2.2 | Indicator 2.2.2 | | | | |
| Output 2.3 | Indicator 2.3.1 | | | | |
| 1 | Indicator 2.3.2 | | | | |
| Outcome 3 | Indicator 3.1 | | | | |
| | Indicator 3.2 | | | | |
| Output 3.1 | Indicator 3.1.1 | | | | |

| | Indicator 3.1.2 | | | |
|------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Output 3.2 | Indicator 3.2.1 | | | |
| | Indicator 3.2.2 | | | |
| Output 3.3 | Indicator 3.3.1 | | | |
| | Indicator 3.3.2 | | | |
| Outcome 4 | Indicator 4.1 | | | |
| | Indicator 4.2 | | | |
| Output 4.1 | Indicator 4.1.1 | | | |
| | Indicator 4.1.2 | | | |
| Output 4.2 | Indicator 4.2.1 | | | |
| | Indicator 4.2.2 | | | |
| Output 4.3 | Indicator 4.3.1 | | | |
| | Indicator 4.3.2 | | | |

PART 2: LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORY

2.1 Lessons learned

Provide at least three key lessons learned from the implementation of the project. These can include lessons on the themes supported by the project or the project processes and management.

| Lesson 1 (1000 character limit) | A key lesson learned relates to the differential budgetary planning periods of the ABG and the UN. The UN's annual financial and programme planning year precedes that of the GoPNG and ABG, and hence numerous challenges were encountered with GoPNG and ABG to co-fund some key activities in the work plan either to do with payroll or recurrent costs. In future the UNDP AWP will be shared in a timely manner with both governments, so that their anticipated commitments are factored into their budget appropriation processes. This approach will significantly cut down on some delays. |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Lesson 2 (1000 character limit) | |
| Lesson 3 (1000 | |
| character limit) | |
| Lesson 4 (1000 | |
| character limit) | |
| Lesson 5 (1000 | |
| character limit) | |

2.2 Success story (OPTIONAL)

Provide one success story from the project implementation which can be shared on the PBSO website and Newsletter as well as the Annual Report on Fund performance. Please include key facts and figures and any citations (3000 character limit).

The project is at the early stages to draw on a success story.

PART 3 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, slightly delayed, or off track: on track

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

Please provide an overview of expensed project budget by outcome and output as per the table below.⁵

⁵ Please note that financial information is preliminary pending submission of annual financial report to the Administrative Agent.

| Output | Output name | | Approved | Expensed | Any remarks on | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------|-----------|------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| number | - | RUNOs | budget | budget | expenditure | | | |
| | | | | | rrangement and the | | | |
| referendum is increased through better awareness of their content and process. | | | | | | | | |
| Output 1.1 | GoPNG and | UNDP | \$490,000 | 338,787.55 | | | | |
| | ABG agree on | | | | | | | |
| | key messages | | | | | | | |
| | on the BPA and for the | | | | | | | |
| | referendum. | | | | | | | |
| Output 1.2 | Accurate and | UNDP | \$235,000 | 162,470.15 | | | | |
| Output 1.2 | objective user- | UNDI | φ235,000 | 102,470.15 | | | | |
| | friendly | | | | | | | |
| | information on | | | | | | | |
| | the BPA and | | | | | | | |
| | the | | | | | | | |
| | Referendum | | | | | | | |
| | available and | | | | | | | |
| | accessible. | | | | | | | |
| Output 1.2 | Increased | UNDP | \$25,000 | 17 284 05 | | | | |
| Output 1.3 | understanding | UNDP | \$25,000 | 17,284.05 | | | | |
| | of and | | | | | | | |
| | confidence in | | | | | | | |
| | the BPA | | | | | | | |
| | processes by | | | | | | | |
| | the | | | | | | | |
| | Bougainville | | | | | | | |
| | population, | | | | | | | |
| | including key | | | | | | | |
| | targeted sub- | | | | | | | |
| | sections | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 2: | 1 | | | I | | | | |
| Output 2.1 | Output 1.4 | UNDP | \$55,000 | 38,024.93 | | | | |
| | Horizontal | | | | | | | |
| | communication | | | | | | | |
| | channels that | | | | | | | |
| | provide | | | | | | | |
| | information about BPA | | | | | | | |
| | processes and | | | | | | | |
| | Referendum | | | | | | | |
| | between | | | | | | | |
| | audiences | | | | | | | |
| | which increase | | | | | | | |
| | trust within | | | | | | | |
| | and between | | | | | | | |
| | communities, | | | | | | | |
| | and of vertical | | | | | | | |

| | channels between audiences and information providers such as the government or the | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | Referendum | | |
| | entity. | | |
| Output 2.2 | | | |
| Output 2.3 | | | |
| Outcome 3: | | | |
| Output 3.1 | | | |
| Output 3.2 | | | |
| Output 3.3 | | | |
| Outcome 4: | | | |
| Output 4.1 | | | |
| Output 4.2 | | | |
| Output 4.3 | | | |
| Total: | | | |

3.2 Comments on management and implementation arrangements

Please comment on the management and implementation arrangements for the project, such as: the effectiveness of the implementation partnerships, coordination/coherence with other projects, any South-South cooperation, the modalities of support, any capacity building aspect, the use of partner country systems if any, the support by the PBF Secretariat and oversight by the Joint Steering Committee (for PRF only). Please also mention if there have been any changes to the project (what kind and when); or whether any changes are envisaged in the near future (2000 character maximum):