



Evaluation of UNDP Millennium Development Goal Programme in Papua New Guinea.

Dr. Wilfred Kaleva
Independent
Consultant

November 2013



Table of Contents

List of Acronyms.....	iv
Executive Summary	vii
1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.1.1 Scope and Objective of the evaluation.....	1
1.1.2 Methodology.....	2
1.1.3 Data collection	3
1.1.4 Analysis	3
1.1.5 Evaluation Criteria.....	4
1.1.6 Limitations	5
1.2 MDGs within PNG's Development context.....	6
2. UNDP's SUPPORT TO GOVERNMENT OF PNG (GoPNG).	7
2.1 UNDPs support to GoPNG in General	7
2.2 UNDP's support to GoPNG within the context of planning for MDG Development.....	8
2.3 UNDP's support as partner in MDG Achievement.....	10
2.4 UNDPs support to implementation of the MDG programme	11
3. UNDP's MDG PRORAMMES AND PROJECTS.	11
3.1 Two Millennium Development Goal programmes from 2008 - 2013.....	11
3.1.1 Outcome & Outputs of UN Country Program (UNCP) 2008 – 2011	12
3.1.2 Outcome and Output of MDGS Population & Aid Coordination (MPA) 2012 – 2015..	12
3.2 MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme from 2008 to April 2013.	13
3.2.1 MDG Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting framework.	13
3.2.2 MTDP Monitoring and Evaluation framework.....	14
3.2.3 Evaluative Comments on the M&E framework.....	15
3.2.4 Challenges.....	16
3.2.5 UNDP's support to the Monitoring of MDG programme	17
3.2.6 Preparation and influence of PNG's MDG progress reports.....	18
3.3 MDG Acceleration framework project at Kairuku District 2011 – 2013.....	19
3.3.1 Project description.	19
3.3.2 Challenges.....	20
3.3.3 Lessons learnt.....	23
3.4 Community Led MDG Achievement (CLMA) Project 2012 - 2015	27
3.4.1 Project Description	27
3.5 POST-2015 Consultations.	28
3.6 Other UN Agencies projects	29

3.6.1	MDG Radio Awareness program	29
4.	Assessment of UNDP MDG programmes according to the evaluation criteria.....	29
4.1	Relevance of UNDP MDG programme	29
4.2	Effectiveness of the MDG Development Programme.....	30
4.2.1	Effectiveness of Outcome 1.2 and Outputs (UNCP 2008 – 2011)	30
4.2.2	Effectiveness of Outcome and Outputs of MPA (UNDAF 2012– 2015)	32
4.2.3	Hindrance to effective achievement of MDGs.....	33
4.3	Efficiency of Financial Resources allocated from UNDP and DNPM for the MDG programme.	35
4.3.1	Financial resource allocation from UNDP	35
4.3.2	Financial resource allocation from GoPNG for the MPA programme.....	36
4.4	Impact of UNDP MDG programme	37
4.4.1	Progress on Achieving Millennium Development Goals.....	37
4.4.2	Impact of MDG Awareness and Advocacy on Policy at the national and sub-national level and transformational results stemming from it.....	38
4.4.3	Impact of awareness and advocacy on Human development programmes at the national and sub-national level and transformational results stemming from it	40
4.4.4	Impact of non programme “ <i>Soft Activities</i> ” on the achievement of MDGs	43
4.5	Sustainability of UNDP MDG programme	44
4.5.1	Sustainability through ownership of MDG Programme in PNG.....	44
4.5.2	Partnership between UN agencies, National and Sub-National governments, Universities, Private sector/communities on MDGs.....	45
4.5.3	Institutionalization of MDG programme in DNPM.....	46
4.5.4	Institutionalization of MDG programme at Higher Learning Institutions.....	47
4.5.5	Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and transformational results.	48
4.6	Promotion of gender equality in the MDG programmes	49
4.7	Rating of UNDP’s performance on components of MDG programmes.	49
5.	RECOMMENDATIONS	55
	Annex 1: TOR – Evaluation of MDG programme in Papua New Guinea	59
	Annex 2. List of Documents collected for analysis	62
	Annex 3: Document Analysis Schedule.....	64
	Annex 4. List of those who were interviewed.....	69
	Annex 5. Interview Schedule	70
	Annex 6. Evaluation Matrix.....	75
	Annex7. Evaluation Criteria	81

List of Acronyms.

ADR – Assessment of Development Results

AIDS – Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome

AusAID – Australian Agency for International Development

AWP – Annual Work Plans

CACC- Central Agency Coordinating Committee

CBO – Community-based Organizations

CLMA - Community Led MDG Achievement

CPA – Central Province Administration

CTA - Chief Technical Adviser

DAD -Development Assistance Database

DCD - Department for Community Development

DGTTF – UNDP’s Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund

DNPM – Department of National Planning and Monitoring

DPLLGA - Department of Provincial and Local Level Government Affairs

DSP – PNG Development Strategic plan 2010 – 2030

EU – European Union

FACE -Funds Authorization and Credit Expenditures

GBV – Gender Based Violence

GDP – Gross Domestic Product

HACT - Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers

HDI – Human Development Index

HIV – Human Immuno-Deficiency Virus

IBBS – Integrated Bio-Behavioral Survey

LLG – Local level government

M&E – Monitoring and Evaluation

MAF – MDG Acceleration Framework

MD – Millennium Declaration

MDG – Millennium Development Goals

MDGAI - MDG Acceleration and Implementation in PNG

MOU – Memorandum of Understanding

MPA – MDGs, Population and Aid (MPA) Coordination

MTDP – Medium Term Development Plan 2011 - 2015

MTDS – Medium Term Development Strategy 2006 - 2010

NA – Needs assessment

NACS – National Aids Council Secretariat

NEC - National Executive Council.

NGO – Non Government Organizations

NSAs – Non State Actors

NSDS - National Strategy for the development of Statistics

NSO –National Statistics Office

NSP – National Strategic Plan

OECD – Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

PMC – Population Media Centre

PMU – Project Management Unit

PNG – Papua New Guinea

SIB – Special Interventions Branch

TOR – Terms of Reference

UN – United Nations

UNCP – United Nations Country Program 2008 – 2012

UNCT – United Nations Country Team

UNDAF - United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2012 - 2015

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

UNFPA – United Nations Population Fund

UNICEF – United Nations Children’s Fund

UNITECH – PNG University of Technology

UPNG – University of Papua New Guinea

VHV – Village Health Volunteer

WHO – World Health Organization

Executive Summary

The executive summary provides the main findings of the independent evaluation commissioned by United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) to evaluate its Millennium Development Goal (MDG) programmes in Papua New Guinea (PNG) for the period 2008 to April 2013.

Effectiveness of Outcome 1.2 and Outputs (UNCP 2008 – 2011).

Activities in this period (2008 – 2011) focused on awareness and advocacy on the 67 Millennium Development Goals (MDG) indicators created nationally and sub-nationally and having relevant Government departments use Medium Term Development Strategy (MTDS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) monitoring systems.

The awareness and advocacy programmes were effective and resulted in integration of MDGs into strategic GoPNG policy and planning documents such as PNG Vision 2050, MTDS 2005 - 2010, MTDP 2011 - 2015, PNGDSP 2010 – 2030 and development of nationally created MDG indicators. This was an outstanding result of advocacy at the national level. However because of unreliable data on which MTDP outcome indicators are based, nationally tailored MDG targets remain estimates.

The translation of policies and plans into practice for achieving MDG targets by 2015 has not been as effective. An equity based approach is needed where interventions target the disadvantaged areas and populations. For example, interventions should target rural areas, provinces and districts where the MDG indicators are the lowest in the country.

MDG monitoring systems were also set up. The establishment of PNGinfo data base was a positive step in having a data base for monitoring MDG indicators. Unfortunately, gaps exist, especially data from the 2011 census from National Statistics Office and up to date information from other key government departments such as Department of Health and Department of Education.

In terms of the medium term development strategy and the MDGs outcome for this period (2008 – 2011), the ADR assessment notes UNDP's support to GoPNG as significant achievement in the production of two national MDG reports and the continued support for national planning documents towards achieving the MDG targets. However the overall progress to achieving the national and international targets has been slow. Overall this outcome has not been achieved.

Effectiveness of Outcome and Outputs of MPA (UNDAF 2012– 2015)

UNDP's continuous MDG advocacy, lobbying and sensitizing the GoPNG of the disparities at the levels of human development between provinces and districts, continuous technical assistance on MDGS, population and human development and related data gathering and analysis proved effective. The advocacy resulted in increased funding in 2013 for provinces and district by

GoPNG through the provincial support improvement programme and the District services improvement programme

The effectiveness of the advocacy was also demonstrated when DNPM officers assisted provinces whose development indicators are much lower than the national average (e.g. Sandaun province), an effective equity based intervention where disadvantaged provinces and the rural areas are targeted.

The MDG Acceleration project in Kairuku 2011 – 2013 had challenges which led to an incomplete project. The challenges that were encountered put a strain on the working relationship and influenced perceptions about UNDP and DNPM. Important lessons learnt are documented, which if acted upon, would facilitate the success of similar projects.

The MDG radio awareness campaign was completed by April 2013. Testimonies from listeners provide some good feedback but a final independent evaluation to assess change in behavior and confirm effectiveness is necessary.

DNPM is supposed to take the lead in GoPNGs annual MTDP report which includes population and MDGs and where programmes outputs and outcomes are to be reported in DNPMs annual progress reports. The evaluator did not see any annual MTDP progress report. DNPM also convenes the meeting on Joint technical working group on aid effectiveness. This is an indication that DNPM has the capacity and lead dialogue on MDGs, population issues and aid coordination but may lack the capacity to produce annual reports.

The institutionalizing of MDGs at the University of PNG and PNG University of Technology who are offering MDG and human development courses is a positive step. The graduates are skilled in thematic areas of human development but unfortunately only a handful of them are employed by government departments who deal with MDG programmes.

Unfortunately, lack of availability, access, consolidation and analysis of data is a major hindrance to effective implementation of many programmes and activities (for example, development of Population policy) that are intended to achieve the MDG outcomes and outputs.

Preparation and influence of PNG's MDG progress reports.

The Quarterly and the Annual progress report which are prepared by UN agencies serve as short term (annual) quality assurance assessment mechanisms (monitoring) and report on progress made on the AWP activities for the outcome and output indicators. These reports are jointly produced with other UN agencies and effectively serve their purposes in providing direction for the next AWP.

The Mid Term Reviews and End Term Review reflect on the progress made outcomes and output indicators within the overall UN Country programmes

and reflects on GoPNG contributions. Evaluation reports also contribute to assessing progress.

Impact on Human development

PNG's Human Development Index value in 2013 was 0.466, giving it a ranking of 156 out of 187 countries (2013 UNDP Global Human Development Report). Progress on the MDGs has been generally disappointing, with attention needed on improving access to basic health and education services. Women and girls are especially disadvantaged, many of whom face discrimination and a lack of economic and political opportunity. Rates of gender-based violence (GBV) are among the highest in the region.

Although PNG has made some progress on the MDGs, PNG is unlikely to meet the MDG targets by 2015. However GoPNG is committed to implementing the MDGs beyond 2015, with the Government introducing tuition fee-free education and free basic health services since 2013. As a result, rates of overall enrolment and use of health services have improved due to these investments. However, quality of services will remain a challenge in the medium term. Some progress has also been made on combating HIV & AIDs with prevalence at 0.49 % (2011 Surveillance report) and the epidemic has not reached the same proportion as in the African continent.

Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and transformational results.

UNDP's capacity building activities on MDGs and human development concentrated on awareness and advocacy and targeted planning at national and sub-national levels. UNDP's involvement in capacity building in various areas included the integration of MDGs into GoPNG strategic policy documents, M&E framework for DNPM, development data base, MDG acceleration projects, gender equality, preparation of progress reports and midterm reviews, community led MDG projects, development of MDG course at higher learning institutions.

As part of the UN's Joint Strategy on MDGs, Population and Aid Coordination, other UN agencies such as UNICEF and UNFPA build capacity in teacher training for child friendly schools and child protection training for justice sector, training for village health coordinators and volunteers, training NSO staff on analysis of census data.

Sustainability of development results is ensured through training of nationals, ownership of programmes by GoPNG departments, institutionalizing programs, partnerships and using bottom-up approaches to development programmes in the communities.

Institutionalization of MDGs programme in DNPM

Two units set up within DNPM as a result of UNDP support illustrate a successful capacity development approach. First the MDG, Population and Aid Coordination (MPA) core group bring together First Assistant Secretaries and technical staff to plan and coordinate the implementation of relevant policies and strategies. Second, the establishment of a Special Interventions Branch within DNPM signals seriousness by GoPNG to institutionalize and address the MDG issues more permanently. The Special Interventions branch facilitates and monitors the planned MDG and populations interventions for the country.

Financial resource allocation from UNDP and DNPM for the MDG programme

Due to overall global budget cuts within UNDP as a result of the global financial downturn, the core funding of UNDP for the MDG programme has probably decreased and in the 2012 budget. However, the non-core funding has increased over the years and in 2012 was higher than the core funding, illustrating that the non-core has become the new core source of funding. As such, UNDP needs to strengthen the resource mobilization from donors and development partners. In addition, the GoPNG has increased its share of funding for the MDG, population and coordination programme, an indication of confidence in UNDP's programmatic activities and a sign of national ownership. However the actual release of funding by GoPNG remains a challenge.

Has programme successfully included and promoted gender equality in the country?

Gender equality is a cross cutting issue and has been promoted in some activities in the MDG programme. For example, the MDG Acceleration Framework Kairuku project targeted Maternal Health and sought to improve the capacity of Women Health Volunteers to provide basic health services on maternal health. The MDG radio awareness broadcasts dealt with a number of gender issues including elevating women's status, reducing violence against women and increasing girl's enrollment in primary schools. The analysis of data encourages the disaggregation according to age and sex to clearly determine impact of programmes (or the lack of it) on the indicators.

Has this programme integrated the principles of sustainability of results into the country's policies and programmes?

The programme did integrate the following principles of sustainable development.

- **Ownership:** by GoPNG and other stakeholders as shown the fact that the MDGs were integrated into the strategic government policy documents such as the PNG DSP 2010 - 2030 and MTDP 2012 - 2015 shows ownership by GoPNG.

- **Partnerships:** Between UN agencies, between UN agencies and the national and sub-national GoPNG departments, universities, private sector and communities.
- **Institutionalization:** as demonstrated by the establishment of the Special Interventions Branch at DNPM and the MDG goals and principles of human development are taught as courses at UPNG and UNITECH.
- **Capacity building:** Through training, awareness and advocacy on the MDGs, human development and sustainable development took place at the national and sub-national levels.
- **Integration:** of the MDGs into the national plans and have started to filter down to the sub-national level.
- **Sustainability:** as demonstrated by the positive answers to the above points. This leads to the conclusion that the impact of the MDG programmes is sustainable and lasting.

What are the non-programme “soft activities” that are impacting on the achievement of MDGs in PNG?

Facilitation of dialogue with DNPM and between DNPM and sub-national governments and with other partners, as well as advocacy/lobbying for MDG acceleration by UNDP are not always explicitly mentioned as part of AWP. However, these so-called “soft activities” proved crucial in achieving results.

Recommendations.

The following recommendations were made in the light of the findings of the evaluation.

Recommendation 1.

That GoPNG use equity based approach where interventions target the disadvantaged areas and populations. These interventions should target rural areas, provinces and districts where the MDG indicators are the lowest in the country.

Recommendation 2

That the institutionalizing of MDG courses at Universities be continued to other higher learning institutions.

Recommendation 3.

That the MDG acceleration framework be used to accelerate the achievement of MDGs and that the objectives and principles of bottom up approach and the lessons learnt be retained but that factors that have been identified as bottlenecks be addressed to facilitate the success of such projects.

Recommendation 4

That MDG development initiatives be community driven and a bottom up approach or social mobilization approach should be used.

Recommendation 5

The UNDP procurement system needs to be reviewed and some processes in the system be streamlined.

Recommendation 6

That UNDP or other UN agencies assist in building capacity of GoPNG departments to systematically collect, analyze, interpret data (relating to MDG indicators) and write annual progress reports.

Recommendation 7

That DNPM retains its role as a coordinating department and not be involved in implementing programmes and project.

Recommendation 8

That MDG Awareness and advocacy should target GoPNG at sub-national level (province and districts).

Recommendation 9.

That awareness and advocacy should target the general population and those in the rural areas on health, education and income generating activities.

Recommendation 10.

That an equity based approach is used where interventions target the disadvantaged areas and populations such as rural areas, provinces and districts where the MDG indicators are the lowest in the country.

Recommendation 11

That UNDP should assist GoPNG to take strong measures to address the issue of gaps in data, especially the analysis of census data.

Recommendation 12

That GoPNG should establish a system which requires key government departments to provide updated information to PNGInfo annually or biannually.

Recommendation 13.

That UNDP should be sensitized to the role “soft activities” play in hindering or facilitating programmes or projects.

Recommendation 14.

That an UNDP adviser /officer to be based at DNPM/ UNDP be appointed for effective communication and liaison between UNDP and DNPM.

Evaluation of UNDP Millennium Development Goal Programme in PNG.

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

This is a report on the findings of an independent evaluation commissioned by United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) to evaluate the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) programme in Papua New Guinea (PNG) for the period January 2008 to April 2013.

Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for the evaluation are as follows (see Annex 1 for details):

Title: Evaluation of MDG Programme in Papua New Guinea¹

Project Name: MDG Programme in Papua New Guinea

Evaluation Period: January 2008- April 2013

1.1.1 Scope and Objective of the evaluation

Scope

The scope of this evaluation covers only the MDG component of the MPA programme supported by UNDP during the period 2008 to April 2013. However, references need to be made to the support of UNICEF for the MDG programme since 2008 and that of UNFPA since 2012.

In particular, the evaluation will cover the following two UNDP supported programmes on MDGs:

1. MDG Awareness and MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme from January 2008 to April 2013, and
2. MDG Acceleration Framework pilot project on infant and maternal health (MDG 4 and 5) in Kairuku District from April 2011 to April 2013.

Objective

The overall objective of this evaluation exercise is to assess UNDP's support to GoPNG's acceleration of progress towards the MDG within the context of PNG's development planning, implementation and monitoring and to inform UNDP's programme approach to support GoPNG strategically in the area of MDGs and human development.

¹UNDP. TOR: Evaluation of MDG programme in PNG. 2013.

In addition, the evaluation recommendations will inform both programming by DNPM and UNDP as well as policy development and advocacy in PNG. Therefore, the evaluation exercise must not be thought of merely a stock taking of programme performance, but as a tool to identify lessons learned and good practices for a forward looking MDG and Human Development programme, in particular in light of the approaching MDG deadline in 2015

The evaluation will cover the following six areas:

1. Preparation and influence of PNG's MDG progress reports;
2. Awareness on MDGs and human development at the national and sub-national level and level of transformational results stemming from it;
3. Integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review/monitoring systems and transformational results achieved;
4. Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and transformational results;
5. Institutionalization of MDGs programme in DNPM
6. Financial resource allocation from UNDP and DNPM for the MDG programme

The evaluation will also provide answers and recommendations for the following questions:

1. Based on actual results achieved, is the approach taken by the MDG programme conducive for the achievement of MDGs in PNG, and in light of the MDG deadline – how to direct the programme;
2. Has this programme successfully included and promoted gender equality in the country?
3. Has this programme helped to integrate the principles of sustainable development into the country's policies and programmes?
4. Has this programme strengthened partnership between UN agencies and national and sub-national governments, universities, private sector/communities on MDGs?
5. What are the non-programme soft activities that are impacting on the achievement of MDGs in PNG?

1.1.2 Methodology

This evaluation assessed UNDP's support for the MDG component of the MDG Population and Aid Coordination (MPA) programme for the

period January 2008 to April 2013 (see Evaluation TOR in Annex 1). The assessment used a combination of the following methods:

- Comprehensive desk review and document analysis of annual and mid-term reports, annual work plans, UNDP multi-year development plans, GoPNG key strategic development policy and planning documents, project documents and evaluation reports.
- Interviews (individual and telephone) and Focus group discussions
- Analysis of data collected using evaluation criteria and according to evaluation TOR.

1.1.3 Data collection

The majority of the documents collected for analysis were provided by UNDP (mostly electronic copies). The rest were downloaded from the internet or provided by DNPM and UNICEF.

Key UNDP and GoPNG documents collected for analysis are listed in Annex 2.

The documents were summarized on a documents analysis schedule (see Annex 3 for copy of Document analysis schedule).

Interviews were held with staff from UNDP, DNPM, UNICEF, UNFPA and UPNG (see list of those interviewed in Annex 4).

Focus group discussions were held with staff from DNPM.

Telephone interviews were held with the MDG course coordinator at UNITECH and the Kairuku MDG Acceleration project manageress (brief telephone conversation).

An interview schedule (see copy of interview schedule in Annex 5) was used as a guide for questions asked during the interviews. Only questions that were relevant to the interviewee were asked. The interview items were based on the evaluation criteria and the main points of assessment as outlined in the TOR (see copy of Evaluation Matrix in Annex 6). The interviewer wrote the responses to the questions on the interview schedule. Only one of the interviews was audio-recorded. All others declined the invitation to be audio-taped.

1.1.4 Analysis

The Evaluation criteria (see details in next section 1.1.5) and the TORs were used as basis for analyzing the documents and the data collected from the interviews.

The Annual Work plans, Annual progress reports and the UNDP multi-year plans such as UNCP 2008 – 2012, UNCP action plan 2008 – 2012, UNDAF 2012 - 2015 and UNDAF Action plan 2012 - 2015 were analyzed to assess the effectiveness of the planned outcomes and

the outputs. That is, to establish whether planned outcomes had been achieved and whether they contributed to achieving the MDG targets. The relevance of the plans to the national and sub-national requirements was also analyzed.

The analysis of the key GoPNG planning and policy documents such as the MTDS 2005 – 2010, MTDP 2011 – 2015 and PNG DSP 2010 – 2030) was to assess the effect of awareness and advocacy programmes in influencing the integration of the MDGs into the national and sub-national plans.

The analysis of the MDG Acceleration project at Kairuku provided a good case study of project planning and implementation, partnership, challenges, bottlenecks and valuable lessons that can be learnt from implementing MDG programmes.

The analysis of reports such as the 2011 Assessment of Development Results, 2010 Comprehensive report on MDG and the Annual Reports also assessed the efficiency and sustainability of the MDG programme from 2008 – 2013 and the impact on Human development and the transformational results from the programme.

Valuable insights about the MDG targets and the MDG programmes were gained from the interviews. The interview data also provided information to verify the contents of the reports and provided perceptions of key personnel about the MDG programme and projects.

1.1.5 Evaluation Criteria

The following set of criteria (modified OECD-DAC criteria; see Annex 7 for details) was used to evaluate components of the MDG programme.

1. **Relevance.** Are we doing the right thing? How important is the **relevance or significance** of the intervention to local and national requirements and priorities? [Added. What is the **relevance or significance** of the MDGs to the local and national requirements and priorities?]
2. **Effectiveness.** Are the objectives of the development interventions being achieved? How big is the **effectiveness or impact** of the project compared to the objectives planned (Comparison: result against planned objectives)?
3. **Efficiency.** Are the objectives being achieved economically by the development intervention? How big is the **efficiency or utilization ratio** of the resources used (Comparison: resources applied against results)?
- 4.1 **Impact - effect.** Does the development intervention contribute to reaching higher level development objectives (preferably, overall objective)? What is the **impact or effect** of the intervention in

proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected?

4.2 Impact - Human development. Was there any progress in Human development key areas such as Education, Health and Income generation? What were the drivers of progress in human development? What were the transformational results?

4.3 Impact - Transformational Results. What evidence is there for progressive change in human development, capacity building on MDGs, sustainable development and integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plan? What transformational results can be seen in the areas of human development, capacity building on MDGs, sustainable development and integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review and monitoring systems?

5.1 Sustainability - Ownership by GoPNG and other stakeholders. Is there any evidence of GoPNG ownership of the programme - at all levels of government from national to provincial, district and local level government (LLG)? Has DNPM demonstrated ownership of the MDG programme by taking lead in influencing national and sub-national plans? Were all stakeholders involved at all stages of programme / project - planning, implementation and evaluation?

5.2 Sustainability - Partnership. Was there evidence of strong partnership between UN agencies and national and sub-national governments, universities, private sector/communities on achieving MDGs?

5.3 Sustainability - Institutionalization. Was the MDG programme institutionalized at the DNPM or at any other organization or Institution?

5.4 Sustainability - Capacity building. Was there Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level? What transformational results were achieved?

5.5 Sustainability -Integration. Was there Integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review/monitoring systems? What evidence can be seen of the integration in the national and sub-national plans? What transformational results were achieved?

5.6 Sustainability - permanence. Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable? How is the **sustainability or permanence** of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?

6. Gender equality. Was gender equality promoted in the country through the MDG programme?

1.1.6 Limitations

The limitations to the evaluation can be summarized as follows:

- The evaluator was unable to interview some important partners and key personnel. For example, staff from National Statistical Office (NSO), executive management of DNPM (only one was interviewed)
- Some key documents could not be obtained. For example, End line report of the UNFPA-funded MDG Radio awareness programme.
- The evaluator would have liked the opportunity to seek clarifications from those interviewed but because of time limitations could not do so.
- Statistical information sought from government departments who are the lead agencies in some MDG indicators were not released in time to include in report.

1.2 MDGs within PNG's Development context.

Since gaining independence in 1975, PNG has undergone a period of both economic progress and poor performance and faced a number of critical development challenges. From 2005 – 2013, in an effort to address these challenges, GoPNG developed key strategic development policy and planning documents aimed at social and economic progress at the national and sub-national levels². These strategic documents include the PNG Vision 2050³, PNG Development Strategic Plan (DSP) 2010-2030⁴, the Medium Term Development Strategy (MTDS) 2005 – 2010⁵, and the Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP) 2011 – 2015⁶. UNDP's 2011 Assessment of Development Results (ADR)⁷ noted that the MTDP 2011 – 2015 which is aligned to the PNG DSP 2010 – 2030 "... outlines resources for development efforts in key policy areas under the Public Investment Programme. It aims to increase economic growth and spreading the benefits of growth to overcome inequalities in opportunities in PNG." Measures put in place recognized that a stable political environment and efficient public service machinery are necessary conditions for successful implementation of the MTDP.

What is important to note is that the MDGs are integrated in all of these GoPNG strategic documents. It demonstrates GoPNGs commitment to achieving the MDG targets in the country since the signing of the UN Millennium Declaration (MD) on the MDG in 2000. The GoPNG also localized the MDG targets and indicators. The PNG tailored MDGs represent a number of development goals (8), targets

²UNDP. 2011 Assessment of Development Results in PNG: Evaluation of UNDP contribution.

³GoPNG. PNG Vision 2050

⁴GoPNG. Development Strategic Plan (DSP) 2010-2030

⁵GoPNG. Medium Term Development Strategy 2005 – 2010

⁶GoPNG. Medium Term Development Plan 2011 – 2015

⁷UNDP. 2011 Assessment of Development Results in PNG: Evaluation of UNDP contribution. p.10.

(15), and indicators (67) for the period 1990-2015, which are focused on elevating the level of human development in PNG⁸.

Unfortunately, as has been noted by reports such as the 2004⁹, 2009¹⁰ and 2010¹¹ Progress reports, although PNG has made some progress in a number of MDGs, the country will not achieve the goals by 2015.

2. UNDP's SUPPORT TO GOVERNMENT OF PNG (GoPNG).

What support does UNDP provide to GoPNG's experience on MDG implementation within the context of PNG's development planning, implementation and monitoring?

2.1 UNDP's support to GoPNG in General

In general, UNDP supports GoPNG in the following ways.

- (i) Provides **technical expertise, advisory services on awareness and advocacy on MDG and how to achieve MDG goals**. This is one of their most important roles. This role needs to be understood by stakeholders and partners in PNG in the context of funding expectations. UNDP is not a donor partner and does not have the same resources and donor funding agencies (see point (v) below).
- (ii) UN's **neutrality and impartiality** are widely recognized. Important in solving conflicts such as in Bougainville.
- (iii) **Global network**: UN has 170 offices worldwide and can mobilize technical assistance for programmes from its extensive worldwide network.
- (iv) UN's role is to **support the priorities of the government** of the day, as long they are in line with UN values. For example, need for integration of MDGs at all levels of planning. UNDP is supporting the process of integrating MDG into planning process from national level, sub-national level down to the district level.
- (v) UNDP provides financial resources for programmes and projects through core funds (funds provided by UN) and non-core funds (generated from other donor funding agencies). It is important to note that UNDP is not a donor agency or a development partner with huge development budget. Partners need to understand these roles as it affects expectations. UNDP depends for funding

⁸Popoitai.2007 (?).Towards implementing MDGs in PNG. Opportunities, Challenges and the way forward.

⁹ PNG MDG Report 2004

¹⁰ PNG MDG Report 2009

¹¹ PNG MDG 2nd National Progressive Report, 2010

from global donors and does not have as much funding as other donor partners. They provide seed money for projects but UNDP's expectations are for governments to take ownership of programmes/ projects when funding has expended. UNDP sees resource mobilization as one of their roles and the GoPNG as important partner for cost sharing.

The 2011 ADR ¹² strongly suggests that the "country office may have to strengthen fund mobilization to ensure there is continuity of initiatives in key areas, such as MDGs, governance and gender equality" and noted that UN had outlined possible areas for resource mobilization from donor partners. It concluded that increase its efforts to create cost sharing and funding partnerships.

2.2 UNDP's support to GoPNG within the context of planning for MDG Development.

As a matter of policy, the UN supports GoPNG's national priorities and uses national systems to deliver planned programmes under the various themes within the UN country programmes. For example, the theme for UN Country Programme 2008 – 2011 was 'Partnership for Nation Building' and the 2012 - 2015 UN Development Assistance Framework's theme is "Supporting PNG to accelerate MDG Achievement"¹³.

UNDP's support to the GoPNG for achieving the MDGs from 2008 – 2013 are outlined in the UN country (UNCP) program for PNG 2008 – 2011¹⁴, UN Development assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012 – 2015¹⁵, and the respective Action Plans. The UN country plans and the Actions Plans are aligned to the GoPNGs strategic policy documents such as PNG Vision 2050, Medium Term Development plan and the Development Strategic plan 2010-2030. As such, both UNCP and UNDAF are partnership agreements between the United Nations and the GoPNG and are aligned to the GoPNGs Medium Term Development Plans (MTDS and MTDP) and the PNG Development Strategic Plan (DSP) 2010 – 2030¹⁶. The UN has comparative advantage in supporting the development goals and priorities of the MTDP and to support PNG to accelerate MDG achievement.

Under the of the **UNCP 2008 – 2011** 'Partnership for Nation Building', five broad developmental outcomes were agreed upon at the "Inter-

¹²UNDP. 2011. Assessment of Development Results in PNG. Evaluation of UNDP contribution. P.26

¹³ UNDP. UNDAF Action Plan 2011 – 2015.

¹⁴UN country (UNCP) program for PNG 2008 – 2011

¹⁵UN Development assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012 – 2015

¹⁶GoPNG.PNG Development Strategic Plan (PNGSP) 2010 – 2030

governmental Secretaries and United Nations Country Team Retreat in May of 2006"¹⁷.

The expected outcomes were:

- Governance and Crisis Management - Government develops and implements effective governance and crisis management policies
- Foundation for Human Development (Health, Education and Child Protection) – By 2012, children, youth, women and men benefit from basic quality health, education and protection.
- Sustainable livelihoods and Population - By 2012, rural communities in selected provinces of each region use improved sustainable livelihood practices.
- Gender - By 2012, women and girls experience fewer gender inequalities in PNG
- HIV and AIDS - By 2012, the rate of HIV and AIDS infection is halted or reduced and Government provides services to those people with, and affected by, HIV and AIDS.

The 2011 ADR: 'Evaluation of UNDP Contribution'¹⁸ reported areas of support provided by UNDP during the UNCP period which were (p.30):

- 2004 and 2009 National MDG reports.
- 2006 Human development report for Autonomous Region of Bougainville.
- Preparing important documents such as MTDP& PNG DSP, especially with clearly defined MDG targets.
- Preparation of 2009 and 2010 MDG reports.
- MDG awareness training for provinces.

The emphasis for UNCP 2008 – 2012 was MDG awareness and advocacy at national and sub-national levels.

The **UNDAF 2012 – 2015** and its Action Plan provide support to GoPNG to accelerate MDG achievement in the following key outcome areas:

1. Governance for equitable development
2. Social justice, protection and gender equity
3. Access to basic services
4. Environment, climate change and disaster risk management

¹⁷ United Nations. UNCP Action Plan 2008 - 2012

¹⁸ Ibid. p.30

Because of the slow progress on achieving MDGs by 2015, the theme of the UNDAF country programme is “supporting PNG to accelerate MDG achievement”¹⁹.

The preparation by DNPM of mid-term reviews to assess GoPNG progress towards achieving MDGs (e.g. 2010 MDG National Progress Comprehensive Report) and the assistance provided in preparing GoPNGs strategic documents are very important areas which the UNDP has supported.

2.3 UNDP’s support as partner in MDG Achievement

The Department of National Planning and Monitoring (DNPM) is UNDP’s key government counterpart in relation to the integration of MDGs into the national and sub-national plans. The integration of the MDGs into GoPNG’s strategic documents such as PNG vision 2050, MTDP, MTDS, PNGDSP illustrates the positive influence of this relationship. Over the years the two organizations have developed a strong partnership which was strengthened by having key partners at both UNDP and DNPM. In previous years the position of the Assistant Resident Representative (ARR) at UNDP was held by a PNG national who provided the link between UNDP and DNPM. The national who held that position has since moved to DNPM and it was necessary to fill the UNDP position with a non-national. The position will be nationalized in 2014. It is the practice for Development partners to have “counterparts” in government departments; the UNDP ARR does not have one particular counterpart but liaises with a number of key people from the various divisions at DNPM. The UNDP’s Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) on MDGs who was based at DNPM (until July 2013) played an important facilitating role between DNPM and UNDP. A number of key informants stated that the working relation between UNDP and DNPM was strong in previous years but that in the last two years or so the partnership had weakened. According to UNDP, this was partly due to the CTA taking a biased rather than neutral and facilitating role.

There is evidence that the planning, design, implementation, recruitment and management of the MDG acceleration project at Kairuku (2011 – 2013) and the challenges that were encountered put a strain on the working relationship and influenced mutual perceptions about UNDP and DNPM (see Section 3.3 for details about the Kairuku project and the challenges encountered). The CTA was UNDP’s facilitator of the project but a lack of full understanding of the procurement processes lead to unfair criticism of UNDP, particularly the slow disbursement of project funds. Although DNPM was the implementing department for the project, DNPM also felt that UNDP

¹⁹UNDAF Action Plan 2012 – 2015. P.13

was “too hands on” the project and that they were trying to take the project away from DNPM and were implementing the project.

The current working relationship between UNDP and DNPM can best be described as weak. UNDP’s effort to communicate with officers at DNPM often ends in frustrations when for example UNDP officials talk to up to eight different officers on official matters. Although interaction between the UNDP Representative and the Minister for National Planning and Monitoring or the Secretary is strong, there needs to be more responsive interaction at the middle management level. The appointment of an UNDP adviser/ officer to be based at the DNPM would result in greater interaction and restoration of some of the goodwill that has been lost.

2.4 UNDPs support to implementation of the MDG programme

How has UNDP contributed to the implementation of MDG programme?

The preceding sections reported on the varied ways that the UNDP provided support for MDG programme. The support that UNDP provides can be summarized as follows:

- Budgetary support through core and non-core resource disbursement of funds for in-country programme.
- Provision of technical advice on programmes, projects and workshops.
- Preparation of mid-term review reports.
- Member of joint supervisory committees (such as the steering committees) which oversee the implementation of MDG programmes.

UNDP’s support to the Monitoring and Evaluation of the MDG programme is discussed under the Section 3.2: MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme from 2008 to 2013.

3. UNDP’s MDG PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS.

3.1 Two Millennium Development Goal programmes from 2008 - 2013

Within the period 2008 – 2013, UNDP had two Millennium Development Goal country programmes in PNG, following the respective UN programming cycles in PNG, i.e. the UN Country Programme (UNCP) 2008 – 2012 (which was foreshortened by one year to accommodate the alignment with the Government’s five-year planning cycle), and the subsequent UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2011 – 2015. This evaluation concentrates on Outcome 1.2 (MTDS and MDGs in National Planning and Monitoring) of the UNCP 2008 – 2011 programme and the interagency cluster 2

Outcome (MDGS Population & Aid Coordination) of the UNDAF programme 2012-2015.

3.1.1 Outcome & Outputs of UN Country Program (UNCP) 2008 – 2011

The interagency Outcome 1.2 (Thematic Area: MTDS and MDGs in National Planning and Monitoring) of the UNCP 2008 – 2011²⁰ was:

“GoPNG efficiently, effectively and transparently coordinates international aid, Donors and Development Partners to support Nation Building and to facilitate the implementation and monitoring of the MTDS/MDGs”.

The expected outputs were that:

- (i) The Government and people of Papua New Guinea are aware of the 67 Millennium Development Goals (MDG) indicators created nationally and sub-nationally.
- (ii) Relevant Government departments have and use Medium Term Development Strategy (MTDS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) monitoring systems.

3.1.2 Outcome and Output of MDGS Population & Aid Coordination (MPA) 2012 – 2015

The interagency cluster 2 Outcome (MDGS Population & Aid Coordination)²¹ of the UNDAF 2012-2015 is:

“By 2015 relevant government bodies undertake evidence-based *and* participatory policy-making, planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, and manage aid effectively to achieve MDGs with equity.”

The expected outputs for this period are:

- (i) Government and stakeholders have the capacity to advocate for the achievement of MDGs.
- (ii) By 2015, relevant government institutions have the capacity to coordinate, collect and analyse age and sex disaggregated population, social and development related data for use in planning, policy formulation and monitoring of progress at national and sub-national levels.
- (iii) The Department of National Planning and Monitoring has the capacity to report and lead dialogue on MDGs, population issues and aid coordination.

In most cases, UNDP was GoPNG's only partner for MDG project implementation. At the same time, in the context of the UN's

²⁰ UNCP Action plan 2008-2012. P.49

²¹ UNDAF Action Plan 2012 – 2015. P.45

'Delivering as One' modality in PNG, UNDP has also chaired the UN Task Team on MDGs, Population and Aid Coordination (MPA) and as such facilitated UN-wide engagement – and other agencies' support (e.g. UNICEF and UNFPA) to GoPNG.

Below are the projects and activities that were part of each one of the programme cycle, which have been assessed by this evaluation. These projects were implemented to fulfill the expected outputs of the two MDG country programmes.

3.2 MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme from 2008 to April 2013.

This section evaluates the monitoring system that was established during the UNCP 2008 – 2011 period and continues into the current UNDAF 2012 – 2015 MDG programme.

It is necessary to provide some information about the Monitoring and evaluation and reporting system that is currently in place for the MDG programme and the Medium Term Development Plan (MTDP) before evaluative comments are made about the monitoring and reporting programme.

3.2.1 MDG Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting framework.

The important points to note about the MDG monitoring and evaluation framework are:

- The UNDAF 2012 – 2015²² and the UNCP 2008 – 2011²³ country programmes have monitoring and evaluation plans.
- The UNDAF Action plan 2012 – 2015²⁴ and the UNCP Action plan 2008 – 2012²⁵ operationalize the Monitoring and Evaluation arrangements as outlined in the country programmes (e.g. UNDAF 2012 – 2015).
- The country programmes, Action plans and Annual Work Plans (AWP) outline all outcomes, (or as in the UNDAF –cluster outcomes), outcome indicators, outputs, output indicators and respective targets, including those formulated to monitor the contribution to nation building (national indicators). The indicators for each outcome and output have been identified as well as baselines, targets, and means of verification in the UNDAF Action Plan Results Matrix.
- The Annual Work plans (AWP) constitute the primary instrument for monitoring outcome and output indicators.
- Data for monitoring is collected from a number of sources including: DEV Info (a socio-economic database such as the

²²UNDAF 2012 -2015. P.25

²³ UNCP 2008 - 2012

²⁴ UNDAF Action Plan 2012 - 2015

²⁵ UNCP Action Plan 2008 - 2012

PNGInfo), research, base and end line surveys, household surveys, census, management information systems, consultative reviews, community-based monitoring and evaluation, programme data, service statistics from government departments (Health, Education, Agriculture, NACS etc.) as well as field and technical backstopping visits. The data is disaggregated to monitor programme performance.

- The Quarterly and the Annual progress reports on the AWP activities serve as short term (annual) quality assurance assessment mechanisms and are based on the Results Matrix, including the baselines, targets and indicators reflected in the UN Joint AWPs. An annual progress report per outcome replaces the quarterly report for the last quarter of each year²⁶. In 2013 quarterly reports were replaced by biannual reports.
- The Annual Progress Report reflects detailed data on advancement towards targets agreed to with Government in the context of multi-year (e.g. 2012-2015) strategies. They include programme-related narrative for each inter-agency outcome, overall analysis of progress including financial expenditure and delivery rates, and outlines key challenges and recommendations²⁷.
- The UN Annual Progress Report is distributed to GoPNG and donor partners and is the basis for UN accountability to these key stakeholders.
- The mechanism for Medium Term (3-5 years) Assurance activities in the UN System is the Mid Term Review and End Term Review of UN Country programmes.

3.2.2 MTDP Monitoring and Evaluation framework

UNDP provided the support to establish MTDP monitoring and evaluation framework. The UN Country programmes (e.g. UNDAF 2012-2015) align their monitoring and evaluation efforts with the National Monitoring and Evaluation framework. The main points to note about the MTDP monitoring and evaluation framework are²⁸:

- The MTDP outlines a Monitoring and Evaluation framework for all sector goals, programmes, baseline data, projects, outcomes, and outputs.
- The M&E framework developed for each sector is used as a reference for monitoring and evaluation sector goals, activities, detailing clear targets, indicators and deliverables that are specific, measurable and time bound.
- Monitoring and Evaluation captures the various stages in the life of a project or program as resources get transformed into outputs, outcomes and impacts.
- Monitoring and evaluation primarily take place at the following levels:

²⁶ UNCP 2008 – 2012. P.39

²⁷ UNDAF Action Plan 2012 – 2015. P35

²⁸ GoPNG. MTDP 2012 – 2015 . p.25

- o From inputs to outputs — have funds been spent on the desired deliverables?
 - o From outputs to outcomes — are we achieving our desired developmental results?
- DNPM is responsible for monitoring and evaluation using best practice strategies and reporting to the Central Agency Coordinating Committee (CACC) and the National Executive Council (NEC).
- DNPM is also responsible for preparing annual reports on progress on the MTDP.

3.2.3 Evaluative Comments on the M&E framework.

The UNDP system of having Annual Work Plans (AWP) and UN Joint Annual Work Plans, all of which are aligned to the UN country programmes (such as UNCP 2008- 2012 and UNDAF 2012 – 2015), the multi-year Action plans (i.e. UNCP and UNDAF Action Plans) with Action Plan Results Matrix, planned activities under the outcome and output indicators and the quarterly, biannual and annual progress reporting against the planned activities is working well. The mid-term reviews have also provided valuable critique of progress against national and international MDG target indicators. The documentary evidence (plans and reports) provides a snap shot of progress made in relation to baseline data, target indicators, deliverables and goals (in particular MDGs). The annual and midterm progress reports are an integral part of the monitoring and evaluation framework.

The annual progress reports indicate that most activities planned for had been implemented. For example, an overall delivery rate of 75% on the programmes outputs was reported in the 2012 Annual Report. This is regarded as above average performance if compared to government departments. However a high delivery rate of the output activities does not necessarily translate to effectiveness, efficiency and high impact which need to be evaluated. For an assessment of UNDP's performance on components of MDG programmes and projects see Section 4.7: Rating of UNDP's performance on components of MDG programme.

M&E Database - PNGInfo

A fully functional development database, PNGInfo, exists at national level (DNPM) and in some provinces. PNGInfo, launched in 2007, is the localized version of a global system of development database. UNICEF provided the financial and technical support to set up the database, with partnerships facilitated by UNDP through the MPA Task Team. DNPM is the lead organization but the key partners who contribute data to PNGInfo are National Statistics Office (NSO), Departments of Health & HIV, Education, Agriculture and Livestock, Environment & Conservation and Community Development. The

PNGInfo databases include MDG indicators, PNG Census data (1990 & 2000), Medium Term Development Plan & PNG Development Strategic plan baseline data and indicators, and Human Development Index.

PNGInfo staff (from DNPM) received training from UNICEF on administering of database and data analysis, use of database to compute indicators such as Human Development Index, inequality adjusted human development index, gender inequality index and multiple dimensional poverty index from the current Chief Technical consultant on MDGs at DNPM. Officers from PNGInfo also conducted a workshop on the database and MDGs (together with other officers from DNPM) at PNG University of Technology, a partnership initiated by UNDP. Other workshops were conducted at four pilot provinces where the data base was rolled out. However, as indicated by PNGInfo officers, gaps exist in the database and there was a need to regularly update the information from the key GoPNG partner departments.

3.2.4 Challenges

The following challenges hinder the successful monitoring and evaluation of MDG outcomes, outputs and target indicators.

The biggest obstacle to effective monitoring and evaluation of the MDG indicators is the lack of relevant data for the indicators as noted by several reports (2004 and 2010 MDG mid-term progressive reports and the 2010 Assessment of Development report).

The non-availability of data (or gaps in data) creates delays to a number of planned activities and affects the accuracy of monitoring of outcome, output and target MDG indicators (see Section 4.2.3: Hindrance to effective achievement of MDGs).

The nationally tailored MDG targets were adopted into MTDS 2005 – 2010 in the hope of achieving the MDGs. The inclusion of country specific targets and indicators was a significant step forward. The 2004 MDG Report recognized that the lack of reliable statistical data constrained development planning and monitoring progress towards achieving the MDGs. In terms of the monitoring and evaluation capacity for each of the MDGs, the 2010 Comprehensive Report on MDGs²⁹ indicates “that PNGs database on human development and MDG monitoring remains incomplete and deficient”. Many of the global as well as national indicators could not be measured because of lack of data. The 2011 ADR ³⁰reported that lack of accurate baselines or targets for the identified priorities in MTDS constrained informed budgetary allocations. The ADR also makes the point that “there was a critical need for comprehensive national statistics and that the

²⁹GoPNG. 2010. Second National Progressive Report on MDGs for PNG. P.236

³⁰UNDP. 2010 Assessment of Development results in PNG. Evaluation of UNDP contribution. P.29

nationally tailored MDGs remain estimates in the MTDP because of a lack of reliable baseline data. ... There was a need to improve data collection capacities”.

Other challenges were that³¹:

- The performance and progress monitoring of project implementation was not robust at the project level.
- There were no formal plans on how nationally tailored targets were going to be reached.
- DNPM programme officers who were “overstretched” and had their own responsibilities were also required to monitor programmes but did not have time to systematically monitor programmes. Consequently this led to difficulties in producing annual MTDP progress reports. The evaluator was not able to sight a copy of an annual MTDP progress report.
- The UNDP programme lacked a National Capacity Development strategy.
- There was limited learning from pilot initiatives because monitoring and documentation was weak.

Reporting is a very important aspect of monitoring and evaluation. The lack of data creates delays in producing reports or else inaccurate reports are produced. The building of capacity of DNPM staff to compile information and write reports (especially MDTP annual progress reports) needs to be addressed urgently.

3.2.5 UNDP’s support to the Monitoring of MDG programme

How has UNDP contributed to the monitoring of MDG programmes?

As explained above, the biggest obstacle to effective monitoring and evaluation of the MDG indicators is the lack of relevant data for the indicators as noted by several reports (2004 and 2010 MDG mid-term progressive reports and the 2011 ADR).

The 2011 ADR suggested that the lack of relevant data for the indicators was a possible area that UNDP could assist by building capacity to systematically collect and analyze relevant data. The collection of national indicator data and analysis were included in the UNDAF Action plan 2012 – 2015 and the 2012 & 2013 AWP planned activities included training workshops for national and provincial officials on Human development indicators and the PNGInfo database, data analysis training for NSO officers, recruitment of international consultant to analyze 2011 census data, PNGInfo training for some provinces, design and implementation of PNG Development Assistance Database (DAD).

³¹ UNDP. 2010 Assessment of Development results in PNG. Evaluation of UNDP contribution. P.29

The following planned activities from the 2012 UN Joint AWP provides examples of UNDP's support for the monitoring and evaluation of MDG programme:³²

- Conduct of data analysis training
- Training workshop for GoPNG and Development partners on data validation and entry procedures.
- Training of key technical officers on data analysis and report writing.

UNDP's reporting of MDG programme activities against the AWP is regular (quarterly, biannual- from 2013 and annual progress reports). The evaluator was not able to establish the regularity of reporting on the activities of the DNPM AWP but assistance in this area is certainly needed.

3.2.6 Preparation and influence of PNG's MDG progress reports

The Quarterly and the Annual progress report serve as short term (annual) quality assurance assessment mechanisms and report on progress made on the AWP activities for the outcome and output indicators. The Annual Progress Report reflects overall analysis of progress including expenditure and delivery rates, and outlines key challenges and recommendations. The preparation of the Annual Progress Reports is a joint effort by the various UN Agencies and reports according to the major themes or outcomes (or Inter-agency outcomes as in the 2012 Annual Report) as outlined in the UN country programmes. Within the UN system, these annual reports are important as progress on outcome and output activities, challenges noted and lessons learnt influence the next AWP. The dissemination of the annual reports to GoPNG departments and other stakeholders inform them of UNs contribution to GoPNG priorities. UNDP's Mid-Term and End Term Reviews reflect on the progress made on outcomes and output indicators within the overall UN Country programmes.

UNDP provides assistance to DNPM in producing GoPNG's mid-term reviews of progress made on the achievement of MDGs (such as 2004 and 2010 MDG comprehensive reports). Interviews with DNPM staff confirm that the department plays a leading role in the preparation of the midterm reviews. The roles include coordinating the reviews, collection of data and information, synthesis and analysis. Usually a consultant is commissioned to write the report which is considered by the MDG Steering Committee and is presented to the National Executive Council (NEC) for approval before it is disseminated to stakeholders. UNDP plays an important role at all stages of the preparation of these reports.

³² UN Joint Annual Work Plan 2012.

3.3 MDG Acceleration framework project at Kairuku District 2011 – 2013.

3.3.1 Project description.

This project is a good Case study of the implementation of MDG in-country programmes and highlights a number of issues, challenges and lessons that can be learnt. The MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF) project on infant and maternal health in the Kairuku district of the Central province was initiated by UNDP as a pilot project to accelerate MDG 4 & 5 (Improve Infant and maternal health). The MDG Acceleration and Implementation in PNG attempts to find best ways, through pilot projects, to achieve the MDGs at a faster rate.

The project had five outputs^{33&34}:

1. Data collection system improved and problems and solutions on maternal and infant health are identified in the project area (Kairuku LLG of Kairuku-Hiri District in the Central Province of PNG)
2. Capacity of the community in Kairuku LLG strengthened to demand basic health rights and better health services and monitor progress on maternal and infant health
3. Capacity of local level governments strengthened to improve policies on maternal and infant health
4. Capacity of the health providers, including Women Health Volunteers improved to provide basic health services on maternal and infant health
5. Lessons learned are documented and disseminated in the post-intervention period for their replication as good practices

The Government of PNG, through DNPM was the lead agency with the Central Province Administration (Health division) as the implementing partner. Other partners included UN agencies UNFPA, UNICEF and WHO³⁵ and district administrations. The project used the MAF guidelines and aimed to improve infant and maternal health in the pilot project sites in Kairuku district, which had some of the highest infant and maternal mortality rates in PNG³⁶. UNDP's Democratic Government Thematic Trust Fund (DGTTF) provided USD 400,000.00 for the project by April 2011 and UNDP PNG, under the National Implementation Modality, supported the Department of National Planning and Monitoring (DNPM) with the project implementation. There was widespread consultation with local leaders and

³³UNDP. MDG Acceleration and implementation pilot project document

³⁴Bhattarai, D. 2011. MDG Acceleration and implementation pilot project

³⁵DNPM. December, 2012. Draft Report. Findings of the Key Informant on the pilot project on maternal and child health (MDG 4 and 5) in Kairuku District, Central Province, Papua New Guinea.

³⁶DNPM. Progress Report, 2011. MDG Acceleration Pilot Project on Child and Maternal Health (MDG 4 and 5) in Kairuku District, Central Province.

communities in the Kairuku district to create awareness and gain support for the project.

A number of key activities took place during the first phase of the project including the conduct of a bottle neck analysis in consultation with the community to identify problems encountered in the district on infant and maternal health, access to health services, possible blockages to the project and to provide feasible solutions. These were reported in “Findings of the Key Informants on the pilot project on maternal and child health (MDG 4 and 5) in Kairuku District”³⁷ in December 2012. A budgeted MAF Action Plan based on infant and maternal health problems and solutions identified by the bottle neck analysis was submitted to UNDP in November 2012. Unfortunately, although UNDP was prepared to fund a 6 week workshop (as in the Action plan) it could not be implemented as supporting documents were incomplete and it was unclear what transformational results would be achieved through an additional workshop.

3.3.2 Challenges

A number of participants who were interviewed for this evaluation called the project a “failed project” and while the decision had not been finalized by UNDP and DNPM (at the time of writing this report) about whether the project should continue, all who were spoken to agreed that challenges encountered by the project made it difficult for the project to be completed as planned.

The challenges encountered include the following:

- **Delays in project start-up.** The project was planned as a two year project from April 2011 to April 2013. There was a delay in the start-up of the project. The implementation processes took time. For example, the recruitment process of the project manager was lengthy and the project manager was on board only from December, 2011³⁸. The vehicle was not available until 22nd June, 2012 (approximately 7 months after the Project Manager was recruited) which meant that there was no logistics support for the Project manager to travel to and from Kairuku district (Central province). These challenges are listed as internal challenges in the 2012 progress report on the MDG acceleration project.³⁹
- **Failure to honour commitments by partners.** The Central Province Administration (CPA) failed to honour its commitment

³⁷DNPM. December, 2012. Draft Report. Findings of the Key Informant on the pilot project on maternal and child health (MDG 4 and 5) in Kairuku District, Central Province, Papua New Guinea.

³⁸UNDP. 2012. MDG Acceleration and implementation in PNG. 2012 Progress Report

³⁹Ibid

to the project. Accommodation was not provided by the Central Health Division in Bereina, Kairuku District for the project manager as agreed to as Central province's in-kind contribution to the project in the MOU between DNPM and Central administration. Including CPA from the beginning of the project may have helped in securing accommodation for the project manager or CPA would have advised of the non-availability of accommodation and alternate plans would have been made. No office space was provided for the project manager in Kairuku until August 2012.

- **Inefficient disbursement of funds.** UNDP's support for the project was inefficient and they had difficulties in timely disbursement of funds for project management. For example, Village Health volunteers' allowances were not paid on time. On a number of occasions, materials and equipment were not prepared in time for scheduled activities such as training workshops⁴⁰. The delay in disbursement of funds was in sharp contrast to DNPM's experience with other UN agencies such as UNFPA and UNICEF who were timely in the disbursement of funds for joint projects with DNPM. The fact that supporting documents submitted by DNPM were not in order added to the slow disbursement. This highlights a lack of understanding by DNPM about UNDP rules and regulations, and the Chief Technical Adviser's (CTA) failure to communicate them clearly.
- **Delays in implementing the project.** UNDP's operational requirements also contributed to the delays in implementing the project. DNPM's lack of understanding of UNDP's procurement process and requirements led to the perception that these requirements are too stringent and rigid. The Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), based at DNPM was UNDP's official facilitator of the project. The CTA did not fully understand the procurement processes and gave incomplete information which resulted in delays and frustrations. For example, provision of supporting documents (such as invoices etc) for planned activities and procurement forms needed to be filled in correctly.
- **Inadequate levels of resource mobilization:** Mobilization of resources for project by both UNDP and GoPNG was inefficient and ineffective. Resulted in unnecessary delays in providing logistical support. As this was a national project, greater responsibility lies with the Government, but none of the promised government cost-sharing had come through.
- **Insufficient funding.** Funding (USD 400,000.00) was exhausted before the objectives of project were fulfilled

⁴⁰Oksen, V. End of project Report. June, 2013. MDG acceleration Pilot Project on maternal and infant health. Kairuku. Mekeo and Kuni LLG.

(acknowledged as a possible risk in the Project document⁴¹) but it seems that the mobilization of extra resources in the second year of the project to counter the risk did not materialize. A budgeted MAF Action Plan based on infant and maternal health problems and solutions identified by the bottle neck analysis was submitted in November 2012 but no actions had been taken to date because the project end date expired and funding had been exhausted by then.

- **Inadequate Monitoring of Project.** The Project was inadequately monitored. A Steering Committee comprising of senior representatives of DNPM and the UN System and project partners were supposed to oversee the project⁴². DNPM was supposed to submit quarterly reports to be considered by the Steering Committee. No regular meetings of Steering Committee (made up project partners) to monitor and oversee project and to discuss issues affecting the project were held. Finding appropriate time for all the members of the committee to have a meeting was given as the reason for not holding regular meetings.
- **Non-inclusion of key partners from beginning.** Central Provincial Administration, a crucial partner was not included from the beginning (at the planning stage) of the project. Consequently, there was lack of support for housing for the project manager and a reluctance to support in other areas.
- **Miscellaneous Costs.** Some miscellaneous costs such as service of vehicle, tyre repairs, purchase of accessories, appreciation costs, although budgeted for, required urgent payment which the project manager paid for with own money. This was a concern for the project manager because petty cash for such activities was not allowed. Refunds took time to process.
- **DNPM's role as coordinating (not an implementing) Department.** DNPM's role is planning, monitoring and coordination and the department should not have been the major implementing partner in the project. Other line agencies such as Health Department or Central Provincial Administration should have taken the lead in the project.
- **Ineffective project management.** Project management was ineffective, inefficient and there was failure to provide strategic direction at all levels – from committee level to implementation level. The Project Manager needed strategic decision making skills.

⁴¹UNDP. 2011. MDG Acceleration and Implementation Pilot Project Document.

⁴²Ibid

- **Non adherence to project budget.** The project was half completed when the funds were exhausted. As a consequence many objectives of the project below were not achieved.
- **Recruitment without consulting DNPM.** The recruitment of a Health Statistician (to triangulate the information from the data collected, costed action plan and to analyze the lessons learned) without the input of the DNPM was a cause of some concern within the department. A lack of DNPM internal communication then led to the impression that UNDP was going its own way.
- **Lack of facilities and infrastructure at project site⁴³.** The absence of banking facilities (for withdrawal and transactions into vendor accounts), petrol stations (bulk procurement in the capital city), and low quality road infrastructure (bridge collapse and inaccessible roads after rainfall) slowed down or even interrupted project implementation. The lack of facilities and infrastructure also has security implications (need to physically transport payments, petrol or wait until roads are accessible again).
- **Project perceptions – “Workshop project”.** There was a strong perception within DNPM (and this was a view shared by those on the ground) that the project was a “workshop project” and did not bring about any tangible benefits or changes. What was interesting to the evaluator was the strong view of UNDP that there was a need to move away from training workshops. Training workshops were not the best way to get people to change their behavior or learn new practices. Apparently there were disagreements between management on the one hand and the CTA and DNPM on the other hand on the use of “workshops”.
- **Negative Perceptions from project.** Overall this project created a negative view about UNDP. UNDP was the visible organization at the forefront of MDG programme implementation. There is a perception at DNPM that the image of UNDP’s strong commitment to MDG was fading.

3.3.3 Lessons learnt

- **Mobilization of Resources for cost sharing and funding partnerships.** The Action plan developed after the bottleneck analysis recommended that further funding to be sought from DNPM, Department of Health, Central province, UN agencies, development partners and donors. This point was also supported by the MDG acceleration project document as a risk mitigation factor and recommended that funding be sought from other partners in the second year. The amount of USD

⁴³UNDP. 2012. MDG Acceleration and implementation in PNG. 2012 Progress Report

400,000 was insufficient for the completion of the project. This should come as no surprise considering that UNDP is not a funding agency and its funds should be considered as seed funding to kick start projects. The projects should be sustained with funding from GoPNG as lead partner and other donor agencies. The 2011 ADR makes the point that although UNCT has developed a standard operating procedure for mobilizing resources for UN agencies, UNDP needs more “concerted efforts to forge cost sharing and funding partnerships”.⁴⁴

- **Involvement of Key Partners from the beginning and at all Stages of project.** All key partners should have been involved from the beginning and at all stages of project – i.e. consultation, design, planning, implementation, and evaluation. Even when a project proposal has been submitted for approval by relevant UN agencies, stakeholders should be consulted and must be involved. In this case, the Central province Health Division and the Kairuku district administration should have been consulted at an earlier stage.
- **DNPM’s role as a Coordinating (not implementing) Department.** DNPM is a coordinating department and must always remain so. The implementation of any project should be left to line agencies. The coordination role is important and should include identification of and liaison with potential partners and implementers of projects. DNPM’s input is important at Steering Committee level and in monitoring projects. This view is strongly supported by the Minister for National Planning, The Honorable Charles Abel as reported by National EM TV news on 3rd November, 2013. The Minister was quoted as saying that DNPM was a coordinating and not an implementing department. “We will concentrate on our job ... monitoring funds and holding people accountable.”⁴⁵
- **Involvement of other UN agencies.** UNICEF and UNFPA were involved at a much later stage when the workshops for village health volunteers were held. WHO was involved in the training of Village Health coordinators and volunteers. They were invited to assist with workshop presentations. UNICEF, UNFPA and WHO should have been involved from the beginning considering that they had expertise in these areas (MDG 4 & 5).
- **Timely disbursement of funds for the project.** UNDP needs to seriously address the long delays in accessing and disbursing funds which has adverse consequences about the successful implementation of projects. They can learn from other UN agencies such as UNICEF and UNFPA who were

⁴⁴UNDP. 2011. Assessment of Development Results. P.28

⁴⁵ National EM TV news at 6 pm. 3rd November, 2013.

timely in their disbursement of funds for the projects they supported. The 2011 ADRs recommendation 13 supports this point as the assessment noted that UNDP has difficulties in timely disbursement of funds.⁴⁶

- **Review of UNDP procurement system.** The UNDP procurement system needs to be understood by project managers and officers at DNPM. In-service on how the UNDP system works should be provided for relevant staff of DNPM and any project manager. However, the procurement systems need to be reviewed and some processes in the system need to be streamlined. For example, working in remote areas of PNG where no banking facilities exist requires the use of petty cash for unforeseen circumstances. If the vehicle gets bogged down on the road and some people assist in pulling vehicle out, one needs to give some appreciation money. There is also a need for cash used to pay to pass through “pothole brigade” or road blocks and the risk of not paying anything far outweighs the risk of carrying cash. If it’s raining, the road conditions make travelling much more difficult and time consuming, more fuel is used and risk of running out of fuel increases which necessitates use of petty cash to pay for fuel.
- **Recruitment of project managers.** The project manager must have some expertise and experience in the relevant field (example, health or education) and has proven and excellent management skills in development areas. Another important skill in the ability to write reports.
- **Inadequate Monitoring of Project.** The UNDP CTA and Programme officers from DNPM were not able to effectively monitor the project. No DNPM M&E staff was assigned to monitor the project and the programme officers did the monitoring in addition to their main tasks and responsibilities. The 2011 ADR makes the point that there was limited learning from pilot initiatives because monitoring and documentation was weak. This conclusion can also be applied to the Kairuku project.
- **Adherence to Budget lines and items.** Strict adherence to expenditure based on planned project budget lines and items is necessary for the successful implementation of project.
- **Removing road blocks to acceleration.** The term “Acceleration” in this project is a misnomer and does not in any way describe what happens in practice. It describes the ideal and the wish that the achievement of MDGs and the process of identifying bottlenecks or road blocks and addressing them will result in acceleration which will take place within a short

⁴⁶ UNDP. 2010 Assessment of Development Results. Evaluation of UNDP contribution. P.63

period of time. Impediments and constraints prevent the acceleration process. These impediments exist with UNDP and DNPM. If the impediments or constraints are removed to create a conducive environment for acceleration to take place, then the acceleration projects are likely to succeed.

The following lessons (which are worth noting) were listed in the 2012 progress report on the project⁴⁷ and many of them concur with lessons noted earlier:

- Sub-national project implementation in PNG comes with a wide range of challenges and risks, including geographic, security, logistic, coordination and administration challenges, which requires a more detailed risk analysis and mitigation strategies for more effective project implementation. This means that it takes time to see progress on the ground when working at sub-national levels.
- A strong link between collection of existing health data, data analysis and further research, including in other areas that impact health outcomes, is required for a pilot project to meaningfully identify solutions to MDG bottlenecks;
- Increased awareness of the men, women and youth in regards to health access, health funds and community participation can create increased demand for services, transparency and accountability;
- Using existing resources, structure and processes (e.g. governance structure at sub-national level such as the Ward Development Committees) makes project outputs easier to achieve and more sustainable in time;
- Provincial and district officers are willing to adopt the MAF methodology in its local government planning process. The improved awareness of District officials in the bottom-up approach to planning has created demand for support in developing District Development Action Plan. This opportunity can be used in engaging and influencing officials on transparency and accountability issue and improving policies on maternal and child health.
- Recruitment of a project manager takes valuable time of short project duration. For timely and effective implementation as well as sustainability of outputs, it might be an advantage to recruit a competent Project Manager from within the district health system on a secondment basis, who can ensure continuity of outputs after the project ends.

⁴⁷UNDP. 2012. MDG Acceleration and implementation in PNG. 2012 Progress Report: p.5

3.4 Community Led MDG Achievement (CLMA) Project 2012 - 2015

3.4.1 Project Description

The Community Led MDG Achievement (CLMA) project was initiated because of concern about PNGs slow progress to achieving the MDG targets (initially the project was called Millennium Development pilot project in PNG). The main levels of concern were⁴⁸:

- Levels of hardship.
- Health (malaria, pneumonia, diarrhoea and TB).
- Child/infant mortality (68/57 per 1000 births).
- Maternal mortality (733 per 100,000 births).
- Education (primary enrolment and retention).
- Access to water, sanitation and electricity.

There was an urgent need to progress the MDG achievement, especially in the rural areas. The CLMA concept was broad, area-based and used community-led development strategy to achieve the MDGs by⁴⁹:

- Investing simultaneously in interventions across sectors, including access to clean water, education, food/income generation, health, and essential infrastructure.
- Creating partnerships to leverage the unique strengths of local level NGOs, church groups etc.
- Attracting greater investment.
- Replicating good practices.

The project was formulated through a participatory approach and is intended to be locally led, responding to village identified needs and priorities. Villages selected for pilot project would have had CBO support for a period of time (it was intended that the CBO would help manage project). Four villages were selected for trial project (MulBaiyer district, WHP; Nodugl district, Jiwaka; Ambunti – Drekikir district ESP and Alotau, Milne Bay). DNPM was the lead agency and the other partners were UNDP, EU, DPLGA, DCD, DIRD, Provincial governments and relevant departments depending on village projects chosen. The project Steering committee had representatives from district, provincial government, LLG, Office of Rural Development, UNDP and DNPM. The total budget for the project was K3.1 million (funded by EU). Monitoring and evaluation was intended to be carried out by PC, DNPM and UNDP with project progress to be monitored by the CBO. The monitoring included measuring the MDG indicators and targets and collection of baseline data at the beginning of the project.

⁴⁸ Community Led MDG Achievement Project in PNG. Power point presentation of Project description. 2012

⁴⁹ Ibid

By August 2013 a Project Manager had been recruited and he had preliminary consultations with the villages and provinces selected for the pilot projects. The project manager expressed concern about the delays in start-up to the project. He would have liked to start as soon as he was recruited but challenges prevented the project from starting. The slow speed at this stage of the project was due to challenges faced with DNPM's limited responsiveness, as well as insufficient ownership and leadership for the project (e.g. steering committee, provincial visits and induction workshops). The project manager also expressed concern that the village officials at sites selected for the project (seven months ago at the design stage of the Millennium Village Development pilot project) had high expectations and were getting disillusioned about the implementation of the project.

This project incorporated some of the lessons learnt from the Kairuku MDG acceleration project until May 2015.

3.5 POST-2015 Consultations.

The Deputy Prime Minister reported at the UN General assembly in New York ("Post Courier", 1st October, 2013) that PNG has made some progress on the MDGs but PNG will not meet the goals by 2015. However the goals will still be relevant for PNG beyond 2015. The MDGs are incorporated into official government policy documents and plans (for example, MTDP 2012 – 2015 and PNG DSP 2010 – 2030) as key to achieving human development in PNG. Based on the Alotau Accord, the GoPNG demonstrated its commitment to education and health (MDG 2, 4, 5 & 6) through a budget allocation of PGK 13 billion for 2013, an increase of 22.7% compared to 2012, and the Government of PNG seeks to provide free basic education and primary health care, as well as improved infrastructure for social service delivery⁵⁰.

The Post-2015 Development Agenda Country Consultations⁵¹ support the notion that the MDGs are building blocks and are clearly the stepping stones to the next development framework. Six emerging issues were identified:

1. Cross-cutting priorities
2. Peace and safety
3. Growth and employment
4. Education
5. Land, water and environment
6. Food and social protection and nutrition security.

⁵⁰ UN Annual Progress Report 2012. P.15

⁵¹ UN. Post 2015 Development Agenda. PNG Country Consultations.

The consultations confirmed that for the people of PNG, there is a strong link between human development and an enabling environment. Public – private dialogue is recommended to take place to determine how the six emerging issues will be incorporated with the MDGs before consensus is reached about the final post 2015 agenda. The GoPNG and the UN will obviously take the lead in the consultation process within the context of government plans for the next 5 to 20 years. Collaboration will be crucial between GoPNG and other Non-State Actors (NSAs) but there will also be a need for NSAs, UN agencies and donor partners to support any government led initiatives.

3.6 Other UN Agencies projects

3.6.1 MDG Radio Awareness program

This activity was conducted under output 2.1 – GoPNG and stakeholders have the capacity to advocate for the achievement of MDGs and the output indicator was “number of DNPM led MDG advocacy events conducted” and was supported by UNFPA.

Two radio serial dramas for PNG – *Nau Em Taim* (“Now is the Time” in pidgin) and *Echoes of Change* (in English)⁵² have been created by Population Media Centre (PMC) to increase public awareness on the MDGs with support from UNFPA and financial assistance from AusAID⁵³. These radio dramas are broadcast by Nau FM. By June 2013, all 208 episodes in both pidgin and English were broadcast. From initial reports the radio dramas have a wide audience from all sections of the community. Personal testimonies have been documented by PMC on how the radio dramas have impacted on people’s lives⁵⁴ (see PMC website).

4. Assessment of UNDP MDG programmes according to the evaluation criteria

4.1 Relevance of UNDP MDG programme

What is the relevance of the UNDP MDG programme?

The Government of PNG (GoPNG) as a signatory to the UN Millennium Declaration (MD) on the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) in 2000, is committed to the attainment of the goals as evidenced by the integration of MDGs into all GoPNG strategic development policy documents such as the PNG Vision 2050⁵⁵, PNG Development

⁵² http://www.populationmedia.media.org/where/papua_new_guinea

⁵³ UNDP. 2011 Narrative on MDGs, Population and Aid Coordination (MPA)

⁵⁴ http://www.populationmedia.media.org/where/papua_new_guinea

⁵⁵ GoPNG. PNG Vision 2050

Strategic Plan (DSP) 2010-2030⁵⁶, Medium Term Development Strategy 2005 – 2010⁵⁷ and the Medium Term Development Plan 2011 – 2015⁵⁸.

That GoPNG ownership of the MDGs is demonstrated by the fact that the MDG targets and indicators have been localized. The PNG tailored MDGs represent a number of development goals (8), targets (15), and indicators (67) for the period 1990-2015, which are focused on elevating the level of human development in PNG⁵⁹. The tailoring of the MDGs enabled the GoPNG to set realistic expectations in terms of achievement based on past trends.

The GoPNG is also an active participant in the UN planning and implementation plans for all their in-country MDG programmes such as UN country program for PNG 2008 – 2012, UN Development assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012 – 2015, and their respective Action Plans. These UNDP multi-year action plans and the Annual work plans are endorsed by the GoPNG and demonstrate that the GoPNG considers these action plans as relevant. This point was also highlighted by the 2011 ADR ⁶⁰ which concluded that the UNDP response as formulated in the UNDP country programme is relevant to the needs of Papua New Guinea.

Almost all who were interviewed for this evaluation affirmed that the MDG programme was relevant for PNG because it provided clear targets to aim for development at all levels – national, provincial down to district level. The MDGs had relevant issues that deal directly with people's lives, for example, increased access to basic education for girls and boys (MDG 2). The MDGs provide the guiding benchmarks for improving the lives of Papua New Guineans.

4.2 Effectiveness of the MDG Development Programme

The questions that aim at effectiveness are: Are the outcomes/ outputs/ objectives of the development interventions being achieved? How big is the effectiveness or impact of the programme compared to the objectives planned (comparison of actual result from planning)?

In the context of this evaluation, did the activities implemented achieve the outcomes and outputs?

4.2.1 Effectiveness of Outcome 1.2 and Outputs (UNCP 2008 – 2011)

Activities in this period (2008 – 2011) focused on awareness and advocacy on the 67 Millennium Development Goals (MDG) indicators

⁵⁶PNG Development Strategic Plan (DSP) 2010-2030

⁵⁷GoPNG. Medium Term Development Strategy 2005 – 2010

⁵⁸Medium Term Development Plan 2011 – 2015

⁵⁹Popoitai. 2007 (?). Towards implementing MDGs in PNG. Opportunities, Challenges and the way forward.

⁶⁰UNDP. 2011. Assessment of Development Results in PNG. Evaluation of UNDP contribution.

created nationally and sub-nationally and having Relevant Government departments use Medium Term Development Strategy (MTDS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) monitoring systems. The difference between awareness and advocacy is that awareness is sensitizing leading to possible change in behaviour and advocacy is a call to action and decision-making to effect change in programmes, systems, policies and practices.

The awareness and advocacy programmes were effective and resulted in integration of MDGs into strategic GoPNG policy and planning documents such as PNG Vision 2050, MTDS 2005 - 2010, MTDP 2011 - 2015, PNGDSP 2010 – 2030 and development of nationally created MDG indicators. This was an outstanding result of advocacy at the national level. The 2011 ADR however notes the “reliability of data on which MTDP outcome indicators are based have not improved significantly. ... and nationally tailored MDG targets remain estimates because of a lack of baseline data”⁶¹.

In addition, the translation of policies and plans into practice for achieving MDG targets by 2015 has not been as effective. An equity-based approach is needed where interventions prioritize the disadvantaged areas and populations. For example, interventions should target rural areas, provinces, districts and population groups for which the MDG indicators are the lowest in the country.

MDG monitoring systems were also set up including PNGinfo data base and this was a positive step in having a data base for monitoring MDG indicators. Unfortunately, it is not as effective as it should be because of the need to regularly update information in the data bases. Gaps exist, especially data from the 2011 census from National Statistics Office and from other key government departments such as Department of Health and Department of Education. There is also a need for improving the data collection capacities of the relevant government departments and data analysis skills.

The ADR⁶² notes that capacity building within DNPM has not been as effective where a more phased approach was needed to systematically build capacity in the department. Technical expertise was needed to provide guidance to Government officers (action oriented approach) to enable the department to function on its own.

In terms of the medium term development strategy and the MDGs outcome for this period (2008 – 2011), the ADR assessment⁶³ notes UNDP’s support to GoPNG as significant achievement in the production of two national MDG reports and the continued support for national planning documents towards achieving the MDG targets. However the report stated that the overall progress to achieving the

⁶¹UNDP 2011. Assessment of Development results, 2011.p30

⁶²UNDP 2011. Assessment of Development results, 2011

⁶³UNDP 2011. Assessment of Development results, 2011. P.50

national and international targets has been slow and that donor coordination has been very weak. Overall this outcome has not been achieved.

4.2.2 Effectiveness of Outcome and Outputs of MPA (UNDAF 2012– 2015)

The UN's continuous MDG advocacy, lobbying and sensitizing the GoPNG of the disparities at the levels of human development between provinces and districts, continuous technical assistance on MDGs, population and human development and related data gathering and analysis proved effective. The advocacy resulted in increased funding in 2013 for provinces and district by GoPNG through the provincial support improvement programme and the District services improvement programme.⁶⁴

The effectiveness of the advocacy was also demonstrated when DNPM officers made the decision to assist provinces whose development indicators are much lower than the national average (e.g. Sandaun province). From an equity based intervention perspective, this was the correct action to take because intervention programmes should target the disadvantage provinces, localities and population groups, such as people living in rural areas.

The preparation of community costed action plan as a part of the bottleneck analysis of the MDG acceleration project at Kairuku was an achievement. Progress was good up to this point but it was not implemented because the project period came to an end in April 2013, and funding had been utilized. This shows that that not only is the availability of funding important but timely disbursement of funding and adherence to budgeted items are also important and can lead to success or failure of project. More importantly are the project management skills.

The MDG radio awareness campaign was completed by April 2013. Testimonies of listeners is good but a final independent evaluation (planned for December 2013) to assess change in behavior and confirm effectiveness is necessary.

DNPM convenes the meeting on Joint technical working group on aid effectiveness. This is an indication that DNPM has the capacity to report and lead dialogue on MDGs, population issues and aid coordination.

The training of officials from 18 provinces as well as national level senior government officials enhanced their knowledge and understanding of MDGs and sustainable development and would prove useful in preparing provincial and district plans, especially when DNPM expects them to MDG integrated five year development

⁶⁴UN Annual Progress Report 2012.

plans⁶⁵. The training is considered effective if they can produce MDG compliant development plans.

The training conducted by UNDP & DNPM at PNG University of Technology to senior academic and management staff resulted in an increased understanding of MDGs and human development and facilitated the introduction of the MDG course at the university which is now a part of the Bachelor of Technology in Communication and development degree programme. This is an effective approach to getting universities to approve and institutionalize a new course. It is hoped that in due time it will become a Centre of excellence in the area of MDG and human development in the South Pacific.

The establishment of a Special Interventions Branch at DNPM with four government officer signals seriousness by GoPNG to address the MDG issues more permanently by a section within the department. The institutionalization of MDG interventions within government structures demonstrates the effectiveness of MDG advocacy for ownership of the programme.

4.2.3 Hindrance to effective achievement of MDGs.

Gaps in data for planning.

It is noted with concern that the effective planning and implementation of projects and activities that are intended to achieve the outcomes and outputs have a common hindrance factor (bottleneck) – lack of data or gaps in data. Examples of the hindrance to progress of activities because of unavailability of data include:

- Delay in completion of draft Population policy 2014 – 2024 because of a delay in the full analysis of the 2011 census data⁶⁶. UNFPA supported consultant could not complete population policy because 2011 census data was not yet available.
- Delay in computation of percentage of annual operational plans of health, education and community development departments that utilize key demographic data (size, growth rate, age and sex composition, spatial distribution) because of “census data not yet available. Indicator and target needs to be more realistic”.⁶⁷
- Delay in calculating proportion of data sets disaggregated by age, sex and location derived from census and surveys that are utilized for decision making at national and provincial levels because of “census data not yet available. Indicator and target needs to be more realistic”.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ UN 2013 Biannual progress report.

⁶⁶ UN 2012 Progress report

⁶⁷ UN 2013 Biannual Progress report April 2013

⁶⁸ Ibid.p.6

- Delay in census data dissemination events undertaken (workshops, Media events, etc) because census data not yet available.
- The Development Assistance Database (DAD) exists at DNPM but is not yet functional⁶⁹.

The gaps in data seriously affects sound planning by GoPNG and other MDG programme implementing UN agencies and donor partners. PNGInfo has functioning databases but these databases need regular update with data from relevant government departments such as Department of Health, Department of Education and National Statistical Office.

“The National” newspaper (October 23, 2013) under the headline “Poor data affects plans” reported the Acting Secretary for the Department of National Planning and Monitoring stating that PNG lacked sound evidence-based policy which resulted in poor development outcomes because of a fragmented and uncoordinated national statistic system. The Acting Secretary further confirmed that the new population policy could not be completed because of a lack of data from 2011 census and highlighted the need to build statistical capacity within GoPNG departments to support design, monitoring and evaluation of all development plans and strategies. These statements were made on the occasion of a consultation workshop organized by DNPM and NSO on formulating the National Strategy for the development of Statistics (NSDS). It demonstrates government's awareness of the critical situation regarding gaps in data and its intention to address the issue for planning and monitoring of development plans to achieve MDGs in the country.

DNPM not fulfilling its planning, coordination and monitoring role effectively.

Another significant factor that hinders effective achievement of MDGs is the fact that DNPM has not fulfilled its coordination and monitoring role effectively and ends up implementing programmes or projects. The coordination role is important as it involves liaising with line departments and identifying possible implementers of projects. It also allows DNPM to fulfill its other functions such as planning and monitoring effectively and without any conflict of interest.

Communication between UNDP and DNPM.

A major hindrance factor is political dynamics, high turnover of staff, fragmentation into factions and lack of accountability within DNPM, leading to changing personnel and levels of engagement. Lack of internal communication within DNPM and coordination lead to

⁶⁹ Ibid. p.6

complicated communication lines which impact negatively on important external partners such as UNDP. For UNDP, DNPM's lack of engagement and responsiveness in a coherent and strategic manner makes support to the Department very difficult.

Slow disbursement of funds for Projects by UNDP.

The other significant hindrance factor, which is related to factors discussed above (i.e. incomplete filling of forms), is financial, notably the slow disbursement of funding by UNDP for projects and the lack of available resources for some activities.

4.3 Efficiency of Financial Resources allocated from UNDP and DNPM for the MDG programme.

4.3.1 Financial resource allocation from UNDP

Table 4 in the 2011 Assessment of Development Results⁷⁰ shows the 2003 – 2011 financial resources for the two country programmes. It shows that:

- The ratio of core funding (\$1.229 million) to non-core (\$74,000) was approximately 17:1 for the MDG programme.
- There was a possibility of decrease in core funding for the forthcoming programme and the ADR recommended a strengthening of fund/resource mobilization for initiatives in key areas of MDGs, governance and gender.
- UNDP needed more concerted efforts in cost-sharing and funding partnerships.

The situation in 2012 (the first year of implementing the UNDAF country programme) was⁷¹ (Annex 1. Expenditure rates by interagency outcomes):

- The ratio of core funding (\$872,424) to non-core (\$1,099,802 including PNG UN Country fund) for 2012 was 1:1.2 for the MDGs, Population and Aid coordination (MPA) programme.
- MDG, Population and Aid coordination was allocated \$1.972 million (total available resources which was made up of core, non-core and PNG UN country funds).
- The PNG UN Country funds are contributed to UN development programmes by bilateral donor funding agencies such as AusAID, New Zealand Aid and European Union. The allocation of PNG UN Country funds for the MPA programme in 2012 was \$675,302.00
- The expenditure rate against available resources was 87% for the MPA programme. The expenditure rate of 87% is quite high

⁷⁰ UNDP. Assessment of Development Results. 2011. P26

⁷¹ UN 2012 Annual Progress report. P.47

even though criticism was leveled at UNDP for the slow disbursement of funds, especially for the MDG acceleration project at Kairuku district.

- In 2012 the overall UNDAF programme was delivered on USD 20 million.
- The overall expenditure rate for the UNDAF programme was 84% and an overall delivery rate of the UNDAF programme outputs was 75% in 2012 which high expenditure and delivery rates.

A question that can be asked is; were the allocated funds used efficiently? Efficiency is comparison of resources applied against results or outcomes. As shown by the 2012 annual progress report⁷², the expenditure rate against available resources was 87% and the delivery rate of the overall UNDAF program was 75% (and MPA is one component of the UNDAF programme), then it can be said that the funds were used efficiently.

The evaluator only has information about the MDG Acceleration project at Kairuku. US\$ 400,000 was budgeted for the project. Was the US\$ 400,000 budgeted for the project used efficiently? The funds were fully expended but only 2/5 (two fifths) of the project outcomes and objectives were fulfilled. Based on the fact that funds were exhausted before all the project objectives were fulfilled or activities completed, the answer to that question will have to be, no. One of the lessons learnt from the Kairuku project was adherence to budget lines and items which also reflects on project management.

Overall the financial resources have been used efficiently for the purposes for which they were intended.

4.3.2 Financial resource allocation from GoPNG for the MPA programme

2013 budget allocation for the MPA programme⁷³:

UN Resources = \$1.626 million

GoPNG = \$1.2 million (parallel funding, i.e. not through UN accounts)

2012 Budget allocation⁷⁴

UN resources = \$1.634 million

GoPNG = \$2.5 million

It is pleasing to note that in 2012, the first year of implementing the UNDAF country programme, the PNG government increased its funding for the MPA programme from USD 385,000 in 2011 to

⁷² UNDP 2012 Annual Progress Report.

⁷³ 2013 Annual Work Plan

⁷⁴ 2013 Annual Work plan

USD2.5 million in 2012. The budget for 2013 from GoPNG was USD1.2 million.

The question is; were these funding amounts actually released for the MDG programme? GoPNG allocates funding but consistently falls short of releasing funds for commitments.

4.4 Impact of UNDP MDG programme

4.4.1 Progress on Achieving Millennium Development Goals

The Post Courier, 1st October, 2013 reported that the Deputy Prime Ministers informed the United Nations Assembly in New York that PNG is unlikely to meet the MDGs by 2015. However the GoPNG is committed to implementing the MDGs beyond 2015. Some progress had been made in universal primary education, reduced infant and maternal mortality rates, combating HIV, TB and other health issues, gender equality and empowerment of women. This statement summarizes the situation in PNG with regards to overall progress on achieving millennium Development goals in PNG.

However, much progress has been made on MDG 2 (Universal Basic Education). Education has made big strides since the introduction of GoPNGs policy on free education. The Minister for Education, The Honorable James Marape, informed parliament on 13th November, 2013 that enrolment in school age children now in primary schools had increased from 53% in 2010 to 74.8% in 2013. The Government was confident of achieving 100% of Universal Basic Education (MDG 2) by 2015 and attributes this possibility to the governments free education policy⁷⁵ & ⁷⁶. While the government may get enrolments close to 90%, it is unlikely that enrolment rates will get to 100% by 2015 because of the need for facilities especially in remote rural areas which are inaccessible because of geographical terrain and locations. It will take a few more years to get close to the 100% enrolment target (and in a country like PNG we may never get to 100%).

The Free Education policy is likely to continue for this term of the current government as announced by the Prime Minister, Honorable Peter O'Neil, at Dregerhafen Secondary Technical school in Finschhafen District, Morobe Province, on the occasion of the presentation of K1.2 million of financial support to the school. The Prime minister stated that the government will continue the "Free Education" policy at primary and secondary level, which began in 2011 (Reported by EM TV News, 6th November, 2013)⁷⁷.

⁷⁵ PNG National EMTV. 6 pm news on 13th November, 2013

⁷⁶ The National. "Free education sees increase in student numbers". 14 November 2013

⁷⁷ PNG National EM TV. 6pm News, 6th November, 2013

In terms of the overall achievement of the MDGs, the 2010 mid-term⁷⁸ report states that limited progress has been made in some of the MDGs while others remain the same and in fact some had deteriorated. While there was potential to achieve some of the country-specific MDG targets, the international targets were less likely to be achieved.

The HIV & AIDS epidemic was mentioned as one of the most important challenge in 2010 as it threatened to undo all progress that had been made⁷⁹. It is fair to say that the HIV & AIDS epidemic has not reached the African style proportion that was predicted for the country and the national prevalence estimate is now reported as below 1%. The 2011 HIV & STI Surveillance Report⁸⁰ gives the prevalence as 0.49 %⁸¹) as compared to 2009 when it was reported as 1.65%. This indicates that some progress have been made in MDG 6 HIV target. However, a much clearer picture of the overall HIV & AIDS situation in the country will not be known until the National Integrated Bio-behavioral Survey (IBBS) is conducted. Although it has been planned for the last five years, the IBBS unfortunately has been further delayed and was not conducted in 2012 and 2013 as planned.

4.4.2 Impact of MDG Awareness and Advocacy on Policy at the national and sub-national level and transformational results stemming from it.

MDG Awareness and advocacy activities at National and sub-national level

The activities under the MDG programmes for the period 2008 – 2013 concentrated on Awareness and Advocacy of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Awareness on MDGs is sensitizing leading to possible change in behaviour and advocacy is a call to action and decision making to effect change in programmes, systems, policies and practices. The effectiveness of the awareness and advocacy programmes is discussed in Section 4.2: Effectiveness of MDG Development Programmes.

The advocacy and awareness made an impact on GoPNG policy at the national level but not as much at the sub-national level. The impact or the transformational results of the awareness and advocacy on national level as demonstrated by the following:

- Resulted in integration of MDGs into strategic GoPNG policy and planning documents such as PNG Vision 2050, MTDS 2005 - 2010, MTDP 2011 - 2015, PNGDSP 2010 – 2030.
- Development of 67 nationally created MDG indicators.
- Setting up including PNGinfo data base which was a positive step in having a data base for monitoring MDG indicators.

⁷⁸ GoPNG. 2010. Second National Progressive Report on MDGs for PNG.

⁷⁹ Ibid. p.239

⁸⁰ NDoH. 2011 HIV & STI Surveillance Report

- UNDPs support to GoPNG was significant achievement when DNPM led the production of two national MDG mid-term reports and the continued support for national planning documents towards achieving the MDG targets.

Some challenges which remain are:

- The translation of policies and plans into practice for achieving MDG targets by 2015 has not been as effective.
- The ADR (2011) notes the “reliability of data on which MTDP outcome indicators are based have not improved significantly. ... and nationally tailored MDG targets remain estimates because of a lack of baseline data”⁸².
- There is a need by key relevant government departments to regularly update information in the PNGInfo databases.
- There is also a need for improving the data collection capacities of the relevant government departments and data analysis skills.
- The ADR⁸³ notes that the overall progress to achieving the national and international targets has been slow and that donor coordination has been very weak. Overall this outcome has not been achieved.

The awareness and advocacy at the sub-national level (provincial, district and local level government) was not as successful because of the following reasons:⁸⁴

- Lack of adequate awareness on MDGs at the sub-national level (provincial, district, Local Level Government);
- Low levels of service delivery;
- Lack of utilization of certain services such as family planning;
- Lack of qualified technical manpower to develop; implement and monitor sub-national development plans based on MDGs and human development with equity;
- Lack of adequate coordination at the sub-national level pose serious bottlenecks for the achievement of MDG and human development goals in PNG.

There was disparity in the awareness and advocacy of the MDG programmes at the national and sub-national levels and challenges that act as bottlenecks for achievement of MDGs.

⁸²UNDP 2011. Assessment of Development results, 2011.p30

⁸³Ibid. P.50

⁸⁴ UNDP. 2012 Annual Progress Report. P.15

Perceptions about the Awareness and advocacy programme

Interviews with senior management and staff of DNPM indicate that the perception within the department is that MDG awareness and advocacy programmes have been effective. At the national and sub-national levels it is demonstrated by the integration of MDGs into the national and some sub-national plans. How these plans can be translated into results will depend on GoPNG, provincial governments, UN agencies and donor partners addressing the impediments. There was enthusiasm that as a result of the advocacy programme the GoPNG was starting to address the impediments and that human development goals could be achieved. For example, GoPNG's free education policy has resulted in increased gross and net enrolment rates at the basic education level and access to education and retention rates have also increased. But areas that still need improvement are in adult literacy rates which are still the lowest in the world and quality issues need to be addressed.

But the overall perception was that more needs to be done. For example, PNG needs to address quality of education and adult literacy (non-formal education). So although some transformational results are evident, there will be a long way to go to achieving MDG goals by 2015. The Deputy Prime Minister reported at the UN General assembly in New York ("Post Courier", 1st October, 2013) that PNG has made some progress in the MDGs but PNG will not meet the goals by 2015 and the goals will still be relevant for PNG beyond 2015.

There was also the perception that GoPNG needed to move away from MDG awareness to resourcing the rural sector at the district level. And GoPNG should also address constraints at the family level (at home) where children and the parents need to be educated about the importance of general hygiene (health), literacy and numeracy (education), nutrition and of sustaining the environment.

It was generally felt that the impact of the awareness campaigns on the general population has not been as effective.

4.4.3 Impact of awareness and advocacy on Human development programmes at the national and sub-national level and transformational results stemming from it

In 2006, Papua New Guinea's Human Development Index (HDI) ranked at 139 out of the 177 countries and territories surveyed (Human Development Report 2006). The HDI, reflecting 2004 data, includes the following main indicators relating to Papua New Guinea: (i) Life expectancy at birth - 55.7 years; (ii) Adult literacy rate - 57.3 per cent and (iii) GDP per capita - US\$2,543 (UNCP Action plan 2008 – 2012. P.12).

UNCP 2008 – 2012 stated as one of their goals that by 2012, children, youth, women and men will benefit from basic quality health, education and protection (UNCP 2008 – 2012. P.9)

The ADR reported that “Between 1980 and 2010, the Human Development Index rose by 1.3 percent annually, from 0.295 in 1980 to 0.431 in 2010. In 2010, Papua New Guinea ranked 137 out of 169 countries with comparable data. The HDI of East Asia and the Pacific as a region increased from 0.391 in 1980 to 0.650 in 2010, placing Papua New Guinea below the regional average”⁸⁵

The UN 2012 Annual Report⁸⁶ states that “in 2012, PNGs Human Development Index value was 0.466, giving it a ranking of 156 out of 187 countries. Progress on the MDGs has been generally disappointing, with attention needed on improving access to basic health and education services. Women and girls are especially disadvantaged, many of whom face discrimination and a lack of economic and political opportunity. Rates of gender-based violence (GBV) are among the highest in the region. HIV prevalence is just below 1% and well low by world standards, still represents over 95% of all HIV cases in the Pacific region”.

The GoPNG national policy document, PNG Vision 2050, aims at raising HDI ranking to within top 50 countries. The PNG Development Strategic Plan (DSP) aims at transforming PNG to middle income country status through faster economic and social growth. The MTDP implements the DSP goals and aims to achieve MDGs by 2015⁸⁷.

The programmes which are aligned to the national policy documents are planned at national and sub-national levels and aim at improving HDI indicators in education, health and income generation.

However, the lack of qualified technical manpower to develop, implement and monitor sub-national development plans based on MDGs and human development with equity and the lack of adequate coordination at the sub-national level have been identified as serious bottlenecks for the achievement of MDG and human development goals in PNG⁸⁸.

Youth, including young women, where 76% of population is under 35 years old need to be included in MDG sensitization, informed policy development and implementation related to MDGs, population and human development⁸⁹.

⁸⁵ UNDP. Assessment of Development Results. 2011. P.11

⁸⁶ UN 2012 Annual Report. P.8

⁸⁷ UN. UNDAF Action Plan 2012 – 2015. P.13

⁸⁸ 2012 Annual progress report. P.15

⁸⁹ Ibid. p.15

The training conducted by UNDP & DNPM at UPNG and PNG University of Technology staff resulted in an increased understanding of MDGs and human development and facilitated the introduction of the MDG course at the universities which is now a part of the Bachelor of Arts (UPNG) and Bachelor of Technology in Communication and development degree programme (UNITECH).

The GoPNG is aware of disparities in level of human development between districts, provinces and across the country and is taking steps to address the situation. The following actions have been taken by GoPNG to improve human development as a result of awareness and advocacy⁹⁰:

- UNDP interventions focused on raising awareness of the Government and the general public of PNG on MDGs, population and human development, and accelerating MDG achievement through a bottom-up approach.
- The effectiveness of the advocacy was also demonstrated by fact that DNPM officers assisted provinces whose development indicators are much lower than the national average (e.g. Sandaun province). From an equity based intervention perspective, this was the correct action to take because intervention programmes should target the disadvantage provinces and localities such as rural areas.
- The UNs continuous MDG advocacy, lobbying and sensitizing the GoPNG of the disparities at the levels of human development between provinces and districts, resulted in increased funding in 2013 for provinces and district by GoPNG through the provincial support improvement programme and the District services improvement programme.⁹¹ This is a “catch 22” situation because if the level of human development is low at the district level, then the possibility of failing government service delivery is high. However, if officers at the sub-national level are equipped with appropriate technical and fiscal skills combined with technical assistance (from UNDP, UNCEF, UNFPA & DNPM) on MDGs, population and human development and related data gathering and analysis, then this intervention is likely to succeed.
- Several policy and planning documents – including a manual on MDGs, Human Development and PNGInfo were developed.

⁹⁰ 2012 Annual progress report. P.15

⁹¹ UN Annual Progress Report 2012.

- An analysis on “Narrowing the gaps to meet the MDGs: Advocating an equity-based agenda for children in PNG”⁹² was conducted by a consultant for UNICEF. This important assessment examines the status of MDGs and provides the situation for each MDG at the provincial and district levels for all provinces in the country. It highlights the disparities of geography, poverty, gender and age at the district and provincial level for each of the MDGs. The report suggests that equity focused intervention starts with the most disadvantaged districts and provinces.
- The draft National Population Policy is been developed by a consultant and is funded by UNFPA.
- The 2012 Annual Progress report informs that “2012 was a good year in terms development frameworks, plans and budget aligned with the MDG targets, human development indicators and population issues and terms. DNPMs strong ownership, leadership and coordination, through the MDG, Population and Aid Coordination Core group – were indispensable for a well-targeted UN assistance.”⁹³

4.4.4 Impact of non programme “Soft Activities” on the achievement of MDGs

Non-programmatic “Soft” activities or assistance is a term that includes policy advice and dialogue, advocacy and brokerage/coordination services and its impact on human development⁹⁴. A “Soft activity” is activity that is not included in the annual work plan. In the PNG context, MDG awareness and advocacy is planned activity in the AWP so they cannot be termed as “soft activities”.

Dialogue and advocacy/lobbying, however, were soft activities during the programme cycles assessed by this evaluation.

The evaluator was unable to gather in-depth information on soft activities that impacted on human development but it seems that dialogue, through regular meetings between UNDP and DNPM and listening to advice was a potential area for advocacy on a number of issues. As such, the various meetings between the Minister for National Planning and Monitoring and the UN Resident Coordinator/UNDP Resident Representative, senior management as well as technical officials from both DNPM and UNDP, helped advance the MDG programme in particular and the acceleration of MDGs and

⁹² UNICEF. Narrowing the gaps to meet the MDGs: Advocating an equity-based agenda for children in PNG. 2012.

⁹³ UN . 2012 Annual Progress Report. P.17

⁹⁴ UNDP. Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation. New York. 2002

human development at large. What was clear was that this line of communication could have been more effectively used for advocacy.

From UNDP's perspective, there was need for a clear line of communication between UNDP and DNPM. The constant changes to senior management at DNPM, and subsequently changing lines of accountability for technical officers, made it difficult to establish rapport and clear communication lines with a focal person. Adhering to agreed and scheduled meetings also seemed challenging for DNPM because of the lack of a focal person. On the management of the MDG acceleration project at Kairuku, regular dialogue on the issues affecting the project, could have helped.

4.5 Sustainability of UNDP MDG programme

The enabling environments for sustaining MDG programmes in the country are:

- Ownership by the GoPNG.
- Partnership between GoPNG, UNDP and other UN Agencies.
- Institutionalized within GoPNG departments and Higher Education institutions.
- Capacity Building and up-skilling of national officers.
- Integration of MDG programmes in national and sub-national plans.
- Sustainability results are permanent when systematized.

The above multi-dimensions are discussed in detail to demonstrate how each contributes to sustainability of MDG programme and projects.

4.5.1 Sustainability through ownership of MDG Programme in PNG

The first dimension of sustainability is ownership by GoPNG and by those for whom the programme is intended – villagers, community at district and local level government (LLG) and provincial level. Ownership of programme occurs when stakeholders at various levels are involved at all stages of planning, implementation and evaluation of programme or project. Finally ownership is demonstrated when GoPNG allocates budget for the activity / project. What evidence is there for ownership of programme by GoPNG?

Ownership of the MDG programme by GoPNG has been demonstrated in number of ways discussed in the previous sections (for example, see section 4.5.2). In summary, the following demonstrates government ownership of the MDG programme:

- Integration of MDGs into key government policy documents such as the PNG Vision 2050, PNG DSP 2010 – 2030, MTDP 2012 – 2015

- Integration of MDGs as key government priority areas for human development.
- DNPM led the production of two national MDG mid-term reports and the continued support for national planning documents towards achieving the MDG targets.
- Use of the MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF) to accelerate progress on the MDGs⁹⁵. DNPM pilot tested the MAF using the bottom-up approach to guide preparation of district development action plans in all districts in the country.
- The creation of the special intervention branch at DNPM to oversee the MDGs, population and sustainable development; and the creation of an MDG, Population and Aid Coordination (MPA) core group within DNPM, which brings together the different policy areas within the department to come to an integrated and coordinated approach.
- The government has allocated K5.0 million to support activities on MDGs, population and coordination and midterm review 2011 - 2015.
- UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA) provide technical support, with GoPNG leading the awareness raising and advocacy for the MDG acceleration.

4.5.2 Partnership between UN agencies, National and Sub-National governments, Universities, Private sector/communities on MDGs

As part of the UN's "Delivering as One" modality, there is good collaboration between UNICEF, UNFPA and UNDP in support of implementing MDGs programme in the country⁹⁶. This is cemented in the 4-year (2012-2015) Strategy on MDGs, Population and Aid Coordination, respective Joint Annual Work Plans and the MPA Task Team. The latter and respective strategies and plans are led and coordinated by UNDP. As such, UNDP's leadership on MDG achievement is also translated in its coordination and convening function amongst UN agencies. At the project level, there was collaboration in the MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF) Project in Kairuku on infant and maternal health. UNFPA and UNICEF assisted with this project by training for Village Health coordinators and volunteers at Kairuku.

UNFPA is also involved in population projects and is supporting DNPM in the development of national population policy, technical assistance such as data analysis training to the National Statistics office, draft plan for 2016 DHS and in coordinating the MDG radio awareness programme administered by Population Media Centre.

⁹⁵ UN. Annual Work Plan 2013.

⁹⁶ UNDP. Assessment of Development Results. 2011. P.24

UNICEF is involved in setting and providing technical advice to DNPM for the PNGInfo data base development and training for use in provinces. UNICEF is also training NSO officers on the use of PNGInfo and the need to update information.

4.5.3 Institutionalization of MDG programme in DNPM.

Two units set up within DNPM as a result of UNDP support illustrate a successful capacity development approach. First, the MDG, Population and Aid Coordination (MPA) core group bring together First Assistant Secretaries and technical staff to plan and coordinate the implementation of relevant policies and strategies. The composition mirrors the UN's task team and thematic focus on MPA. As such, the core group and the UN task team act as direct interlocutors for joint planning and implementation of MDG acceleration.

Second, the establishment of a Special Interventions Branch (SIB) at DNPM with four government officer also signals seriousness by the GoPNG to address MDG issues more permanently by a section within the department. The institutionalization of MDG interventions within government structures demonstrates the effectiveness of MDG advocacy for ownership of the programme. The SIB facilitates and monitors the planned MDG and populations interventions for the country.

The evaluator was not able to sight any copies of the roles and responsibilities of the SIB but it was established to coordinate the MDGs, population and sustainable development activities. DNPM has not fulfilled its coordination role effectively and sometimes ends up implementing programmes and projects (such as the MDG Kairuku project). The SIB can assist in facilitating DNPM mandated roles by:

- Ensuring that DNPM concentrates on planning, monitoring and coordinating programs and projects rather than in implementing intervention programs.
- Liaising with UNDP (or any other UN agencies or donor partners) on any planned intervention programmes and identifying relevant government line departments to lead the intervention programs.
- Taking the lead role in preparing GoPNGs (DNPM) annual MTDP progress report where MDGs and population programme outputs and outcomes are reported.
- Leading dialogue on behalf of GoPNG on MDGs, population issues and aid coordination by convening the meetings on Joint technical working group (for example on MDGs and aid effectiveness).

- Facilitating training at national and sub-national levels to enhance government official's knowledge and understanding of MDGs and advocate for developing MDG compliant Development plans at provincial and district levels.
- Facilitating discussions between DNPM and UN agencies or other donor partners on any intervention programmes planned for the country.

4.5.4 Institutionalization of MDG programme at Higher Learning Institutions

The institutionalization of MDG courses at the University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) and the PNG University of Technology (UNITECH) is one of the achievements of the MDG programme in PNG in terms of sustainability, awareness and human development. Courses on MDG were approved as core subjects in academic disciplines by the respective University Councils. The approval of the courses by the university councils shows the recognition by the universities of the importance of the MDGs in nation-building and human capacity development. The fact that the courses have been institutionalized demonstrates ownership by the universities and guarantees the continued teaching of the themes and concepts under each of the MDGs as priority areas for human development and nation building. Both universities indicated that the content of MDG courses will necessarily change after 2015 but the basic concepts will remain the same. The offering of MDG courses are planned for other higher learning institutions such as University of Goroka and Divine Word University.

UPNG started offering the MDG course in 2011, after a year (2010) of preparation, getting the course approved and the official launching of the course. The UNDP CTA assisted in providing materials and in designing the course. It is a compulsory course which is offered to third year Bachelor of Arts students majoring in the population studies, environmental studies and demography studies strands. From 2011 – 2013 an average of 20 students enrolled for the course per year. Only a handful of the graduates have ended up working at key government departments such as NSO, Department of Environment and Conservation or DNPM. The course coordinator at UPNG indicated that the course equips students with relevant technical skills that can be utilized by these key departments by so few of them are employed. From 2011 – 2012 the course was co-taught with DNPM staff but by 2013 the university took full responsibility for the teaching the course.

UNITECH introduced the MDG course in 2013 as a part of the Bachelor of Technology in Communication and Development. DNPM with support from UNDP conducted an MDG advocacy workshop for

staff and university management which proved to be successful in facilitating the approval of the course through the academic board and the University council. The course was co-taught with staff from DNPM and UNITECH. The ultimate goal is for the university to have a Center of Excellence in the area of MDGs and Human development in the South Pacific.⁹⁷ This forward looking plan emphasizes the importance that the university places on the thematic areas of the MDGs and possibilities for human development in PNG and the South Pacific region.

As a project, institutionalizing MDGs at higher learning institutions was one of the more successful stories in terms of sustainability, awareness and human development.

4.5.5 Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and transformational results.

UNDPs capacity building activities on MDGs and human development were through awareness and advocacy and implications for planning at national and sub-national levels. UNDP's involvement in capacity building in various areas is well documented in other sections in this report. Examples are given of UNDP's recent involvement in capacity development which were done in collaboration with DNPM in the following areas⁹⁸:

- Knowledge of 90 officials, including Provincial Administrators and Planners from 18 provinces as well as national level senior government officials was enhanced on MDGs and sustainable development framework. The provincial officers were required to train officers at district level.
- Capacity of 25 officers of Department of National Planning and Monitoring, who train the provincial and district officials on planning and monitoring, was enhanced on the sustainable development framework and integration of MDG Acceleration Framework in the MTDP Alignment Toolkit.
- A training workshop on MDG Acceleration Framework and MTDP Alignment was held in Vanimo, Sandaun province where capacity of 20 senior officers of the province, including the Provincial Administrator and Chief Provincial Planner enhanced on MDGs, MDG Acceleration Framework, M&E Framework, Bottom-up Approach to Planning and MTDP Alignment Toolkit to help provincial officials to come up with provincial and district plans based on MDGs and sustainable development frameworks.

⁹⁷ UNDP. 2012 Annual Report. P.17

⁹⁸ UNDP. 2013 Biannual report

- Development finance – Resourcing PNGs development plans and priorities, strengthening medium and longer term fiscal planning.⁹⁹

4.6 Promotion of gender equality in the MDG programmes

In the UNDAF 2012 – 2015 country programme, Gender equality is included in Cluster 2 – Social justice, protection and gender equality. Under UNDAF 2012 – 2015, the MDG programme falls under Cluster 1 – Governance for equitable development. But Gender equality is a cross cutting issue and has been promoted in some activities in the MDG programme.

The projects that promoted gender equality included:

- MDG Acceleration Framework Kairuku project. The project targeted Maternal Health (and Infant Health) and sought improve the Capacity of the health providers, including Women Health Volunteers improved to provide basic health services on maternal health.
- The MDG radio awareness broadcasts dealt with a number of gender issues including
 - promoting the use of effective family planning methods;
 - elevating women's status;
 - reducing violence against women
 - increasing girls enrollment in primary schools
 - increasing enrollment of male and female children in primary school
- Other MDG programmes targeted equal opportunities for girls in education and Gender Based Violence.
- The analysis of data (including census population data) encourages the disaggregation of population, social and demographic data according to age and sex to clearly determine impact of programmes (or the lack of it) on the indicators.

In general the in the planning and implementation of MDG programmes, gender issues are consciously included as gender equality is a cross cutting issue.

4.7 Rating of UNDP's performance on components of MDG programmes.

In this section a rating is provided, based on the evaluator's assessment of UNDPs performance, on various components of the MDG programmes and projects.

⁹⁹ UNDP. 2012 Annual Progress report

The performance is rated on a scale from 1 – 5 (where 1 = very low, 2 = low, 3 = average, 4 = high, 5 = very high).

A brief narrative is provided as justification for the rating. Details in the report under each of the sub-headings provide justifications for the ratings.

Ratings on MDG Programmes or projects components.

1. MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme framework from 2008 to April 2013.

Rating = 3. Narrative: The MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme framework has been setup and is well documented but implementing of MDTP M&E, especially reporting is still a problem.

2. UNDP's MDG Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting framework.

Rating = 5. Narrative: UNDPs M&E and reporting system is effectively working as reporting through quarterly, bi-annual and annual progress reports against the AWP is regular.

3. UNDP's support to MTDP Monitoring and Evaluation framework.

Rating = 3. Narrative: UNDP Support provided in setting up MTDP M&E framework but more support is needed in the implementation of M&E framework.

4. UNDP's support to the Monitoring of MDG programme.

Rating = 3. Narrative: UNDP reporting against their AWP is regular but the biggest obstacle to effective monitoring and evaluation of the MDG indicators is the lack of relevant data for the indicators and more support is needed for data input to GoPNG database for monitoring purposes.

5. Preparation and influence of PNG's MDG progress reports.

Rating = 5. Narrative: UNDPs Annual Progress report reflect overall analysis of progress made on MDG outcome and outputs including expenditure and delivery rates, and outlines key challenges and recommendations for next AWP. Their dissemination to key GoPNG departments and stakeholders informs them of UNDP contributions to government priorities.

6. UNDP assistance in setting database for monitoring MDG indicators.

Rating = 3. Narrative: Assistance has been provided in setting up Development Assistance Database and PNGInfo database (the latter through UNICEF) but there is a need for a system to be put in place to regularly update the databases.

7. UNDP assistance in addressing gaps in data.

Rating = 2. Narrative: Assistance is needed in addressing gaps in data for MDG indicators and Census data and other GoPNG data update on PNGInfo.

8. UNDP assistance in up-skilling of DNPM and NSO officers in collection of data, analysis and writing of reports.

Rating = 3. Narrative: Some work done in this area but more needs to be done in up-skilling officers in data collection, analysis and report writing skills.

9. MDG Acceleration framework project at Kairuku District 2011 – 2013.

Rating = 2. Narrative: This is an incomplete project with many challenges and bottlenecks that were not addressed. Documented challenges and lessons learnt, if taken into account for similar projects would help facilitate the acceleration of MDGs.

10. MDG POST 2015 Consultations.

Rating = 3. Narrative: A report has been produced on consultations done to date but more public – private dialogue is recommended to take place to determine how the six emerging issues will be incorporated with the MDGs before consensus is reached about the final post 2015 agenda.

11. Relevance of UNDP MDG programme.

Rating = 5. Narrative: Relevance of UNDP MDG programme has been demonstrated by the integration of MDGs into GoPNGs strategic plans such as PNG Vision 2050, MTDS 2005 - 2010, MTDP 2011 - 2015, PNGDSP 2010 – 2030 and development of nationally created MDG indicators.

12. Effectiveness of Outcome 1.2 and Outputs (UNCP 2008 – 2011).

Rating = 3. Narrative: The awareness and advocacy programmes were effective and resulted in integration of MDGs into strategic GoPNG policy and planning documents. The translation of policies and plans into practice for achieving MDG targets by 2015 has not been as effective. An equity based approach is needed where interventions target the disadvantaged areas and populations.

13. Effectiveness of Outcome and Outputs of MPA (UNDAF 2012– 2015).

Rating = 3. Narrative: UNDP's continuous MDG advocacy, lobbying and sensitizing the GoPNG of the disparities at the levels of human development between provinces and districts, continuous technical assistance on MDGS, population and human development and related data gathering and analysis proved effective. Began work on effective

equity based intervention where disadvantaged provinces and the rural areas are targeted. The implementation of MDG Acceleration project in Kairuku 2011 – 2013 had challenges which led to an incomplete project.

14. Effective Communication between UNDP and DNPM.

Rating = 2. Narrative: Many hindrance factors that need to be addressed. Lack of internal communication within DNPM and coordination lead to complicated communication lines which impact negatively with important external partners such as UNDP. For UNDP, DNPM's lack of engagement and responsiveness in a coherent and strategic manner makes support to the Department very difficult.

15. Community Led MDG Achievement (CLMA) Project 2012 – 2015.

Rating = 2. Narrative: Slow start-up due to a variety of challenges, including slow responsiveness by DNPM since the arrival of the project manager.

16. Efficiency of Financial Resources allocated from UNDP and DNPM for the MDG programme.

Rating = 3. Narrative: The expenditure rate of 87% is quite high even though criticism was leveled at UNDP for the slow disbursement of funds, especially for the MDG acceleration project at Kairuku district. Need for review of procurement system.

17. Financial resource allocation and mobilization from UNDP.

Rating = 3. Narrative: Financial resource allocation in 2012: Core funding allocation affected by down turn in world economy and slight increase in non-core funding. Need for concerted effort in resource mobilization from bilateral donors.

18. Financial resource allocation from GoPNG and commitment of allocated resources for the MDG programme.

Rating = 3. Narrative: Pleasing to note increase in GoPNGs allocation of funding for MDG programmes but actual release (commitment) of funds allocated is still a problem.

19. Impact of UNDP MDG programme.

Rating = 3. Narrative: Overall impact of MDG programmes is average. Programme has made high impact on influencing GoPNG strategic planning documents and has not made much impact on human development and overall achievement of MDGs.

20. Progress on Achieving Millennium Development Goals.

Rating = 2. Narrative: Overall some progress made on increasing enrollment in Education and combating HIV & AIDs but not much progress on other MDGs.

21. Impact of MDG Awareness and Advocacy on Policy at the national level and transformational results stemming from it.

Rating = 4. Narrative: High impact of awareness and advocacy by UNDP on policy at national level, resulted in integration of MDGS in GoPNG planning strategic documents.

22. Impact of MDG Awareness and Advocacy on Policy at the sub-national level and transformational results stemming from it.

Rating = 2. Narrative: Less impact at the sub-national level because lack of adequate awareness on MDGs at the sub-national level (provincial, district, Local Level Government) and lack of service delivery at the level.

23. Impact of awareness and advocacy on Human development programmes at the national level and transformational results stemming from it.

Rating = 3. Narrative: Progress made on planning for human development at national level (training for national officers).

24. Impact of awareness and advocacy on Human development programmes at the sub-national level and transformational results stemming from it.

Rating = 2. Narrative: Lack of adequate awareness on MDGs at the sub-national level (provincial, district, Local Level Government and service delivery at this level.

25. Impact of non programme "Soft Activities" on the achievement of MDG.

Rating = 2. Narrative: Dialogue, through regular meetings between UNDP and DNPM and listening to advice was a potential area for advocacy on a number of issues. There was need for a clear line of communication between UNDP and DNPM with the need for a focal person.

26. Sustainability of UNDP MDG programme.

Rating = 3. Narrative: Sustainability of MDG programme was achieved through ownership and partnership of programme by GoPNG, institutionalizing of MDG programme at DNPM and at Higher Education Institutions, capacity building on MDGs. However progress on human development has been slow.

27. Sustainability through ownership of MDG Programme in PNG.

Rating = 4. Narrative: GoPNG ownership of the MDGs evidenced by the integration of MDGs into all GoPNG strategic development policy documents and also by the fact that the MDG targets and indicators have been localized. More needs to be done in translating policies into programmes and projects.

28. Partnership between UN agencies, National and Sub-National governments, Universities, Private sector/communities on MDGs.

Rating = 4. Narrative: As part of the UN's "Delivering as One" modality, there is collaboration between UNICEF, UNFPA and UNDP in support of implementing MDGs programme in the country. UNDP takes the lead in meetings on Strategy on MDGs, Population and Aid Coordination, respective Joint Annual Work Plans and the MPA Task Team. Partnerships between universities and communities have been nurtured except for private sector.

29. Institutionalization of MDG programme in DNPM.

Rating = 4. Narrative: The set up within DNPM as a result of UNDP support illustrate a successful the capacity development approach. First, the MDG, Population and Aid Coordination (MPA) core group and secondly, the setting up of the Special Interventions Branch.

30. Institutionalization of MDG programme at Higher Learning Institutions.

Rating =4. Narrative: Success story on sustainability of MDG programme. Institutionalization at UPNG and UNITECH and plans underway for MDG courses to be offered at other higher learning institutions.

31. Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and transformational results.

Rating = 2 Narrative: PNGs Human Development Index value was 0.466, giving it a ranking of 156 out of 187 countries. Although some progress has been made on education enrollment rates, progress on the MDGs has been generally disappointing, with attention needed on improving access to basic health and quality education services. Disparities in level of human development exist between LLGs, districts and provinces.

32. Promotion of gender equality in the MDG programmes

Rating = 3 Narrative: Gender equality has been promoted in some activities in the MDG programme.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made in the light of the major findings of the evaluation report.

1. Disparities of human development exist between provinces and districts. GoPNG needs to identify these disparities and address them at provincial and districts levels. The disparities are based on gender, age and geographical locations. Interventions should Target provinces and districts whose development indicators are much lower than the national average. UNICEFs book "Narrowing the gaps to meet the millennium development goals. Advocating an equity based agenda for children in PNG" can be used as a guide.

Recommendation 1.

That GoPNG use equity based approach where interventions target the disadvantaged areas and populations. These interventions should target rural areas, provinces and districts where the MDG indicators are the lowest in the country.

2. Institutionalizing MDGs at Higher learning institutions. MDG courses are now being taught at UPNG and UNITECH. This ensures sustainability of programme and increased knowledge and understanding of MDGs and human development issues.

Recommendation 2

That the institutionalizing of MDG courses at Universities be continued to other higher learning institutions

3. Lessons learnt from MDG Acceleration framework project at Kairuku District 2011 – 2013

Recommendation 3.

That the MDG acceleration framework be used to accelerate the achievement of MDGs and that the objectives and principles of bottom up approach and the lessons learnt be retained but that factors that have been identified as bottlenecks be addressed to facilitate the success of such projects.

Recommendation 4

That MDG development initiatives be community driven and a bottom up approach or social mobilization approach should be used.

4. The UNDP procurement system needs to be understood by project managers and officers at DNPM. In-service on how the UNDP system works should be provided for relevant staff of DNPM and any project manager. However, the procurement systems need to be reviewed and some processes in the system need to be streamlined.

Recommendation 5

The UNDP procurement system needs to be reviewed and some processes in the system to be streamlined.

5. The lack of relevant data for the MDG indicators was a possible area that UNDP or other UN agencies could assist by building capacity of GoPNG departments, especially DNPM, to systematically collect and analyze and interpret relevant data and write reports.

Recommendation 6

That UNDP or other UN agencies assist in building capacity of GoPNG departments to systematically collect, analyze, interpret data (relating to MDG indicators) and write annual progress reports.

6. DNPM is a Coordination Department. It is not an implementing Department and should not be involved in implementing programmes or projects.

Recommendation 7

That DNPM retains its role as a coordinating department and not be involved in directly implementing MDG project at the local or sectoral level.

7. The MDG advocacy and awareness made an impact on GoPNG policy at the national level but not as much at the sub-national level.

Recommendation 8

That MDG Awareness and advocacy should target GoPNG at sub-national level (province and districts).

8. Advocacy and awareness has not reached the general population, especially those in the rural areas.

Recommendation 9.

That awareness and advocacy should target the general population and those in the rural areas on health, education and income generating activities.

9. The translation of policies and plans into practice for achieving MDG targets by 2015 has not been as effective. An equity based approach is

needed where interventions target the disadvantaged areas and populations. For example, interventions should target rural areas, provinces and districts where the MDG indicators are the lowest in the country.

Recommendation 10.

That an equity based approach is used where interventions target the disadvantaged areas and populations such as rural areas, provinces and districts where the MDG indicators are the lowest in the country.

10. The lack of data results in poor planning at the national and sub-national levels, inaccurate measures of target indicators, delays in policy documents such as the population policy. The development data, PNGInfo database needs updated information from key government departments such as education department, NSO and the Health department.

Recommendation 11

That UNDP should assist GoPNG to take strong measures to address the issue of gaps in data, especially the analysis of census data.

Recommendation 12

That GoPNG should establish a system which requires key government departments to provide updated information to PNGInfo annually or biannually.

11. Dialogue, awareness, advocacy, lobbying (if not in AWP), listening to advice and perceptions that are formed about programmes or projects can be termed as “soft activities”. Soft activities have the potential to facilitate or hinder programmes.

Recommendation 13.

That UNDP should be sensitized to the role “soft activities” play in hindering or facilitating programmes or projects.

12. The current working relationship between UNDP and DNPM is weak and needs to be strengthened, including lines of communication at the middle management level. The appointment of a UNDP adviser/officer to be based at the DNPM would result in greater interaction and restore good working relations between the UNDP and DNPM. Alternatively, a national officer should be appointed to be based at UNDP who will be the liaison person between UNDP and DNPM.

Recommendation 14.

That an UNDP adviser /officer to be based at DNPM/ UNDP be appointed for effective communication and liaison between UNDP and DNPM.

Annex 1: TOR – Evaluation of MDG programme in Papua New Guinea

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of MDG Programme in Papua New Guinea

Project Name: MDG Programme in Papua New Guinea

Evaluation Period: 2008- April 2013

Background:

In response to the Millennium Declaration signed by the Government of Papua New Guinea (PNG) the United Nations (UN) is supporting the Government's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) programme implemented by Department of National Planning and Monitoring (DNPM). Under the UN Country Programme (UNCP) 2008-2012, UNDP and UNICEF jointly supported this programme through parallel funding modality.

The expected interagency outcome of this programme period was "GoPNG efficiently, effectively and transparently coordinates international aid, Donors and Development Partners to support Nation Building and to facilitate the implementation and monitoring of the MTDS/MDGs".

The expected outputs of this programme period were:

1. The Government and people of Papua New Guinea are aware of the 67 Millennium Development Goals (MDG) indicators created nationally and sub-nationally.
2. Relevant Government departments have and use Medium Term Development Strategy (MTDS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) monitoring systems.

The 2008-2012 UNCP was foreshortened by one year, to have the subsequent United Nations Development Framework align with the MTDP, and as such cover the period 2012-2015.

The intermediate outcome of the MPA programme for the period 2012-2015 is "Relevant government bodies undertake evidence-based *and* participatory policy-making, planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, and manage aid effectively to achieve MDGs with equity."

The expected outputs for this period are:

1. Government and stakeholders have the capacity to advocate for the achievement of MDGs.
2. By 2015, relevant government institutions have the capacity to coordinate, collect and analyse age and sex disaggregated population, social and development related data for use in planning, policy formulation and monitoring of progress at national and sub-national levels.
3. The Department of National Planning and Monitoring has the capacity to report and lead dialogue on MDGs, population issues and aid coordination.

UNFPA joined UNDP and UNICEF in the joint Annual Work Plans (AWPs) on MDGs, Population and Aid Coordination (MPA) in 2012 and 2013. While UNDP's and UNICEF's focus remains similar to the one from 2008-2011, UNFPA support focuses on the MDG radio awareness programme through parallel funding modality.

Objective and Scope

The scope of this evaluation covers only the MDG component of the MPA programme supported by UNDP during the period 2008 to April 2013. However, references need to be made to the support of UNICEF for the MDG programme since 2008 and that of UNFPA since 2012.

In particular, the evaluation will cover the following two UNDP supported programmes on MDGs:

1. MDG Awareness and MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme from 2008 to April 2013, and
2. MDG Acceleration Framework pilot project on infant and maternal health (MDG 4 and 5) in Kairuku District from April 2011 to April 2013.

Objective

The overall objective of this evaluation exercise is to assess UNDP's support to GoPNG's experience on MDG implementation within the context of PNG's development planning, implementation and monitoring and to inform UNDP's programme approach to support GoPNG strategically in the area of MDGs and human development. In addition, the evaluation recommendations will inform both programming by DNPM and UNDP as well as policy development and advocacy in PNG. Therefore, the evaluation exercise must not be thought of merely a stock taking of programme performance, but as a tool to identify lessons learned and good practices for a forward looking MDG and Human Development programme.– in particular in light of the approaching MDG deadline in 2015

The evaluation will cover the following six areas:

1. Preparation and influence of PNG's MDG progress reports;
2. Awareness on MDGs and human development at the national and sub-national level and level of transformational results stemming from it;
3. Integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review/monitoring systems and transformational results achieved;
4. Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and transformational results;
5. Institutionalization of MDGs programme in DNPM
6. Financial resource allocation from UNDP and DNPM for the MDG programme

The evaluation will also provide answers and recommendations for the following questions:

1. Based on actual results achieved, is the approach taken by the MDG programme conducive for the achievement of MDGs in PNG, and in light of the MDG deadline – how to direct the programme;
2. Has this programme successfully included and promoted gender equality in the country?
3. Has this programme helped to integrate the principles of sustainable development into the country's policies and programmes?
4. Has this programme strengthened partnership between UN agencies and national and sub-national governments, universities, private sector/communities on MDGs?
5. What are the non-programme soft activities that are impacting on the achievement of MDGs in PNG?

Methodology

The exercise will entail a combination of the following:

1. Comprehensive desk reviews and document analysis
2. Consultations with key stakeholders, particularly DNPM, other GoPNG Departments, including Departments of Finance and Treasury, MDGs and Human Development programme at the University of Papua New Guinea, Central Provincial Government, Kairuku District Administration, and health facilities and communities of Bereina and Veifa'a, UNFPA and UNICEF

Finalization and Report

Upon completion of the two tasks mentioned in the methodology, the evaluator will:

1. Prepare first draft of the evaluation report and share it with UNDP for comments.
2. Revise the draft as per the comments received and finalize and submit it to UNDP.

Qualifications:

The evaluator (local consultant) will have a Masters' degree in social sciences and at least 10 years of experiences in the field of social science monitoring and evaluation.

Annex 2. List of Documents collected for analysis

List of Documents

Policy Documents

1. MTDS – Medium Term Development Strategy 2005 - 2010
2. UN country program for PNG 2008 – 2012
3. MTDP – Medium Term Development Plan 2011 – 2015
4. UN Development assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012 – 2015
5. PNG Development Strategic Plan (DSP) 2010-2030
6. PNG vision 2050

Planning documents

Multi-year plans

7. UNCP action plan 2008 – 2012
8. UN Development assistance Framework (UNDAF) Action plan 2012 – 2015
9. MDG acceleration and Implementation pilot project document 2011 – 212

Annual work plans

10. Annual work plans 2010
11. Annual work plans 2011
12. Annual work plans 2012
13. Annual work plans 2013

Annual Progress Reports

14. Annual Progress Report 2009
15. Annual Progress Report 2010
16. Annual Progress Report 2011
17. Annual Progress Report 2012
18. Biannual Progress Report 2013

Midterm reports

19. Second National MDG Progress Summary Report 2009
20. PNG second National progress Comprehensive Report 2010

Evaluation Reports

21. Assessment of Development results 2011

Project Reports

22. MDG awareness project
23. MDG acceleration implementation program
24. 2012 Health Statisticians Consultancy Report
25. 2012 Kairuku Pilot project report

26. PNG Project Document 2011 DGTTF final
27. MDG Pilot progress report 2012
28. 2012 year end reporting DGTTF PNG
29. Towards MDG Implementation DNPM (year?)
30. UN PNG Post 2015

Annex 3: Document Analysis Schedule.

Project title: Evaluation of Millennium Development Goals (MDG) Programme in PNG

Document Analysis

Name of Document _____

Period covered/ Year (s) _____

Organization/ Author _____ Date _____

Brief description of Document.

Sample questions on overall objectives of the Millennium Development Goals in PNG

1. *What support does UNDP provide to GoPNG's experience on MDG implementation within the context of PNG's development planning, implementation and monitoring? Level of support?*

2. *What support does UNDP provide to GoPNG strategically in the areas of MDGs and human development? Level of support?*

3. *Overall Assessment of the MDG program? Does document provide information on any of the following **6 evaluation criteria**:*

- *Relevance – What is **importance/ significance** of the MDGs to the local and national requirements and priorities*

- *Effectiveness- Are the overall objectives and outputs of the MDG programs being achieved? (see list)*

- *Efficiency - Are the objectives being achieved economically by the MDG programs? Were the resources used efficiently?*

- *Impact – effect, does the MDG program contribute to reaching higher level development objectives such as human development? Is the programme making an impact on human development index areas - education, health or income generation? Has MDG programme resulted in Transformational results – positive change in human development and capacity building?*

- *Sustainability – permanence; are positive effects sustainable? What about in these areas that contribute to sustainability of MDG programs – partnership with UNDP, Institutionalization of program at DNPM, capacity building of nationals, integration of MDG into national and sub-national plans & Annual work plans (AWP)?*

- *Gender equality- Was gender equality promoted in the country through the MDG programme?*

4. *Recommendations for MDG policy development and advocacy in PNG?*

5. *What are the challenges in implementing MDG programmes in PNG?*

6. *What **lessons were learnt** and good practices for a **forward looking MDG and Human Development** programme?*

Sample questions on six areas of Evaluation.

The evaluation will cover the following six areas:

7. **Preparation and influence of PNG's MDG progress reports;**

Criteria 4.1: Impact - effect.

[Who to Question – UNDP, DNPM, UNICEF, UNFPA]

Which is the lead organization for PNGs MDG progress reports (PR)? What are the processes involved in the preparation of the MDG PR? What is the importance of

MDG progress reports? Dissemination of MDG PR – to whom, how, stakeholder meetings? Publicity / awareness of MDG PR for public. Key government departments? Evidence of influence of MDG PR? Planning? Implementation of MDG Programmes? Lessons learnt?

8. Awareness on MDGs and human development at the national and sub-national level and level of transformational results stemming from it;

Criteria 4.2: Impact -Human Development & Criteria 1: Relevance

Why conduct awareness on MDGs? Why are MDGs important to human and national development? With which organizations, Government departments do you conduct awareness ? What are your expectations of government department or what do you hope they will do as a result of awareness? What MDG awareness programmes are currently being implemented? Target population?

*[MDG Awareness and MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme?]
Reports?*

Has awareness impacted in any way on Human development (index – education, health, income)? How?

What human development awareness programmes are currently being implemented? Target population?

Give examples of positive impact of MDG awareness programmes.

*How is MDG awareness and human development **monitored and reported** at national and sub-national level?*

What transformational results have been achieved as a result of the awareness on MDG and human development?

9. Integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review/monitoring systems and transformational results achieved;

Criteria 5.5 Sustainability - Integration

Sight National & Sub national plans. Document analysis (Annual Work Plans etc) – examples & evidence of integration of MDGs into national & sub-national plans.

Are the MDGs integrated into the national and sub national Annual work plans?

How to Monitor MDGS in national plans? Do the AWP's have monitoring of MDGs? Evidence of review & monitoring of plans. The integration of MDG in national & sub-national levels, Does it result in achievement of MDGs. Are there reports showing transformational results (MDG achieved)? Give examples showing increase/ decrease in MDG indicators. Lessons learnt?

Give examples of positive impact on key Human development areas such as education, health & income as a result of MDG programme?

[MDG Acceleration Framework pilot project on infant and maternal health (MDG 4 and 5) in Kairuku District from April 2011 to April 2013]

How has MDG programme impacted on people's lives? Example or evidence? MDG indicators? Reports? Lessons learnt?

10. Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and transformational results;

Criteria 5.4: Sustainability - Capacity building.

How do you build capacity on MDGs – awareness, AWP, programmes, human development and sustainable development at national and sub-national levels? Are there any capacity building plans/ programmes/workshops on MDG, human and sustainable development? Describe them – workshop or on the job training. Who funded them? Who conducted them? How have they been implemented? How successful were they? Were there any evaluations or report? Give examples of actual results that have been achieved?

Do you feel that you are in position to take lead in advocating for MDG programs or achievement of MDGs?

Were there any evaluations of the programs? Were there any transformational results? Give examples.

11. Institutionalization of MDGs programme in DNPM.

Criteria 5.3 Sustainability - Institutionalization

Are the MDG programmes institutionalized at DNPM?

Are there key people in DNPM who deal with MDG programmes? Is there a section or unit that deals specifically with MDG? How does DNPM oversee MDG programs in other sectors? Does DNPM claim ownership of MDG programmes? What systems are in place to monitor MDG programs?

What are some lessons learnt in implementing the MDG programme?

Were there any good practices introduced/ learnt when implementing the program that could be recommended for MDG and Human development programs?

Evidence for Advocacy of inclusion and achievement of MDG in national and sub-national plans?

Are they evident (included) in Annual Work Plan? How is inclusion and achievement of MDGs monitored?

Are there any advocacy Programmes for MDG? Which departments and sections are responsible for conducting MDG advocacy? List and describe any MDG advocacy programme.

What MDG policies have been developed by DNPM?

12. Financial resource allocation from UNDP and DNPM for the MDG programme

Criteria 3. Efficiency

What was the annual budget allocation for MDG programme for 2008 - 2013 by UNDP & DNPM. How much was actually expended from 2008 - 2013?

The evaluation will also provide answers and recommendations for the following questions:

6. Based on actual results achieved, is the approach taken by the MDG programme conducive for the achievement of MDGs in PNG, and in light of the MDG deadline – how to direct the programme;

Criteria 5.1 Sustainability - Permanence

7. Has this programme successfully included and promoted gender equality in the country?

Criteria 6: Gender equality

8. Has this programme helped to integrate the principles of sustainable development into the country's policies and programs? How has that been achieved?

Criteria 5.5 Sustainability - Integration

9. Has this programme strengthened partnership between UN agencies and national and sub-national governments, universities, private sector/communities on MDGs?

Criteria 5.2 Sustainability - Partnership

10. What are the non-programme “*soft activities*” that are impacting on the achievement of MDGs in PNG? Positive or negative?

Criteria 4.1: Impact - Effect

Annex 4. List of those who were interviewed.

Name	Organization	Position
Mr. Joe Turia	DNPM	First Assistant Secretary – Policy, Budget and Statistics Division
Mr. Dilli Bhattarai	DNPM	Chief Technical Adviser (MDGs)
Mr. Jonathan Kennett	DNPM	A/ Assistant Secretary – Special Interventions Branch
Mr. Desmond Anthony	DNPM	Special Interventions Branch
Mr. Wilson Gusamo	DNPM	Special Interventions Branch
Ms. Rosemary Isicar	DNPM	Assistant Secretary – Economic Policy Branch
Ms Maria Wau	DNPM	Assistant Secretary-Statistic Branch
Ms. Rosemary Matawai	DNPM	Senior Statistic and Data Officer
Ms Christine Aisoli	DNPM	Population project Officer
Ms. Lina Bade	World Bank – Water Sanitation based at DNPM (previously with UNDP)	
Ms. Vathinee Jitjaturunt	UNICEF	Deputy Representative
Ms. Jill Lawler	UNICEF	
Mr. Jorg Schimmel	UNDP	Assistant Resident Representative
Ms. Emma Powan	UNFPA	Program analyst
Dr. Martin Bakker	Consultant – Population Policy	
Mr. Kelly Kalit	Project Manager – Community Led MDG achievement project PNG	
Ms. Eleina Butuna	UPNG	MDG Course coordinator
Dr. Gary Sali	Unitech (telephone interview)	HOD – Communication & Development Dept
Ms. Vicky Oksen	Project Manager – MDG acceleration Project Kairuku (Brief Telephone conversation)	

Annex 5. Interview Schedule

Project title: Evaluation of Millennium Development Goals (MDG) Programme in PNG

Interview schedule

Name _____ Position _____

Organization _____ Date _____

Sample questions on overall objectives of the Millennium Development Goals in PNG

1. *What support does UNDP provide to GoPNG's experience on MDG implementation within the context of PNG's development planning, implementation and monitoring? Level of support?*

2. *What support does UNDP provide to GoPNG strategically in the areas of MDGs and human development? Level of support?*

3. *What is your overall Assessment of the MDG program? In terms of **evaluation criteria**:*

- *Relevance – What is **importance/ significance** of the MDGs to the local and national requirements and priorities*

- *Effectiveness- Were the overall objectives and outputs of the MDG programme achieved? (see list)*

- *Efficiency - Are the objectives being achieved economically by the MDG programs? Were the resources used efficiently?*

- *Impact –effect,does the MDG program contribute to reaching higher level development objectives such as human development? Is the programme making an impact on human development index areas - education, health or income generation?Has MDG programme resulted in Transformational results – positive change in human development and capacity building?*

- *Sustainability – permanence; are positive effects sustainable? What about in these areas that contribute to sustainability of MDG programs – partnership with UNDP, Institutionalization of program at DNPM, capacity building of nationals, integration of MDG into national and sub-national plans & Annual work plans (AWP)?*

- *Gender equality- Was gender equality promoted in the country through the MDG programme?*

4. *From your experience (as a senior officer at DNPM / UNDP/ other stakeholder) in working with MDG programs, what would you recommend for MDG policy development and advocacy in PNG?*

5. *What are the challenges in implementing MDG programmes in PNG?*

6. *What **lessons were learnt** and good practices for a **forward looking MDG and Human Development** programme?*

7. *What should be done to accelerate the achievement of MDGs to reach target dates by 2015?*

Sample questions on six areas of Evaluation.

The evaluation will cover the following six areas:

- 1. Preparation and influence of PNG's MDG progress reports;**

Criteria 4.1: Impact - effect.

[Who to Question – UNDP, DNPM, UNICEF, UNFPA]

Which is the lead organization for PNGs MDG progress reports (PR)? What are the processes involved in the preparation of the MDG PR? What is the importance of MDG progress reports? Dissemination of MDG PR – to whom, how, stakeholder meetings? Publicity / awareness of MDG PR for public. Key government

departments? Evidence of influence of MDG PR? Planning? Implementation of MDG Programmes? Lessons learnt?

2. Awareness on MDGs and human development at the national and sub-national level and level of transformational results stemming from it;

Criteria 4.2: Impact -Human Development& Criteria 1: Relevance

Why conduct awareness on MDGs? Why are MDGs important to human and national development? With which organizations, Government departments do you conduct awareness? What are your expectations of government department or what do you hope they will do as a result of awareness? What MDG awareness programmes are currently being implemented? Target population?

[MDG Awareness and MDG/MTDP Monitoring and Reporting programme?] Reports?

Has awareness impacted in any way on Human development (index – education, health, income)? How?

What human development awareness programmes are currently being implemented?Target population?

Give examples of positive impact of MDG awareness programmes.

*How is MDG awareness and human development **monitored and reported**at national and sub-national level?*

What transformational results have been achieved as a result of the awareness on MDG and human development?

3. Integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review/monitoring systems and transformational results achieved;

Criteria 5.5 Sustainability - Integration

Sight National & Sub national plans.Document analysis (AWP etc) – examples & evidence of integration of MDGs into national & sub-national plans.

Are the MDGs integrated into the national and sub national Annual work plans?

How to Monitor MDGS in national plans? Do the AWP's have monitoring of MDGs? Evidence of review & monitoring of plans. The integration of MDG in national & sub-national levels, Does it result in achievement of MDGs. Are there reports showing transformational results (MDG achieved)? Give examples showing increase/ decrease in MDG indicators. Lessons learnt?

Give examples of positive impact on key Human development areas such as education, health & income as a result of MDG programme?

[MDG Acceleration Framework pilot project on infant and maternal health (MDG 4 and 5) in Kairuku District from April 2011 to April 2013]

How has MDG programme impacted on people's lives? Example or evidence? MDG indicators? Reports? Lessons learnt?

4. Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and transformational results;

Criteria 5.4: Sustainability- Capacity building.

How do you build capacity on MDGs – awareness, AWP, programmes, human development and sustainable development at national and sub-national levels? Are there any capacity building plans/ programmes/workshops on MDG, human and sustainable development? Describe them – workshop or on the job training. Who funded them? Who conducted them? How have they been implemented? How successful were they? Were there any evaluations or report? Give examples of actual results that have been achieved?

Do you feel that you are in position to take lead in advocating for MDG programs or achievement of MDGs?

Were there any evaluations of the programs? Were there any transformational results? Give examples.

5. Institutionalization of MDGs programme in DNPM.

Criteria 5.3 Sustainability- Institutionalization

Are the MDG programmes institutionalized at DNPM?

Do you have key people in DNPM who deal with MDG programmes? Is there a section or unit that deals specifically with MDG? How does DNPM oversee MDG programs in other sectors? Does DNPM claim ownership of MDG programmes? What systems are in place to monitor MDG programs?

What are some lessons learnt in implementing the MDG programme?

Were there any good practices introduced/ learnt when implementing the program that could be recommended for MDG and Human development programs?

How do you advocate for the inclusion and achievement of MDG in national and sub-national plans? In AWP? How do you monitor the inclusion and achievement of MDGs?

Are there any advocacy programmes for MDG? Where (departments) and how do you conduct MDG advocacy? Describe any MDG advocacy programme.

What MDG policies have been developed by DNPM?

6. Financial resource allocation from UNDP and DNPM for the MDG programme

Criteria 3. Efficiency

What was the annual budget allocation for MDG programme for 2008 - 2013 by UNDP & DNPM. How much was actually expended from 2008 - 2013?

The evaluation will also provide answers and recommendations for the following questions:

1. Based on actual results achieved, is the approach taken by the MDG programme conducive for the achievement of MDGs in PNG, and in light of the MDG deadline – how to direct the programme;

Criteria 5.1 Sustainability - Permanence

2. Has this programme successfully included and promoted gender equality in the country?

Criteria 6: Gender equality

3. Has this programme helped to integrate the principles of sustainable development into the country's policies and programs? How has that been achieved?

Criteria 5.5 Sustainability - Integration

4. Has this programme strengthened partnership between UN agencies and national and sub-national governments, universities, private sector/communities on MDGs?

Criteria 5.2 Sustainability - Partnership

5. What are the non-programme "*soft activities*" that are impacting on the achievement of MDGs in PNG? (*Examples of soft activities. Positive or negative?*)

Criteria 4.1: Impact - Effect

Annex 6. Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Key Evaluation questions	Method of Data collection	Item / Instrument/ Data source (*)	Participants (*)
1. Relevance. Are we doing the right thing? How important is the relevance or significance of the intervention to local and national requirements and priorities? [Added. <i>How important are the MDGs to the local and national requirements and priorities?</i>]	<i>EQ17. How important are the MDGs to the local and national requirements and priorities?</i> What is the relevance or significance of the MDGs to local and national requirements and priorities? <i>EQ20. Why are MDGs important to human and national development?</i>	Interviews Focus Group Discussion (FGD) Desk Reviews Document analysis Phone interviews	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Personnel from key stakeholders including DNPM, GoPNG government Depts, Dept of Finance & Treasury, UNDP, UNICEF & UNFPA. Key personnel from UPNG, UNITECH, Central Province Health, Kairuku district admin
2. Effectiveness. Are the objectives of the development interventions being achieved? How big is the effectiveness or impact of the project compared to the objectives planned (Comparison: result – planning)?	<i>EQ4. What is the overall Assessment of performance of the MDG program? (in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability & gender equality)</i> <i>EQ18. Were the overall objectives and the outputs of the MDG programme achieved?</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Same as above
3. Efficiency. Are the objectives being achieved economically by the development	<i>EQ11. What financial resources were allocated from UNDP and DNPM for the</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions	Same as above

Evaluation Criteria	Key Evaluation questions	Method of Data collection	Item / Instrument/ Data source (*)	Participants (*)
intervention? How big is the efficiency or utilization ratio of the resources used (Comparison: resources applied v/s results)?	<i>MDG programme?</i> <i>Are the objectives being achieved economically by the MDG programmes?</i>		Document analysis	
4.1 Impact - Effect. Does the development intervention contribute to reaching higher level development objectives (preferably, overall objective)? What is the impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected? [Added. <i>Can the observed effects be unambiguously attributed to the program and not other initiatives</i> (Muller, 2012)]	<i>EQ6. What is the process for preparing PNG MDG progress reports and what were the influences of the progress reports on adoption and integration of MDGs in national and sub national programmes?</i> What is the impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected? <i>EQ16. What are the non-programme soft activities that are impacting on the achievement of MDGs in PNG?</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Same as above
4.2 Impact - Human development Was there any progress in Human development key areas such as Education, Health and Income? What were the drivers of progress in human development? What were the	<i>EQ19. What human development programs took place at the national and sub-national level and what transformational results were achieved?</i> <i>EQ24. Were there any progress made in Human development key areas such as</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Same as above

Evaluation Criteria	Key Evaluation questions	Method of Data collection	Item / Instrument/ Data source (*)	Participants (*)
transformational results?	<i>Education, Health and Income as a result MDG programme? What were the drivers of progress in human development?</i>			
4.3 Impact - Transformational Results What evidence is there for progressive change in human development, capacity building on MDGs, sustainable development and integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plan? What transformational results can be seen in the areas of human development, capacity building on MDGs, sustainable development and integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review and monitoring systems?	<i>EQ1. What success and progress was made on MDGs against key indicators and target dates?</i> <i>EQ7. What awareness was conducted on MDGs at the national and sub-national level and what transformational results were achieved?</i> <i>EQ8. Were the MDGs and their review/monitoring systems integrated into the national and sub-national plans and what transformational results were achieved?</i> <i>EQ21. What systems are in place for the review and monitoring of the MDG at the National and sub-national levels?</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Same as above
5.1 Sustainability - Permanence Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable? How is the	<i>EQ14. Has this programme helped to integrate the principles of sustainable development into the country's policies and programmes?</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document	Same as above

Evaluation Criteria	Key Evaluation questions	Method of Data collection	Item / Instrument/ Data source (*)	Participants (*)
sustainability or permanence of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?	<p><i>EQ3. What Lessons were learnt in programming by DNPM and UNDP as well as policy development and advocacy in PNG?</i></p> <p><i>EQ5. What were the lessons learned and good practices for a forward looking MDG and Human Development programme?</i></p> <p><i>EQ12. Based on actual results achieved, was the approach taken by the MDG programme conducive for the achievement of MDGs in PNG, and in light of the MDG deadline – how to direct the programme</i></p>		analysis	
<p>5.2 Sustainability - Partnership</p> <p>Was there evidence of strong partnership between UN agencies and national and sub-national governments, universities, private sector/communities on achieving MDGs? Is there any evidence of GoPNG ownership of programme?</p>	<p><i>EQ2. What was the level of UNDPs support to GoPNG's experience on MDG implementation and human development?</i></p> <p><i>EQ15. Has this programme strengthened partnership between UN agencies and national and sub-national governments, universities, private sector/communities on MDGs?</i></p> <p><i>EQ23. Is there any evidence of GoPNG ownership of programme?</i></p>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Same as above

Evaluation Criteria	Key Evaluation questions	Method of Data collection	Item / Instrument/ Data source (*)	Participants (*)
5.3 Sustainability - Institutionalization Was the MDG programme institutionalized at the DNPM? Has DNPM demonstrated ownership of the MDG programme by taking lead in influencing national and sub-national plans?	<i>EQ10. Was the MDG programme institutionalized in the DNPM?</i> <i>EQ22. Has DNPM demonstrated ownership of the MDG programme by taking lead in influencing national and sub-national plans?</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Same as above
5.4 Sustainability - Capacity building Was there Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level? What transformational results were achieved?	<i>EQ9. Was Capacity building an integral part of the programme on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level and what transformational results were achieved?</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Same as above
5.5 Sustainability - Integration Was there Integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review/monitoring systems? What evidence can be seen of the integration in the national and sub-national plans? What transformational results were achieved?	<i>EQ8. Were the MDGs integrated into the national and sub-national plans and their review/monitoring systems and what transformational results were achieved?</i>	Same as above	Interview Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	Same as above
6 Gender equality	<i>EQ13. Was gender equality included and</i>	Same as above	Interview	Same as above

Evaluation Criteria	Key Evaluation questions	Method of Data collection	Item / Instrument/ Data source (*)	Participants (*)
Was gender equality promoted in the country through the programme?	<i>promoted in the country through MDG programme?</i>		Schedule FGD questions Document analysis	

Notes:

(*). At National level. The questions will be as in matrix and will focus on key personnel at DNPM and possibly UNDP.

At sub-national level the questions will be modified and will focus on program level & key personnel at UPNG, UNITECH and Central province health personnel and not all questions will be relevant to sub- national level

Annex7. Evaluation Criteria

Project: Evaluation of Millennium Development Goals (MDG) Programme in PNG

Evaluation Criteria

Modified from OECD – DAC Evaluation Criteria.

Source: www.entwicklung.at/uploads/media/Guidelines_for_Project...

OECD-DAC Guidelines for project and programme evaluations. Austrian Development Agency, 2009: (P.2) including additions and modifications to list by evaluator.

4. **Relevance.** Are we doing the right thing? How important is the **relevance or significance** of the intervention to local and national requirements and priorities? [Added. What is the **relevance or significance** of the MDGs to the local and national requirements and priorities?]
5. **Effectiveness.** Are the objectives of the development interventions being achieved? How big is the **effectiveness or impact** of the project compared to the objectives planned (Comparison: result against planned objectives)?
6. **Efficiency.** Are the objectives being achieved economically by the development intervention? How big is the **efficiency or utilization ratio** of the resources used (Comparison: resources applied against results)?
- 4.4 **Impact - effect.** Does the development intervention contribute to reaching higher level development objectives (preferably, overall objective)? What is the **impact or effect** of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected?
- 4.5 **Impact - Human development.** Was there any progress in Human development key areas such as Education, Health and Income generation? What were the drivers of progress in human development? What were the transformational results?
- 4.6 **Impact - Transformational Results.** What evidence is there for progressive change in human development, capacity building on MDGs, sustainable development and integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plan? What transformational results can be seen in the areas of human development, capacity building on MDGs, sustainable development and integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review and monitoring systems?
- 5.7 **Sustainability – Ownership** by GoPNG and other stakeholders. Is there any evidence of GoPNG ownership of the programme - at

all levels of government from national to provincial, district and local level government (LLG)? Has DNPM demonstrated ownership of the MDG programme by taking lead in influencing national and sub-national plans? Were all stakeholders involved at all stages of programme / project - planning, implementation and evaluation?

5.8 Sustainability - Partnership. Was there evidence of strong partnership between UN agencies and national and sub-national governments, universities, private sector/communities on achieving MDGs?

5.9 Sustainability - Institutionalization. Was the MDG programme institutionalized at the DNPM or at any other organization or Institution?

5.10 Sustainability - Capacity building. Was there Capacity building on MDGs, human development and sustainable development at the national and sub-national level? What transformational results were achieved?

5.11 Sustainability -Integration. Was there Integration of MDGs in the national and sub-national plans and their review/monitoring systems? What evidence can be seen of the integration in the national and sub-national plans? What transformational results were achieved?

5.12 Sustainability - permanence. Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable? How is the **sustainability or permanence** of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?

7. Gender equality. Was gender equality promoted in the country through the MDG programme?