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# About the QTAG

The Quality and Technical Assurance Group (QTAG) provides strategic, advisory, review, and quality assurance capability and services to support the delivery of Australia’s aid program in Papua New Guinea. It is designed to assure both governments that the agreed development objectives are being addressed efficiently and effectively and that development outcomes are emerging.

The goal of the QTAG is to improve the quality and performance of the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG) programs that support stability and inclusive growth in Papua New Guinea.

The objective of the QTAG is to enable DFAT and the GoPNG to make more informed decisions and exercise greater accountability for the performance and quality of agreed strategies and selected projects.

The QTAG is implemented by Oxford Policy Management (OPM) Australia.

# Executive Summary

This document sets out the findings of the independent review of the South Fly Resilience Plan. The team conducted the review in April – May 2022 and utilised a theory-based approach. The findings of the review are based upon document analysis, consultations with key stakeholders and communities and fieldwork in Papua New Guinea, including in the South Fly District.

The South Fly District in Papua New Guinea has a high incidence of multi-dimensional poverty and gender inequalities are glaring. The District is subject to a range of risks, such as droughts, floods, transmittable diseases, geopolitical dynamics and border closures. Many of these risks eventuated in 2020. The Australian development program has responded, and the South Fly Resilience Plan (SFRP) was rapidly formulated and launched to bolster food and water security. This is a key component of Australia’s investment in the region and presents opportunities for learning to inform the design of future investments in Western Province.

The Plan focused on three strategic components: 1) water, sanitation and hygiene; 2) food security, livelihoods and governance and 3) a transport fuel voucher system to access essential services. Component 3 was delayed and is not a primary focus for this review. The Implementation Plan, under the SFRP, sets out a program of work from January 2021 to June 2022. This review examined the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence and gender equality aspects of the SFRP.

Stakeholders welcomed the independent review, and there is intent to learn from the past. Emerging lessons are relevant to i) programming in rural communities in Papua New Guinea, ii) responding to crises and iii) aid delivery models.

Progress towards increasing food and water security is evident, but there are risks and challenges to sustainable change. In the food, livelihoods and governance component, there is some evidence of very limited changes in the percentage of the population with improved financial literacy. There is also some very minor improvement in governance capacity, through the delivery of the Ward Profiles. Together these demonstrate very nascent, but nonetheless relevant, progress towards the achievement of intermediate outcomes. In water, sanitation and hygiene, progress is being demonstrated in open defecation free communities, the construct of toilets, the capability to respond to droughts and three well upgrades in Daru. Progress is also being demonstrated in water, sanitation and hygiene governance.

Both component activities and outputs could be delivered in ways that are more sensitive to the socio-cultural context. This relates to the monitoring and evaluation framework’s assumptions surrounding i) communities and Government engaging with the implementing partners and ii) the delivery of the right type of support to achieve outcomes. Implementing partners should consider how to enhance engagement with, and reporting to, District authorities and communities, while furthering the practice of adaptive management for gains in efficiency and effectiveness.

The District is a costly location to implement a development program. In both components, particularly within food security and livelihoods, progress against outputs is behind schedule. In food, livelihoods and governance, budget execution has been rapid and uneven across budget lines. This is more a symptom of the design, the operating environment and the operating model, than delays to implementation on behalf of implementing partners. There seems a need to increase resourcing, enhance engagement and bolster quality assurance and monitoring mechanisms.

The Plan is relevant to the needs of communities, District and Provincial Plans and Australia’s strategic priorities in Papua New Guinea. While the Plan is harmonised and coordinated across much of Australia’s broader development programme, there are opportunities to further this with key actors in the South Fly District. Few actors understood the details of the different components of the SFRP. For example, District Authorities have not seen the Implementation Plan, although fact sheets have been disseminated and presentations made. Nor are District Authorities sufficiently familiar with the various reports under the Plan. This hampers partners relations, ownership and the extent to which sustainability can be achieved.

The Provincial and District authorities prioritise the sustainability of results. After only one year of implementation, there is some, very limited, evidence of the program contributing to more resilient communities. However, the District is largely unable to monitor and respond to crises, much water infrastructure is deteriorating and food security has not yet improved. It is very unlikely that formal and informal institutions will be able to maintain both components, without longer term support. In water, sanitation and hygiene, however, important gains in governance are evident. It will be useful for each component to develop a framework to identify pathways to sustainability for identified outputs.

There are visible signs of progress being made to address gender inequality and social exclusion. Promising progress is demonstrated in women in leadership, but there is less progress in women’s economic empowerment. Implementing partners are not engaged in gender-based violence. Given the donor landscape and inequalities, opportunities to improve gender equality and social inclusion should be exploited. More can be done, in particular, to address gender-based violence and the experience of disabled people.

Recommendations:

1. Implementing partners and DFAT should consider how best to improve engagement with, and reporting to, District authorities and communities, while furthering the practice of adaptive management for gains in efficiency and effectiveness.
2. Should the ambitions of the plan remain, an increase in resourcing is justified. This should be directed, largely, to i) the implementation of activities in food, livelihoods and governance, ii) the Australia Papua New Guinea sub–National Program’s administration and engagement function in Daru iii) a bolstered monitoring and quality assurance function and iv) activities to contribute to or progress gender equality.
3. The Rangers should be more actively engaged in agricultural extension services and water, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure delivery, in the short term. Value will also be found in INLOC (implementer of the Ranger program) recruiting Papua New Guinean male and female advisers.
4. Continue to strengthen existing coordination mechanisms. Meanwhile, facilitate, with District authorities, the establishment of a partner coordination platform, meeting at least biannually, comprising, among others, of the Sustainable Development Program, Ok Tedi Development Foundation, faith groups and implementers of Australian funded development initiatives.
5. Identify pathways to sustainability for identified outputs, that leverages and improves the position and capabilities of different levels of Government, the private sector and civil society.
6. Increase emphasis on facilitating gender equalitythrough enhancing i) women’s access to training opportunities and decision-making forums, ii) increasing consultation with women’s groups to determine acceptable economic enhancement activities and iii) strengthen women’s access to family sexual violence services and referral pathways.
7. Resource a gender equality and social inclusion function within the SFRP, and conduct a gender analysis and a disability analysis to inform current and future programming in Western Province.
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ADRA | Adventist Development and Relief Agency |
| AHC | Australian High Commission |
| APSP | Australia Papua New Guinea sub–National Program |
| CLTS | Community Led Total Sanitation |
| CSEP | Comprehensive Strategic and Economic Partnership  |
| DAL | Department of Agriculture and Livestock |
| DCP | Decentralisation and Citizen Participation Partnership |
| DFAT | Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade |
| DPLGA | Department of Provincial and Local Level Government Affairs |
| FLAG | Food, livelihoods and governance |
| FOREX | Foreign exchange |
| GEWES | Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Strategy |
| GoPNG | Government of Papua New Guinea |
| LLG | Local-level government |
| MEF | Monitoring and evaluation framework |
| MEL | Monitoring, evaluation and learning |
| NFA | National Fisheries Authority |
| OPM | Oxford Policy Management |
| PNG | Papua New Guinea |
| QTAG | Quality and Technical Advisory Group |
| RRRC | Reef and Rainforest Research Centre |
| SDP | Sustainable Development Program |
| SFD | South Fly District |
| SFRP | South Fly Resilience Plan |
| STC | Save the Children |
| WASH | Water, sanitation and hygiene |
| WVI | World Vision International |

# 1. Purpose, structure, methodology and background

## 1.1 Purpose

This report communicates lessons and justifies recommendations, to adapt Australian food and water security programming in the South Fly District (SFD) of Papua New Guinea (PNG). This includes an examination of whether the underpinning assumptions of the South Fly Resilience Plan (SFRP) are holding, which can inform the design of the Western Province Partnership. To these purposes, this report answers the questions posed in the terms of reference for the independent review of the SFRP. The terms of reference for the review are included in Annex 1. This includes signposts to where the questions are answered in this report.

## 1.2 Structure

The remainder of this section presents the methodology to the review, and background to the SFRP. Section 2 follows with an assessment of effectiveness, before Section 3 discusses efficiency. This is followed by assessments of coherence, sustainability and gender in Sections 4, 5 and 6, respectively. Section 7 presents concluding observations and recommendations.

## 1.3 Methodology

The review was undertaken in late April and May 2022. Where appropriate, the review employed elements of theory-based approaches to evaluations.

Pre mission reading was followed by consultations with stakeholders located in Cairns, Port Moresby and the SFD. A list of organisations consulted can be found in Annex 3. At the end of the two-week field trip, initial findings were presented to stakeholders via an Aide Memoire. This provided opportunity for feedback. Subsequent remote consultations were then held with stakeholders. Despite best attempts, some communities did not feel they were adequately notified of the visit of the review team. This impacted the tenor of responses.

The review occurred after 12 months of implementation, and with two months remaining on the initial SFRP contracts. This short time frame meant that progress towards outcomes, and the demonstration of sustainability, was expected to be limited. However, the conduct of an independent review at this point does allow for adaptation, as the risks of COVID-19 subside, while also providing input into the design of Australian support to Western Province.

## 1.4 Background

Population densities in Western Province are low, in comparison to other provinces of PNG[[1]](#footnote-2), and the population growth rate had been shrinking to 2011. Of the circa 60,000 people residing in the SFD in 2011, 26% of the population resided in Daru Urban. This level of urbanisation is above other Districts in Western Province.

The rural population of the SFD live mostly in villages spread across a large geographic area, with scant road connectivity[[2]](#footnote-3). In most villages, government services are limited to the provision of education[[3]](#footnote-4). Most households engage in subsistence agriculture and income generation activities, often from seasonal activities. Income generating activities largely pay for essential services, and improve food security. Markets are exceptionally nascent and government services are patchy; the SFD is a very challenging operating environment.

The needs of the population for improved food and water security are high. Areas of the low-lying District have been found to have a high incidence of multi-dimensional poverty[[4]](#footnote-5). The District is also subject to climate induced extreme weather events; such as droughts, floods and increasingly high king tides. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the severity and incidence of these events are worsening. The District also suffers from a high incidence of multi drug resistant tuberculosis, as well as HIV[[5]](#footnote-6). In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic, and possible subsequent infection rates, restrictions on movement and the border closure, created another shock. Given the need, Australia, a committed partner, responded.

Figure 1: Major events in the evolution of the SFRP



A major manifestation of Australia’s response has been the SFRP. At initiation, the long-term goal of the SFRP was to enhance stability, enhance economic recovery and improve health security, through bolstering, primarily, the ability of communities to meet their own food and water needs. Effort is also being directed to enhance the capability of the Ward and District authorities to i) improve governance, ii) invest in food and water security and iii) respond to emergencies. A results framework is provided in Annex 2.

Figure 1 provides a timeline of major events during the initiation, formulation and implementation of the SFRP. The SFRP was initiated under the Decentralisation and Citizen Participation (DCP) Partnership, during the second quarter of 2020. 2020 was characterised by unusual levels of uncertainty, alongside movement restrictions, due to the COVID-19 pandemic[[6]](#footnote-7). In responding, the SFRP was rapidly designed by a team of specialists, working remotely. The design was informed by remote consultations, secondary evidence, prior implementation experience and a survey implemented by the Reef and Rainforest Research Centre (RRRC).

The DCP was succeeded by the Australia Papua New Guinea sub–National Partnership (APSP) in the first quarter of 2022. The lessons from the SFRP and the recommendations from this review, are relevant to the end of program outcomes of the APSP. These define:

* *A development outcome:* Efficient and effective programs are delivered in selected provinces that achieve planned end of program outcomes; and,
* *A partnership outcome:* Australia is recognised as a well-informed and constructive partner for investment and policy dialogue at subnational level.

The SFRP expands on, and substantially adapts, prior resilience programming specific to the SFD. Prior programming centred around the Building Resilience in Treaty Villages initiative, operating since 2015 and implemented by RRRC and the INLOC Group. This largely focussed on enhancing water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) outcomes which have been progressed through the engagement of community based and selected Rangers[[7]](#footnote-8).

The SFRP has expanded activities to all Wards in the SFD, and now includes support to non-treaty villages. Australian support has expanded from being delivered to the fourteen treaty villages, to supporting fifty-two villages.

Under the SFRP, RRRC and INLOC now deliver the food, livelihoods and governance (FLAG) component while World Vision International (WVI) deliver the WASH component. The implementation of a fuel voucher scheme, to facilitate access to health services, has been cancelled. The roles of key partners are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Key roles in the SFRP

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| APSP/DCP (Abt Associates) | RRRC and INLOC | WVI | Ship Management Company |
| * Overall management oversight including grant management of RRRC and World Vision International
* Lead on MEL and Gender
* Lead Implementing Partners Working Group
* Specialist Technical inputs
* Freight Transport
 | * Implement monthly food and water security assessment
* Lead food security and livelihoods component
* Implement Ranger program
 | * Lead WASH component
* Implement Fuel Voucher Trial (delayed)
 | Supports freight needs to deliver program of works for food and water security. |
| FY20/21: AUD 1,120,216FY21/22: AUD 1,438,349 | **FY20/21: AUD 1,845,500****FY21/22: AUD 4,270,000** | **FY20/21: AUD 1,221,182****FY21/22: AUD 2,415,494** | **FY20/21: AUD 1,087,420****FY21/22: AUD 1,793,630** |

A shipping charter agreement has been entered into under the SFRP. This allows for the transportation of goods, primarily destined for use in Australian development projects, from Port Moresby to Daru or Mabudawan. The charter agreement allows for other stakeholders to the SFRP, and businesses, to utilise the service, at above market rates. This pricing has been determined, so that the service does not undermine existing commercial services.

# 2. Effectiveness

## 2.1 The theory of change and its assumptions

The minimum sufficient monitoring and evaluation framework (MEF), delivered one year after the launch of the SFRP, suggests that “understanding the results of the current work requires a longer timeframe than the current window…”. This timeframe is detailed in Figure 2.

Figure 2: SFRP’s results timeline



The use of an appropriate theory of change, and the subsequent employment of contribution analyses, can assist in untangling if and how activities and outputs are contributing, or are likely to contribute to, intermediate and end of program outcomes. This can include the extent to which assumptions are holding. The SFRP’s assumptions, defined in the review and reflection summary in April 2022, are detailed below.

1. Community engagement being essential for the SFRP to be effective.
2. Communities being able to, with the right assistance, reduce vulnerability and increase resilience to the impacts of climate shocks.
3. Local government engagement being essential for the SFRP to be effective.
4. Local government being able to, with the right assistance, effectively deliver the necessary services to communities to reduce vulnerability and increased resilience to the impacts of climate shocks.

These assumptions are critical, and they do not account for gender equality. Given the implementation related nature of these assumptions, a more comprehensive formulation, including consultative, process would have allowed for these to be addressed more fully in the SFRP. For example, one component’s risk registry includes several risks regarding the feasibility and sustainability of SFRP supported economic activities. This also suggests that communication between partners, during formulation, has not been sufficient. It is not too late to address these points, through managing activities and outputs adaptively and enhancing engagement in support of a more effective contribution to outcomes.

Community and government expectations are high and the SFRP is ambitious, but there is a widely held view among these stakeholders that little relevant progress has been made. This suggests that engagement could have been more effective. When we further investigated the rate of progress with communities, agreement was generated on progress in Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) and WASH governance. Very nascent progress is also evident in FLAG.

## 2.2 Food, livelihoods and governance

Figure 3 displays intermediate and end of program outcomes for the FLAG component. Of the intermediate outcome indicators in the MEF, there may be very limited changes in the percentage of the population with improved financial literacy (financial literacy training has been delivered to 20 men and 20 women). There may also be some minor improvement in governance capacity through the delivery of the Ward Profiles. Together these demonstrate very nascent, but nonetheless relevant, progress towards the achievement of intermediate outcomes. Given that this is a new component, and the stage of implementation, this slow rate of progress towards intermediate outcomes is not surprising.

Figure 3: End of investment and intermediate outcomes in food, livelihoods and governance

Several outputs may need adapting and accelerating to achieve outcomes. For example, the Implementation Plan is overly prescriptive in which economic activities should be progressed. This may risk the engagement of communities and the achievement of outcomes. The introduction of goats is considered particularly risky. Wherever productive activities are being considered, a very careful consideration of environmental sustainability, inclusivity (especially the current and future role of women) and competitiveness is needed. This should include the needs, capabilities and expectations of communities, and other stakeholders.

In line with the assumption in the MEF, implementation capability of Government also needs consideration. The District authority requires substantial improvements in capability to sustain improvements in FLAG. Further while the SFRP recognises that the Department of Agriculture and Livestock (DAL) and the National Fisheries Authority (NFA) as being critical to implementation, the Implementation Plan recognises an absence of capability. We saw little visibility of these organisations, or the results of their projects, in the District. Challenges could arise in relying too heavily on their support.

Across FLAG, in order to further the achievement of outcomes, there seems a need to i) enhance engagement with communities to build on existing food and livelihood activities wherever possible, ii) continue to allow flexibility across budget lines, iii) facilitate the funding of the Food Security Plan through a wider range of sources than the District budget and iv) accelerating governance improvements at the Ward level, and District level.

## 2.3 Water, sanitation and hygiene

Figure 4 shows the intermediate and end of program outcomes of the WASH component. Of the intermediate outcome indicators, progress is being demonstrated in open defecation free communities (which is subject to being verified), the construct of toilets, the capability to respond to droughts (through ‘mobile’ desalination plants) and three well upgrades in Daru. Progress is also being demonstrated in WASH governance, through the creation of the District and Ward level WASH committees.

Figure 4: End of investment and intermediate outcomes in water, sanitation and hygiene

This moderate rate of progress is not surprising. Further, the transition to the new approach to WASH, which prioritises longer term transformational change, has paused gains in small WASH infrastructure. For Treaty Villages, which benefited from support to WASH through INLOC, this transition has been hard. A more balanced approach seems relevant, that does not undermine the sustainability of the new practices being facilitated in WASH governance. This will require a rapid acceleration in support to WASH infrastructure this dry season.

Transformational change could be generated through the release and use of the much-anticipated hydrological assessments of some villages, though challenges are being encountered in receiving the report. With more assessments and subsequent investment, water security could be bolstered through the dry season. But to manage risks, this should be part of a mixed approach to water security that includes improved rain catchment and storage.

Much emphasis is being given to the role of the District in WASH service delivery, including emergency response, in line with the assumptions in the MEF. The sector is in a state of flux in urban areas, as responsibility for WASH shifts from Provincial Health Authorities to District authorities. The Provincial Health Authorities will continue to take responsibility for WASH in rural areas, and the Authority has updated its organisational structure to account for WASH responsibilities.

The District, with WVI support, has made good progress and could become a demonstrator for other Districts to follow. However, great challenges remain and greater emphasis can be given to building institutional capability as the District takes on more functions in WASH. This should include i) acting on the findings of the bottleneck analysis, ii) facilitating a broad range of funding streams to the WASH plan and iii) embedding WASH functions in the District Administration and Provincial Health Authority in the next 12 months.

In WASH, in order to further the achievement of outcomes, there is a need to i) obtain and use the results of the hydrological survey, ii) accelerate the delivery and maintenance of WASH infrastructure, subject to engagement with the District and the Provincial Health Authority, this dry season, iii) facilitate the funding of the draft WASH plan through a broader range of sources than the District budget and iv) accelerate governance strengthening at the District level.

## 2.4 Sensitivity to the socio-cultural local context

Across both components activities and outputs could be delivered in ways that are more sensitive to the socio-cultural context.[[8]](#footnote-9) Importantly it risks the holding of assumptions surrounding i) communities and Government engaging with the SFRP and ii) the delivery of the right type of support to achieve outcomes.

We found widely held views, that the SFRP is not engaging appropriately at the community level. This is a challenging area, but it seems improvements can be made. There is a widely held view that information is being gleaned from communities, with little reciprocity. This is not a sustainable approach, and is culturally inappropriate. For example, members of one community felt ill informed about the hydrogeological survey. The community were alarmed when they witnessed the survey team conducting their tests.

Facilitating the introduction of new behaviours within communities is challenging, and comes with risks. During consultations, stakeholders gave examples of i) negative messaging to effect change, ii) the discontinuation of support to much needed WASH infrastructure in the transition phase and iii) communities being told what to do.

In one village women were concerned about the lack of progress in infrastructure work on toilets. This village were advised to dig pits, which they did. Due to floods, the pits were continuously inundated with water. They were advised to purchase 44 gallon drums to use in pits. These could only be accessed from Daru, which is costly. Drums are also not always available. When the implementing partner conducted a monitoring visit and found they had not prepared appropriate pits, they were informed that they would not be further assisted until they had appropriate pits.

The approach to engagement and facilitating behaviour change can be more balanced, by employing positive messaging, patience, evidence-based consultation and dialogue and decision making by consensus, while building on existing behaviours wherever possible. This takes patience, but seems a more appropriate way of working in rural Papua New Guinea.

Engagement with District authorities, during the formulation of the SFRP and the early phases of implementation, has also not met expectations. While presentations on the Plan have been made and factsheets disseminated, the District Administrator was apparently only made aware of the SFRP when they were approached to establish the District WASH Committee. While effort to inform and consult was made, this evidently did not meet expectations.

A stakeholder engagement plan is in use, and the Rangers are now utilised for communication, A more systematic approach will be beneficial. An engagement protocol, which is mindful of gender inequality, and the continued utilisation of the Rangers for communication will help.

**Recommendation 1:** Implementing partners and DFAT should consider how best to improve engagement with, and reporting to, District authorities and communities, while furthering the practice of adaptive management for gains in efficiency and effectiveness.

Risks to future engagement, among communities and government, could stem from the inconsistent issuance of allowances for participating in training and workshops run by the SFRP’s implementing partners. A consistent approach will level the playing the field and manage expectations.

# 3. Efficiency

## 3.1 Overview

The SFD is a costly location to implement a development program. This is driven largely by transportation costs and the absorptive capability of local stakeholders. Monitoring activities and results is also costly, and there is a risk that results are not verified.

Much has been done. But in both components, particularly food security and livelihoods, progress against outputs is behind schedule. In FLAG, budget execution has been rapid and uneven across budget lines. We view these more of symptoms of the design and the operating environment, than delays to implementation on behalf of implementing partners. There seems a need to increase resourcing, enhance engagement and bolster quality assurance mechanisms.

**Recommendation 2:** Should the ambitions of the plan remain, an increase in resourcing is justified. This should be directed, largely, to i) the implementation of activities in food, livelihoods and governance, ii) the Australia Papua New Guinea sub–National Program’s administration and engagement function in Daru iii) a bolstered monitoring and quality assurance function and iv) activities to contribute to or progress gender equality.

## 3.2 Achievement of outputs and budget execution in food, livelihood and governance

This component adopts a multi-layered approach, whereby RRRC have an over-the-top contract and subcontracts INLOC. The approach may affect the extent to which adaptive management can be practiced effectively.

The FLAG component includes a range of activities and outputs that are new to Government, communities and implementing partners. These challenges were compounded by the ambitions of the SFRP, and the top-down way the SFRP and the associated work plans were formulated.

Table 2: Key envisioned actions under the FLAG component until June 2022

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| RRRC/INLOC | APSP/DCP |
| * Tok Save Roadshows / community consultation
* Basic agriculture workshops
* Procurement and distribution of water wheels
* Facilitate and support communities to construct nursery infrastructure
* Provision of moringa trees
* Income generation trials
* Capacity development DAL and NFA
* Facilitate enhancement of bush road from Sota to Weam
* Procure and facilitate construction of a reaction/cable Pontoon across Bensbach River
* Procure and support construction of hub infrastructure
* Ranger Program
* Community Governance training
 | * Market Development and mobile money activities in Mabuduwan
* Financial Literacy Training in Mabuduwan
* Rapid evaluation of income generation trials
 |

According to the Output summary report, delivered in April 2022:

* 9 communities now have access to water wheels;
* 40 people have received financial literacy training; and,
* 40 Wards have received Ward Development Profile Workshops, and 22 have developed Ward Development Plans.

No outputs have been achieved relating to income generation through micro businesses or small and medium enterprises, training in garden practices, agriculture or aquaculture hubs and the food security plan. However, progress is being made towards delivering some of these outputs. One nursery has been constructed but is not yet being used, and the food security plan is at a mature stage of drafting. When output level results are reported, these should be disaggregated by gender and disability.

According to the work plan, activities were expected to be well advanced across all outputs by May 2022. For some outputs, delays seem to be a result of relying on the participation of National agencies and the ambition and complexity, and associated need for engagement and technical assistance, of establishing hubs, micro businesses and income generation trials.

While progress against outputs has been slow to April 2022, by December 2021 58% of the grant to RRRC, under the SFRP, had been expended. Meanwhile, the utilisation rate of the Rangers has fallen from prior programming.

To address the high burn rate and rate of delivery of outputs, it will be useful to revisit the mode of delivery to:

* Increase the utilisation rate of Rangers in delivering appropriate agricultural extension services;
* Accelerate the delivery of technical assistance and community engagement for micro businesses and agricultural trials; and,
* Enhance the footprint of implementing partners in Daru (and perhaps beyond), to facilitate engagement associated with the formulation and implementation of the Food Security Plan and the Ward Development Plans, among others.

**Recommendation 3:** The Rangers should be more actively engaged in agricultural extension services and water, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure delivery, in the short term. Value will also be found in INLOC recruiting Papua New Guinean male and female advisers.

Wherever possible, activities should build existing value chains or exploit existing momentum, rather than seeking to introduce new value chains without private sector, and sufficient community, participation. Value will also be found in gradually recruiting Papua New Guinean male and female advisers into the ranks of INLOC.

Written deliverables are of a mixed quality in FLAG. The feasibility studies tend to arrive at a solution early, and then identify challenges to further implementation. An alternative approach could have considered options for how the value chain could be strengthened or established, sustainably, with donor support. Given the nascent nature of markets, several options could have been considered. The Food Security Plan is nearing a final draft, and sufficient attention should be given to appraising options and consultation, with the District, to ensure its feasibility. Given the role of women in food security, adequate attention should also be given to consulting with women in communities.

The Tok Save Road Show Outcomes report was not a formal deliverable. However, feedback from communities and stakeholders and the content of the report suggest that, while the Road Show was useful, deeper engagement with communities is required.

The monthly Food and Water Security Reports, which monitor the position of focal villages, is valued. However, concerns were raised over the ways questions are asked, and alignment with GoPNG’s methodology for similar reports. The methodology is soon to be adapted, so that it aligns with the GoPNG’s methodology. Support provided to Ward Profiles has been well received, and is considered of a high quality. The monthly progress reports are a key tool for accountability, and there is space for improving them in FLAG. There is a view that underperforming areas are glossed over, rather than communicating lessons and adapting.

## 3.3 Achievement of outputs and budget execution in water, sanitation and hygiene

The WASH component has adopted a different approach to prior programming, which was implemented by RRRC and INLOC. The WASH Component now seeks to deliver transformational change through i) mapping and accessing aquifers, ii) achieving Community Led Total Sanitation and iii) improved sector governance, among others.

Table 3: Key envisioned actions under the WASH component to June 2022

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| WVI | APSP/DCP |
| * Expanded WASH survey
* Community Total Led Sanitation
* District WASH Plan
* Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Management Plan
* Establishment of District level WASH Committee
* Establishment of Ward level WASH committees
* Pre-positioning of desalination plants
* Latrine construction
* Well upgrades and new boreholes
 | * Hydrological survey
 |

According to the output summary report delivered in April 2022:

* 3 well upgrades have been completed;
* 15 communities have been triggered for Community Led Total Sanitation;
* 477 latrines have been constructed;
* 13 Ward level WASH committees have been established;
* A District level WASH plan has been drafted, and a committee formulated; and,
* 2 desalination units have been prepositioned.

No outputs have yet been achieved in new boreholes (though three have been drilled, awaiting equipment, in Mabuduwan), the number of schools and health facilities with access to a basic level of WASH or emergency protocols and response drills. Given the requirements for sequencing and prioritisation, the rate of progress for these outputs is understandable.

At the end of December 2021, the burn rate of the grant amount reached 27% (excluding FOREX and interest). There is variance on almost all line items in the budget, and this has been contributed to by the delay in contracting and COVID-19. In WASH it is also necessary to consider the seasonal nature of the construction of much ground-based WASH infrastructure. There seems a need to accelerate the construction of WASH infrastructure this dry season.

While good progress is being made, this has come at the cost of past and anticipated gains in small WASH infrastructure development, which was temporarily discontinued. A more balanced approach seems justified.

Written deliverables are generally of a good quality. The WASH survey provides a wealth of information relevant to policy formulation. Meanwhile the District is proud of the progress it is making in WASH governance. Relevant Wards are satisfied by the equal representation of men and women in the WASH committees.

The draft District WASH Plan outlines an ambitious approach to service delivery and governance of the sector. An appropriate appraisal and consultative process, that emphasises the voice of women given their role in WASH, will support its feasibility.

The hydrological survey covered 22 villages, across 3 Local Level Governments. The assessment could trigger transformational change if suitable sources of ground water can be identified. However, challenges have been encountered in receiving the reports from the Mineral Resource Authority. Any future surveys should be under contracted arrangements, rather than Memoranda of Understanding, to ensure the timely delivery of outputs.

## 3.4 The shipping service to the South Fly

Transporting goods to the South Fly commercially is costly, and services infrequent. It is not possible to use supply lines from the Torres Strait. To address these points, an innovation under the SFRP has been the charter of the Motor Vessel (MV) Islander. This service is provided to all Australian development partners in the District. The service is being delivered through arrangements between the DCP/APSP (Abt Associates), AST Oceanics and Inchcape. Inchcape manage APSP’s interest in the charter, while AST Oceanics subcontract to Trans World Logistics (who own the MV Islander). The MV Islander, and its accompanying launch, is well configured to meet the specific environment of the District. However, the MV Islander’s accessibility to areas outside of Mabuduwan and Daru is partly constrained by the absence of accurate shipping charts.

The arrangement has required Abt Associates to participate in a new market in a short period of time; this has been conducted efficiently. DFAT has also responded efficiently to meet this challenge. The service is delivering substantial cost and time efficiencies to Australia’s investments in the South Fly. For example, an infrastructure investment, valued at AUD 16 million, found savings of AUD 2 million. through utilising the service. The service also provides opportunity for other development partners and the private sector to utilise the service. Further efficiencies will be gained, following improvements to wharf and jetty infrastructure and stevedoring operations.

# Coherence

## 4.1 Coherence with Australia’s priorities in the SFD

The SFRP represents one of the Australian development program’s responses to the COVID-19 policy context, as well as the needs of the population for food and water security. The delivery modalities under the DCP facilitated the scale and rapid nature of the response, however this came at the cost of sufficient engagement with District authorities and communities.

The SFRP is aligned with *Partnerships for Recovery: Australia’s COVID-19 Development Response[[9]](#footnote-10)*, by focusing initially on the emergency response and then the transition to recovery. The Plan is also aligned to DFAT’s *Papua New Guinea COVID-19 Development Response Plan[[10]](#footnote-11)*, which singles out the SFD as a place to “pilot a more integrated approach to engagement” reflecting “shared strategic and development interests in this region.”

The SFRP also aligns to key pillars of the *Comprehensive Strategic and Economic Partnership[[11]](#footnote-12)* (CSEP). The CSEP includes a range of principles relevant to the future of the SFRP as it adapts, principally i) open communication, ii) shared responsibility and iii) flexibility. Gender equality and women’s empowerment are also important priorities for Australia, as embodied in the CSEP and Gender and Women’s Empowerment Strategy (GEWES)[[12]](#footnote-13). Progress is most evident in one of the three pillars of the GEWES.

## 4.2 Synergies with Australia’s development program and the bilateral partnership

The SFRP has developed strong synergies and is coordinated across much of Australia’s development program and bilateral partnership. The South Fly Shipping Service is the most visible evidence of opportunities being capitalised upon. This is improving time and cost efficiencies, across the development program.

Australia’s development program has a long history of health interventions in the SFD, and the SFRP has worked closely with the PNG Australia Transition to Health project during the pandemic. Synergies and interlinkages are increasingly being capitalised on through past and upcoming infrastructure investments. Recent investments include the health centre and jetty at Mabuduwan, which aims to serve many villages in the South Fly. Future, possible, investments include rehabilitating Daru Port and the medium wave radio transmitter in Daru for the National Broadcasting Corporation. These will improve access to goods and services. Under the SFRP, the construction of a road has been put on hold. But its inclusion in the SFRP does demonstrate awareness of the need to improve connectivity through infrastructure investments across the South Fly.

A study is currently under way to investigate the potential for interventions to alleviate the high cost of fuel and improve coastal and riverine transport of goods and people. If progressed, this will improve access to essential services.

The SFRP’s interlinkages with Churches are less well formed and could be strengthened in food security and gender equality. Caritas, Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) and United Church Partners have been responding to COVID-19 through food security and livelihood interventions in Oriomo-Bituri Local Level Government. This is funded by the Australian Humanitarian Partnership through their Australian Church Partners, a 5-year program (2017-2022). Caritas coordinates with Australian funders and provides reporting, while the United Church and ADRA implement interventions. There is some overlap between the FLAG component and ADRA’s initiative. RRRC is developing a map to show the footprint of different initiatives in FLAG to avoid duplication of effort.

Greater coordination with the law and justice program, particularly the Justice Service and Stability for Development Program’s Community Justice Adviser in Western Province, would also be beneficial. Interlinkages are likely to be found in gender-based violence, in particular.

Save the Children (STC) is conducting a baseline on nutrition in the North and South Fly communities. This is funded under the Australia Non-Governmental Organisation Cooperation Program. STC have not heard of the SFRP nor met any implementing partner. Opportunities exist for synergies and interlinkages.

The SFRP is expected to transition into the Western Province Partnership in the first half of 2023. The formulation of the Western Province Partnership will provide opportunity to further coherence and generate synergies across Australia’s investments.

## 4.3 Harmonisation and coordination with key actors in the SFD

There is space to improve harmonisation and coordination with key actors in the SFD. This can build on the improvements already made.

Coordination and partnership with national level institutions is important for the SFRP’s effectiveness, and coordination is improving. The Department of Provincial and Local Level Government Affairs (DPLGA) is responsible for institutional strengthening at the sub national level. Training in this area, facilitated by the SFRP and involving DPLGA, is considered of high quality. There is further space to engage with DPLGA in governance related activities. Wherever this occurs, it will be necessary for the implementing partners to support the District administration in requesting support from DPLGA. This will build, or strengthen existing, relationships.

The Department of National Planning and Monitoring is responsible for the Papua New Guinea WASH Policy 2015-2030, though responsibility for the ownership of WASH in the provinces is vague. The SFRP is navigating this vacuum well, and the SFD could become a recognised leader in WASH service provision once functions are fully adopted by the District and Provincial Health Authority.

The focus on food and water security is aligned to the *New Way Forward*: *Western Province Development Plan 2018-2022 and the Papua New Guinea National Food Security Policy 2018-2027*. This focuses on advancing the meeting of the basic needs of the population. The imminent updating of this Plan, and the District’s plan, provides opportunity to maintain alignment, and identify synergies as the SFRP adapts. The Provincial Administrator has effective lines of communication with the Australian High Commission. The existing Provincial Coordination and Monitoring Committee allows for the engagement of all government and non-government stakeholders; participation in this mechanism should be continued.

While the SFRP complements Provincial and District plans there has been insufficient engagement in the formulation and early implementation stages of the Plan. This has recently improved. For example, the SFRP’s Steering Committee first met in April 2022. While best efforts were made to convene the Steering Committee in Daru earlier, the delay to the first meeting of the Steering Committee is a symptom of trying to gather a broad range of stakeholders together.

However few partners understood the details of the different components of the SFRP, and activities therein. For example, District authorities have not seen the Implementation Plan. Though they have received fact sheets and presentations have been made. Nor are District authorities familiar with the various surveillance, research and monitoring reports of the SFRP.

This hampers partner relations and the extent to which sustainability, complementarity, harmonisation and coordination can be achieved. However, the effort directed towards the Steering Committee and the establishment and strengthening of the District and Ward level WASH Committees, and the Food and Water Security Plans, does demonstrate the utilisation of local systems.

The Sub National Adviser has delivered a much-required step change in engagement. The Australian High Commission’s mobilisation of technical expertise in agriculture also seems valuable. But improvements in the quality and consistency of engagement with communities and the District is still required. Value will also be derived by sharing reporting (such as the results of the WASH survey and the monthly situation reports) with District and Provincial authorities.

Relations with other development partners, such as the Ok Tedi Development Foundation, are emerging. However, the relationship with the Sustainable Development Program (SDP) seems fraught. Bridges should be built between the organisations. This is especially relevant given SDP’s engagement in vanilla production and aquaculture.

Relations with non-government organisations, civil society organisations and church partners will be important to progressing the SFRP. These organisations already have the relationships and established systems that can be utilised to deliver projects at community level.

**Recommendation 4:** Continue to strengthen existing coordination mechanisms. Meanwhile, facilitate, with District authorities, the establishment of a partner coordination platform, meeting at least biannually, comprising, among others, of the Sustainable Development Program, Ok Tedi Development Foundation, faith groups and implementers of Australian funded development initiatives.

# Sustainability

## 5.1 Overview

The Provincial and District authorities prioritise the sustainability of results. Meanwhile the SFRP is ambitious; particularly with the aim of facilitating sustainable new economic activities and governance arrangements in a short period of time.

After only one year of implementation, there is some, very limited, evidence of the program contributing to more resilient communities[[13]](#footnote-14). However, the District is largely unable to monitor and respond to crises, much water infrastructure is deteriorating and food security has not yet improved. It is very unlikely that formal and informal institutions will be able to maintain all components, without longer term support.

We suggest that each component develop a framework to identify pathways to sustainability for identified outputs; such as those discussed in Section 5.1. Value will be derived from consulting with partners on the prioritisation and feasibility of these pathways during the formulation of the Food and Water Security Plans.

When formulating pathways, consideration can be given to the requirements of relationships, technical capability and finances. When considering financial sustainability, greater emphasis should be given to leverage not only District, but also Ward, SDP, Ok Tedi Development Foundation, District Service Improve Program, private sector and household resources.

**Recommendation 5:** Identify pathways to sustainability for identified outputs, that leverages and improves the position and capabilities of different levels of Government, the private sector and civil society.

## 5.2 What areas are likely to be sustained in the long term by formal and informal institutions?

There is potential for sustainability in new governance practices, if these are formulated in ways that recognise i) the absorptive capacity of local institutions and ii) leverage internal (such as the WASH Committee leveraging District Development Authority funds) and external financing and technical resources (including the Ranger program). Long term support will likely be required.

At the Ward level, innovations include the WASH Committees and the soon to be formulated Ward Development Plans. Where they exist, the Wards’ WASH Committees seem to meet when the implementing partner visits. Ongoing mentoring support will be likely be required. The Committees are more likely to be sustained once there are financial and reputational incentives for, and skills to support, ongoing Committee meetings. These incentives and skills will be more firmly established once i) the District WASH Plan and Ward Development Plans are financed and ii) there is sufficient engagement between different governance institutions. Other promising indications of sustainability in WASH include the updating of the Western Province Health Authority Organisational chart and the utilisation of the WASH survey, by District authorities, to secure funding for urban WASH improvements.

In many communities this will be the first time that Ward Development Plans have been formulated. The formulation of the Plans, provide opportunity to leverage DPLGA processes and experience. It will also be useful to formulate Plans to allow for continued momentum, and quick visible results. The upcoming election may provide opportunity to facilitate, with Wards and District, an induction program for elected officials to promote the sustainability of new practices in governance.

At the District level, there will be value in carefully considering implementation and financial capacity in formulating the Food Security Plans and Water Security Plans. Overly ambitious Plans could be beyond the means of the district to fund, and other stakeholders to implement. The Water Security Plan provides opportunity to utilise the results of the hydrogeological survey for sustainable improvements in access to water.

The SFRP considers DAL and NFA as partners critical to implementation, and therefore the sustainability of new practices. However, these institutions do not seem to have a widespread footprint in the District; which hampers the delivery of associated SFRP outputs and the sustainability of new practices.

Outside of villages adjacent to Daru and the border areas, substantial challenges to transformational change in sustainable livelihoods arise from the cost and time associated with the transportation of goods. This is one of many challenges to facilitating the introduction of new livelihoods activities. There may be no quick fixes to this challenge, and sustainable solutions in the medium term may rely solely on bolstering the competitiveness, inclusivity and sustainability of existing livelihood activities.

Several of the new economic activities envisioned to be introduced under the SFRP, come with substantial risks to environmental and commercial sustainability. Where new livelihood activities are to be introduced, carefully brokered partnerships with the private sector, perhaps from outside the SFD, may provide avenues to sustainability. However, trust can be built and value delivered more quickly, through facilitating improvements in the commercial and environmental sustainability of existing economic activities.

The Ranger program is unlikely to be sustained under its current model in the long term, without donor support. Rangers allow for food and water security to be monitored, and could provide seed resourcing to the delivery of the District’s plans while the District enhances its ability to formulate and implement policy. However expectations should be balanced against the capability of the Rangers. Further, there is the risk of the Rangers operating in parallel structures at the Ward level, and there will be value in increasingly aligning the work of the Rangers to the activities contained in the Ward Development Plans, the Food and Water Security Plans and the District WASH Plan.

# Gender

## 6.1 Overview

Australia’s GEWESestablishes three priorities: i) enhancing women’s voice in decision-making, leadership and peace building ii) promoting women’s economic empowerment and iii) ending violence against women and girls. In the SFD, gender inequality is glaring. For example, World Vision’s research found that women only make up 17 % of decision makers in South Fly and anecdotal evidence suggests that the incidence of gender-based violence is very high.

## 6.2 Progression against gender to date, forming stronger linkages, leveraging opportunities and unintended consequences

Progress is being made, but this is very uneven across the three pillars. Given the donor landscape in the SFD and gender equality and social inclusion outcomes, more can be done across the three pillars of the GEWES.

**Recommendation 6:** Increase emphasis on facilitating gender equalitythrough enhancing i) women’s access to training opportunities and decision-making forums, ii) increasing consultation with women’s groups to determine acceptable economic enhancement activities and iii) strengthen women’s access to family sexual violence services and referral pathways.

Women in leadership

We found that gender norms regarding women in leadership are being challenged. There are promising examples of women in leadership being progressed through the equal representation of men and women in the 13 WASH committees. There are early signs of this influencing the composition of other local Committees. Further, the engagement of female Rangers is building skills and leadership experience among women. As the Ward Development Plans provide a critical entry point for modelling equity, support should be provided so that women as well as men participate.

More can be done in women’s access to training and consultation, such as those relating to the Ward Profiles and Plans. Implementing partners could also make more use of the Councils of Women, which operate at the level of Local Level Government. Given the role of women in food and water security in households, the formulation of the Food and Water Security Plans should provide opportunities for promoting women’s leadership during consultations, or regarding baselines for livelihoods.

Women and economic empowerment

There has been limited progress towards facilitating gender inclusive economic empowerment. Partly this is because activities in FLAG are behind schedule.

At output level the business literacy skills training was delivered to 20 men and 20 women from 11 wards. At intermediate outcome level, there is no evidence to show how the learnings have been applied by participants.

There is the chance that new economic activities, hamper progress in women’s economic empowerment. For example, men may be more able to access the new economic activities, while women focus on household chores and subsistence farming. Or there might be unintended consequences for the women who do participate, as access to income can be a trigger for gender-based violence. For each of the food and livelihoods activities being progressed, employing a gender risk assessment tool could help with managing unintended consequences. In any case, women’s participation in economic activities should inform how the SFRP engages with communities and how these activities are facilitated.

Women stated that they mainly participate in economic activities for survival, while men engage in higher value crops, fishing and livestock. Women from inland communities reported that they could farm cocoa, but noted that men control the income from cash crops. Women prefer to grow vegetables such as cabbages, corn, capsicum, onions for consumption or to sell. Women are also engaged in handicrafts (brooms, mats, baskets), which they sell to coastal communities.

Women in coastal communities mentioned that fishing and mud-crab projects were feasible, but they would need further assistance to engage in commercial scale production. It was reported that this should include business and financial literacy training, and training on handling live products correctly, storage, transport and market access. None of the women consulted were running a small or medium sized enterprise. Women are concerned about long supply chains. Many women highlighted a need for long term mentoring and coaching in business, and in transitioning from the informal to the formal sector.

Gender based violence

We were informed by staff of the Family Support Centre, at Daru Hospital, that rates of intimate partner violence are very high in Western Province. Despite this, we saw no evidence of the SFRP preventing gender-based violence and supporting survivors of violence at the community level. There is a need to work collaboratively with Australia’s Justice Services and Stability for Development Program. There is no institutionalised data base on gender-based violence, a gap in itself which poses risks for survivors.

Violence seems to be an impediment for women and girls’ economic empowerment and women in leadership in the SFD. Where the SFRP progresses economic activities, in-built protective elements to prevent gender-based violence or support survivors of violence are required. This was requested by women in certain communities. Shortages of food and water weakens livelihoods and can force people to adopt new survival skills. As this responsibility falls on women, new strategies may be harmful to them.

The SFRP can support partners to strengthen service provision for survivors of violence. The referral pathway is incomplete as there are no community run safe houses. The referral pathway could be strengthened by the SFRP by working through established institutions, alongside other interventions. One implementing partner has historically been part of the referral pathway. Both INLOC and World Vision apply a ‘zero tolerance’ approach to violence and discipline any staff who perpetrates violence, and provide support for staff who experience violence.

Australia provides training to Family and Sexual Violence Action Committees, through the Justice Services and Stability for Development Program. Mentoring and coordination support is also provided to these Committees, including strengthening linkages to other areas of the referral pathway. Church partners (Caritas, United Church, ADRA) are working in partnership with UN Women on capacity building on the Referral pathway. This provides opportunities for partnership with SFRP implementing partners. These partners are applying the Theology of Gender Equality in their gender equality and social inclusion work. An international non-governmental organisation, FHI360, is also supporting the Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee with training on the referral pathway and data collection.

## 6.3 Has sufficient effort/resourcing been made?

While there has been some progress across two of the pillars of the GEWES, the SFRP has no outcomes related solely to women or people with disability. Only one intermediate outcome relates to men and women (Intermediate Outcome 2.3: Access to local buyers)**.** Women are however included in five (of 11) output indicators in FLAG. The MEF for WASH is almost silent on gender; this only assumes that women and vulnerable groups are accurately targeted. These shortcomings in the formulation of the SFRP and the MEF should be addressed, and more effort be directed towards collecting gender and disability disaggregated data. More attention can also be given to conducting gender analyses, which can inform current and future programming. This analysis can also inform the redesign of the MEF.

Where partner organisations are unable to support gender-based violence programmatically, the trainings on DFAT’s Child Protection Policy and Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Harassment should be delivered. While this is included one of the component’s risk registries, Rangers stated that they have not been made aware of these policies.

The needs of people with disability have not been addressed sufficiently to date, across components. Women with disability are further disadvantaged in communities, if their needs are not assessed, addressed or met. In communities visited, people with hearing and vision impairments, and physical and unseen disabilities, made their way to meetings and did not participate. While we engaged with men and women separately, on reflection a more inclusive approach would have yielded further insight. It will be useful for the Rangers to conduct a stocktake of the incidence of disability, to support future programming.

**Recommendation 7:** Resource a gender equality and social inclusion function within the SFRP, and conduct a gender analysis and a disability analysis to inform current and future programming in Western Province.

A gender specialist can lead a gender analysis of the South Fly District. This can inform current and future programming, including the Western Province Partnership. DFAT applies a twin-track approach to achieve gender equality. The first track requires action to address gender inequalities where they are particularly challenging or where progress is slow. The second track requires integrating gender equality across all areas and sectors. This approach establishes a target that at least 80 per cent of investments, regardless of their objectives, will effectively address gender issues in implementation.

# 7. Concluding remarks

Stakeholders welcomed the independent review, and there is intent to learn. Emerging lessons are relevant to i) programming in rural communities in Papua New Guinea, ii) responding to crises and iii) aid delivery models.

The SFRP is ambitious in its intent to improve food and water security in such a short period of time. Meanwhile the South Fly District is an expensive and risky place to implement a development program. Despite this, the SFRP is making progress towards increasing food and water security. The recommendations, presented hereunder, aim to further the achievement of the SFRP’s objectives.

## 7.1 Consolidated recommendations

1. Implementing partners and DFAT should consider how best to improve engagement with, and reporting to, District authorities and communities, while furthering the practice of adaptive management for gains in efficiency and effectiveness.
2. Should the ambitions of the plan remain, an increase in resourcing is justified. This should be directed, largely, to i) the implementation of activities in food, livelihoods and governance, ii) the Australia Papua New Guinea sub–National Program’s administration and engagement function in Daru iii) a bolstered monitoring and quality assurance function and iv) activities to contribute to or progress gender equality.
3. The Rangers should be more actively engaged in agricultural extension services and water, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure delivery, in the short term. Value will also be found in INLOC recruiting Papua New Guinean male and female advisers.
4. Continue to strengthen existing coordination mechanisms. Meanwhile, facilitate, with District authorities, the establishment of a partner coordination platform, meeting at least biannually, comprising, among others, of the Sustainable Development Program, Ok Tedi Development Foundation, faith groups and implementers of Australian funded development initiatives.
5. Identify pathways to sustainability for identified outputs, that leverages and improves the position and capabilities of different levels of Government, the private sector and civil society.
6. Increase emphasis on facilitating gender equalitythrough enhancing i) women’s access to training opportunities and decision-making forums, ii) increasing consultation with women’s groups to determine acceptable economic enhancement activities and iii) strengthen women’s access to family sexual violence services and referral pathways.
7. Resource a gender equality and social inclusion function within the SFRP, and conduct a gender analysis and a disability analysis to inform current and future programming in Western Province.

# Annex 1: Review of the South Fly Resilience Plan – Terms of Reference

Introduction

The governments of Papua New Guinea (PNG) and Australia are progressing a new Comprehensive Strategic and Economic Partnership (CSEP) to shape the future bilateral relationship. The Australian government is seeking to deepen its engagement in key regions of the country through the lens of ‘place’ rather than sector-based approach. The development of the CSEP provides an opportunity to deepen engagement and coordination in mutually agreed priority regions and economic corridors. The idea of economic corridors was first described in the PNG’s Government’s Strategic Development Plan 2010-2030, reaffirmed in its Mid-Term Development Plan III (2018-2022), and then recently captured in Prime Minister Marape’s 2019 Manifesto.

PNG’s COVID-19 response has focused strongly on its international border control, including within Western Province. This has highlighted the importance of this region, particularly the South Fly District and its border with Indonesia and Australia’s Torres Strait. The Australian Government’s new Partnerships for Recovery: Development Strategy for COVID-19 brings a whole-of-government approach to health security, stability and economic recovery. It provides a strong policy platform to reshape Australia’s approach and engagement in Western Province. The South Fly Resilience Plan (SFRP) is a key component of Australia’s investment in the region and presents opportunities for learning to inform the design of the Western Province place-based approach, linked in with the broader Sub-national Program design.

The South Fly Resilience Program (SFRP) was developed to meet the challenges of COVID-19 and set out a program of work from January 2021 to June 2024 focusing on support to three strategic components including:

Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH),

food security and livelihoods and

a transport fuel voucher system to access essential services.

DFAT have contracted Abt Associates through the PNG-Australia Governance Partnership (PAGP) to manage the implementation of the SFRP. Implementation is executed under a contractual arrangement with implementing partners including World Vision International (components 1 and 3), the Reef and Rainforest Research Centre (RRRC), its sub-contractor Inloc International (component 2), and strategic partnerships with other relevant DFAT investments such as the new PNG-Australia transition to Health Program (component 3).

The expected outcomes of the SFRP are as follows:

* Strengthened resilience to water-related disasters in the South Fly District
* Targeted communities in South Fly have sustainable livelihoods and improved income
* Improved access to essential services for emergency patients, mothers and babies.

Context of Work

The strategic design framework of the PNG Subnational Design is expected to start in January 2022 and end in March 2026 (with option to extend). A more strongly place-based approach has been accepted as the feature of the Australian support in PNG for the medium term. An enabling facility will allow DFAT to implement place-based programs including existing Bougainville Partnership and Kokoda Initiative Partnership, and for Western Province program. To build on learnings of existing programming, the Australian High Commission has outlined a review of the South Fly Resilience Plan to inform the design of the future Western Province program.

Scope of Work and Deliverables

In October 2021, QTAG delivered an Analytical Review Paper on opportunities and threats to continued development efforts in Western Province. This will form key grounding to the following stages of the review process.

An independent review of the SFRP will be conducted to gather learnings around activities and outputs after 18 months of implementation. The review will focus on examining whether the underpinning assumptions are holding within the SFRP design in order to inform the Western Province design. The review will be based on the principles of efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, sustainability and gender equality. Guiding evaluation questions have been devised to delineate what is in scope for this review and are presented in this ToR. This review will look to build a strong basis for the mid-term evaluation in 2024, whilst taking into consideration the relatively early stage of implementation.

Timeline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase** | **Tasks** | **Indicative dates** |
| **Phase 0**  | Identification and confirmation of team, including deeper understanding of role to be played by successful managing contractor in the design process.  | March 2022  |
| **Phase 1**  | Initial document review, preliminary (online) discussions with review team, AHC. Planning for fieldwork, identification of key stakeholders  | Late March / early April 2022  |
| **Phase 2** | Fieldwork to Port Moresby and Western Province to conduct key stakeholder consultations  | Late April 2022 |
| **Phase 3**  | Analysis of information, further remote consultations (if required) and drafting process  | May 2022 |
| **Phase 4** | Delivery of first draft to the AHC for feedback and revision  | Late May / early June 2022  |
| **Phase 6** | Delivery of final draft to the AHC | June 2022  |

Specified Skills and Experience of Team

The team should collectively possess the following skills and experience:

* Demonstrated ability to draw on international best practice in accountability and governance programming to inform the design.
* Excellent communication skills, particularly in a cross-cultural setting, and the ability to clearly explain design and monitoring and evaluation principles.
* A sound knowledge of Australian Aid Program policies on design, M&E and reporting processes for aid delivery.
* Technical expertise in governance, economic development and related fields
* Familiarity with cross cutting issues such as gender equality, climate change and disability inclusion.
* A good understanding of PNG’s social and political context.

A team will be made up of:

* An international-based team leader with extensive experience in design and M&E processes.
* A PNG based deputy team leader with experience in managing complex consultative processes in PNG and preferably with the Australia Aid program in PNG.
* An individual identified by AHC as key Western Province Coordinator – either from AHC or from affiliated implementing partner

Other team members will include a panel of experts will be available for the team to draw on. Usage of these resources will be at the discretion of the team leader. This will include:

* An international M&E and accountability specialist who will act as Quality Assurance
* QTAG Program Manager & Program Assistant, who will help facilitate in management of the team

The team will work collaboratively with the identified managing contractor who will implement the Western Province design. The managing contractor is planned to be announced in December 2021, with intended commencement date of March 2022.

Implication of Contextual Risks

#### COVID 19

At the time of writing, quarantine restrictions have been lifted for international vaccinated travellers however case numbers are rising. Safety and security of QTAG team members both international and based in PNG are of highest priority and as such this piece of work will remain flexibly as to whether it is done remotely or with in-country travel. Those who are present in PNG (team members, AHC and partners) are currently able meet face-to-face however health and safety protocols will be developed and adhered to with updates with any changes to the context. All international team members will be required to be double vaccinated (if not triple dependent on their personal health advice) to consult with partners as part of this design process. All PNG team members will be strongly encouraged to be double vaccinated, and if they are unvaccinated they will be unable to visit certain parts of Western Province (in particular the Treaty Villages) in order to minimise COVID-19 risk to vulnerable communities.

#### PNG Election and Potential Unrest

The PNG national elections are arranged to be held in June 2022 and comes with a higher likelihood of violence and COVID-19 transmission. This is likely to have impact on access to some partners in Western Province, hence the planned commencement of consultation work to take place in April 2022.

Evaluation Foci & Questions

Noting the relatively short implementation period, the review team will focus on five key areas for analysis:

* Effectiveness: what evidence can be provided at this stage of implementation as an update on achievements against component intermediate outcomes?
	+ Sections 2.2 and 2.3
* Efficiency: in what ways were activities and outputs, in relation to the inputs delivered in a cost-efficient way?
	+ Sections 3.2 and 3.3
* Coherence: in what ways is the implementation of the SFRP coherent with Australia’s priorities in South Fly?
	+ Section 4.1
* Sustainability: what areas of the program are more likely to be sustainable in the longer term?
	+ Section 5.1
* Gender Equality: to what extent has gender equality and the three components of the gender strategy been progressed to date?
	+ Section 6.2

Effectiveness:

* In what ways are activities and outputs being delivered in a manner that is sensitive to gender and the socio-cultural local context?
	+ Section 2.4
* To what extent are the intermediate outcomes likely to be achieved in the medium to long term and what are the major factors influencing this?
	+ Sections 2.2 and 2.3

Efficiency

* Are the resources allocated to the administration and implementation of the plan appropriate to achieve the program’s outcomes? What lessons can be learned regarding financial sustainability moving forward?
	+ Sections 3.1 and 5.1
* Are the modalities used to deliver the activities appropriate (given consideration of the complex operating environment)? Are there other options where efficiencies could be gained?
	+ Sections 3.2 and 3.3

Coherence

* Are there synergies and interlinkages between the program and other parts of Australia’s development program and bilateral partnership operating in Western Province? How well have these opportunities been capitalised on?
	+ Section 4.2
* How effectively has the program complemented, harmonised and coordinated with key actors and interventions in Western Province?
	+ Section 4.3

Sustainability

* To what extent has the program contributed to more resilient communities?
	+ Section 5.1
* How well is the program strengthening local institutions, both formal and informal?
	+ Chapter 2 and Section 5.1
* To what extent are informal and formal institutions likely to be able to maintain all components[[14]](#footnote-15) without support?
	+ Section 5.1

Gender Equality

* What gender equality outcomes have been progressed to date in line with the three components of the gender strategy, and has this met stakeholder expectations?
	+ Section 6.2
* Have opportunities been identified to form stronger linkages, leverage opportunities, or establish meaningful reforms in relation to women’s economic empowerment?
	+ Section 6.2
* Have there been any intended and unintended consequences (good and bad) with regards to gender equality?
	+ Section 6.2
* Has sufficient effort/resourcing has been made (was it sufficiently prioritised, and if not, why not)?
	+ Section 6.3

# Annex 2: SFRP’s results framework



# Annex 3: Stakeholders consulted[[15]](#footnote-16)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation** | **Numbers involved**  |
| Pre departure briefing (DFAT) | 2 |
| Australian High Commission, Sub National Team | 4 |
| Australian High Commission, Counsel General, Governance | 1 |
| Australian High Commission, Infrastructure Team | 2 |
| Australian High Commission, Health Team | 1 |
| Australian High Commission, Law and Justice Team | 2 |
| World Vision, Port Moresby | 2 |
| Abt Associates, Australia Papua New Guinea Subnational Program | 4 |
| Trans World Logistics & Inchcape | 3 |
| Reef and Rainforest Research Centre | 3 |
| Fly River Provincial Administrator | 1 |
| SFD Administrator and Officers | 5 |
| SFD WASH Committee | 6 |
| SFD LLG Presidents and Managers | 8 |
| INLOC Advisers | 4 |
| World Vision (SFD) | 1 |
| INLOC Rangers | 8 |
| Kibuli village | Circa 80 |
| Mabuduwan village | Circa 50 |
| Buzi village  | Circa 50 |
| Sigabuduri village | Circa 100 |
| Old Mawatta village | Circa 30 |
| Parama village | Circa 60 |
| Katatai village | Circa 40 |
| Aide Memoire presentation | Circa 20 |
| AST Oceanics | 1 |
| Department of Provincial and Local Level Government Affairs | 1 |
| Family Support Centre-Daru Hospital  | 1 |
| Justice Services and Stability for Development –Daru  | 1 by phone  |
| Save the Children  | 1 |
| Caritas Australia  | 1 by phone  |

1. Census, 2011, online, available at: <https://png-data.sprep.org/dataset/2011-census-report> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The New Way Forward, Western Province Development Plan 2018-2022, Office of the Governor, Western Province, Papua New Guinea [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Analytical Review Paper on Western Province Papua New Guinea, October 2021 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Busilacchi, S., J. Butler, I. Van Putten, Y. Maru and J. Posu, 2018, Asymmetrical development across transboundary regions: The case of the Torres Strait Treaty Region, online, available at: <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/10/11/4200/pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Analytical Review Paper on Western Province Papua New Guinea, October 2021 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The World Bank, Papua New Guinea High Frequency Survey on COVID 19, online, available at: <https://www.unicef.org/png/media/2061/file/WB-UNICEF-PNG-HFPS.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Butler, J.R.A., Busilacchi, S., Bohensky, E.L. and Exon, D. 2019. Building Resilience in Treaty Villages, South Fly District, Papua New Guinea: Program Evaluation. Report to the Reef and Rainforest Research Centre, Cairns. 49 pp. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Our assessment of how activities and outputs and outputs are being delivered in ways sensitive to the positions, needs and expectations of men and women is included in Section 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. DFAT (2020) Partnerships for Recovery: Australia’s COVID-19 Development Response, online, available at: <https://www.dfat.gov.au/development/australias-development-program/partnerships-recovery-australias-covid-19-development-response> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. DFAT (2020) Papua New Guinea COVID 19 Development Response Plan, online, available at: <https://www.dfat.gov.au/development/australias-development-program/covid-19-development-response-plans/papua-new-guinea-covid-19-development-response-plan> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. DFAT (2020) Comprehensive Strategic and Economic Partnership, online, available at: <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/papua-new-guinea-australia-comprehensive-strategic-and-economic-partnership-signed.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. DFAT (2016) Gender and Women’s Empowerment Strategy, online, available at: <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment-strategy.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. This is further elaborated in Sections 2 and 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Gender Equality and women’s economic empowerment strategy (2016) [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. In chronological order. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)