



**SUPPORT TO GOVERNMENT'S CAPACITY FOR ENGAGEMENT IN PEACEBUILDING
ISSUES
FINAL PROGRAMME¹ NARRATIVE REPORT**

Programme Title & Project Number
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme Title: Support to Government's Capacity for Engagement in Peacebuilding Issues • Programme Number (if applicable): N/A • MPTF Office Project Reference Number: 00066694

Country, Locality(s), Thematic Area(s)²
<i>(if applicable)</i> Country/Region: Sierra Leone
Thematic/Priority: Public Administration

Participating Organization(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP

Implementing Partners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, PBF Secretariat • UN-PBF Coordination and Support Office

Programme/Project Cost (US\$)
MPTF/JP Fund Contribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 348,125 USD
Agency Contribution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • by Agency <i>(if applicable)</i>
Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i>
Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i>
TOTAL: 348,125 USD

Programme Duration (months)
Overall Duration 20 months
Start Date ³ 31.07.2008
End Date (or Revised End Date) ⁴ 31.12.2010
Operational Closure Date ⁵ TBD ⁶
Expected Financial Closure Date TBD

Final Programme/ Project Evaluation
Evaluation Completed

Submitted By
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Name: Mohamed Abchir ○ Title: Deputy Country Director, Programmes

¹ The term "programme" is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

² Priority Area for the Peacebuilding Fund; Sector for the UNDG ITF.

³ The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#).

⁴ As per approval by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

⁵ All activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF programme have been completed. Agencies to advise the MPTF Office.

⁶ As at October 2012, there remains no Ministry or PBF Secretariat staff available to oversee operational closure. The two PBF Secretariat Officer contracts ended prior to the PBF extension and the Officer assigned from MOFED left the Ministry. In addition, the Development Secretary and Deputy Minister are also no longer with MOFED.

Yes No Date: _____

Evaluation Report - Attached

Yes No

Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP
 Contact information:
mohamed.abchir@undp.org

FINAL PROGRAMME REPORT

I. PURPOSE

The Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MOFED) is the Government institution responsible to oversee Peace building Fund (PBF) projects in Sierra Leone. The PBF calls for national ownership with Government in the lead to initiate and oversee the envisaged peace building interventions. The main goal of the project is therefore to support Government's capacity for the monitoring and coordination of the PBF.

Immediate Objectives:

- i. Contribute to increased Government leadership/ownership of the PBF process;
- ii. Contribute to increased capacity for Government oversight of the Peace building programmes;
- iii. Contribute to improved public awareness and engagement on the PBF and its activities.

Outputs and Key Activities:

- i. A four person PBF Secretariat/Unit set up within the Ministry of Finance and Development;
- ii. Secretariat staff provided with capacity building training in peace building PME related activities;
- iii. A mechanism for effective coordination on implementation strengthened;
- iv. Collaborate with the UN-PBF Coordination and Support Office in rolling-out its public awareness raising output of its communication strategy through public engagement in various forms;
- v. Collaborate with the UN-PBF Coordination and Support Office in reporting on impact of PBF activities.

This project contributes to PBF Priority 4, rebuilding essential government capacity, and Outcome 13, support to technical capacity building. The PBF procedure dictates that Government should own and lead the implementation of PBF interventions, however, the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL) did not have the capacity to do so. The project therefore sought to provide that much needed capacity. Its key mandate was to ensure that national peace building priorities, the PBF Plan, and project objectives, outputs, and activities were strongly linked.

II. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMME/ PROJECT RESULTS

The PBF Secretariat was established in MOFED with support from the project and its capacity to plan, monitor and evaluate peace building programmes was increased throughout the project's duration. Staff was brought on board through recruitment and reassignment in order to ensure the full functionality of the Secretariat and internet connectivity was provided to the Secretariat in order for the staff to disseminate information to the public on the progress made and contributions of PBF projects toward the overall goals of peace consolidation and stability in Sierra Leone. Required operating equipment such as two vehicles, IT facilities including computers and stationary was

procured and delivered to the Secretariat. With the Secretariat fully staffed and capacitated with the necessary equipment and vehicles, it was enabled to monitor project activities and approve and provide direction on proposals and ongoing peace building efforts.

Government's capacity to lead the PBF process was significantly increased through support from the project. Meetings were held with different Project Managers to review progress and address bottlenecks in the implementation of various PBF projects. The PBF Secretariat in concert with the PBF Coordination and Support Office undertook four monitoring trips and three advocacy drives over the course of the project nationwide to determine progress achieved and identify and discuss key challenges and issues that affected progress. The regular monitoring as well as joint monitoring exercise was valuable in providing feedback to the Secretariat on the status of ongoing PBF projects in the country and supporting more the timely, effective and efficient implementation of the projects in terms of reporting and financial deadlines.

For instance, a joint project monitoring and field steering committee meeting with the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and other partners including prisons officials, local government actors and contractors to determine progress achieved on the spot, identify and key issues affecting progress in PBF support to prisons. This monitoring exercise offered opportunities for the team to assess the progress made with a focus on the overall quality of work and what specific errors needed to be corrected. This high-level meeting, which included the IOM Chief of Mission, resulted in the development of suitable recommendations that were subsequently incorporated into implementation. Importantly, these regular feedback mechanisms meant that constraints in project implementation were quickly addressed and timely adjustments were made to project operations, resting in the improved awareness of government counterparts on the PBF processes.

The Secretariat also convened PBF Project Board Committee meetings and Steering Committee meetings throughout the project period to discuss implementation issues and recommend extensions with key stakeholders including project beneficiary institutions and recipient organisations, thereby mapping a way forward for various interventions.

The Secretariat undertook four regional sensitisation workshops and radio discussion programmes to heighten awareness on the PBF process and its implementation status over the project period. These awareness raising activities successfully increased the level of public understanding and engagement on the PBF process. Feedback mechanisms were also introduced and the general public and other stakeholders utilized these have helped to provide comments and suggestions in terms of the future programming and implementation of the PBF.

In addition, a documentary and newsletter was produced by the Secretariat which showcased details of the projects funded by the PBF across the country and the achievements made so far in their implementation. This visual presentation of evidence of results attained since the outset of the PBF process in Sierra Leone was important for enhancing stakeholder engagement and support of the PBF support, and also provided further opportunity for stakeholders to provide critical feedback. Finally, the PBF Secretariat, in concert with the PBF Coordination and Support Office, undertook a stakeholder briefing and discussion on the PBF and Sierra Leone being awarded the African Peace Award in Durban, South Africa, in 2010.

In late 2010, the PBF Secretariat became non-operational and a decision still needs to be made by the Steering Committee members as to whether or not the Secretariat will be supported in future. Operational closure of the project has therefore not taken place due to the fact that no MOFED or PBF Secretariat staff remains available to help facilitate the closure process. The two PBF Secretariat Officer contracts ended prior to the PBF project extension and the Officer assigned from MOFED left the Ministry. In addition, the Development Secretary and Deputy Minister are also no longer with MOFED.

III. EVALUATION & LESSONS LEARNED

A Mid-Term Evaluation of the PBF supported projects in Sierra Leone was undertaken in 2009 and the Mid-Term Evaluation Report was finalised in June. The following lessons were learned through the conduct of the Mid-Term Evaluation and over the duration of the project:

- Greater sensitisation of recipient institutions on the roles and responsibilities of the PBF Secretariat would have ensured that Government counterparts recognised and accepted the Secretariat as part of the overall PBF architecture earlier on. Most of the recipient institutions were frustrated with the complex procedures and mechanisms involved in the PBF process and considered the Secretariat as an additional layer of bureaucracy due to lack of sensitisation.
- Managing expectations around top up salaries to maintain a balance between existing staff and reassigned staff was difficult but was adequately managed through the management techniques of MOFED. This was achieved through a series of motivation meetings held with staff on the need for top up salaries as related to expected performance.
- A lack of financial support from the GoSL for this intervention was a key challenge to its sustainability. There was a heavy reliance on the PBF for future funding for the project with no guarantee of support on the part of the Government. MOFED attempted to work with stakeholders to obtain continued support for the Secretariat, however, these partnership building efforts did not produce the desired results. In late 2010, the Secretariat became non-operational.

IV. INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baselines	Planned Indicator Targets	Achieved Indicator Targets	Reasons for Variance (if any)	Source of Verification	Comments (if any)
Outcome 1 Contribute to increased Government leadership/ownership of the PBF process							
Output 1.1 A four person PBF Secretariat/Unit set up within the Ministry of Finance and Development	Indicator 1.1.1 Staff recruited to support the work of the Secretariat within MOFED	No Secretariat staff	Staff recruited	Yes		Report on the interview process and signed contracts	
	Indicator 1.1.2 Secretariat fully equipped as provided for in the budget	Secretariat not equipped	Vehicles, IT equipment and internet facilities procured	Yes		Quarterly reports and delivery note	
Outcome 2 Contribute to increased capacity for Government oversight of the Peace building programmes							
Output 2.1 Secretariat staff provided with capacity building training in peace building PME related activities	Indicator 2.1.1 Two staff provided with capacity building training in PCM, tools for monitoring qualitative change, Monitoring and Evaluation of peace building activities and strategic planning	Staff capacity not built and no training received	Capacity of two staff built	Partially; PBF Secretariat Project Manager undertook course on Project Management at the Sierra Leone Institute of Public Administration		Quarterly reports	
Output 2.2 A mechanism for	Indicator 2.2.1 Secretariat with well	No coordination	Coordination mechanism	Yes		PBF Project Board	

effective coordination on implementation strengthened	established coordination mechanism between the PBF, Government and other stakeholders	mechanism in place	established including Steering Committee and PBF Project Board Committee			Committee meeting and Steering Committee meeting minutes	
Outcome 3 Contribute to improved public awareness and engagement on the PBF and its activities							
Output 3.1 Collaborate with the UN-PBF Coordination and Support Office in reporting on impact of PBF activities	Indicator 3.1.1 Awareness raising workshops and sensitisation programmes jointly organised with the UN-PBF Coordination and Support Office	Low public awareness and understanding of PBF support and processes	2 awareness raising workshops and 4 radio/TV sensitisation programs jointly organised	Yes		Radio air time receipts, workshop reports, documentary, newsletter	