



**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)
ANNUAL PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT
COUNTRY: SIERRA LEONE
REPORTING PERIOD: 1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2017**

Programme Title & Project Number
<p>Programme Title: Conflict Prevention and Mitigation during the Electoral Cycle in Sierra Leone.</p> <p>Programme Number <i>(if applicable)</i></p> <p>MPTF Office Project Reference Number:¹ 00105794</p>

Recipient UN Organizations
<p>List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme:</p> <p>United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)</p>

Implementing Partners
<p>List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations:</p> <p>Ministry of Internal Affairs; National Commission for Democracy; Political Parties Registration Commission; Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone; Sierra Leone Police; Office of National Security; Judiciary; Legal Aid Board; Civil Society Organizations.</p>

Programme/Project Budget (US\$)
<p>PBF contribution (by RUNO) \$ 2,999,798</p>
<p>Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i></p>
<p>Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i> \$ 1,872,675 - UKAid</p>
<p>TOTAL: \$ 4,637,073</p>

Programme Duration
<p>Overall Duration <i>(months)</i> 18</p>
<p>Start Date² <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 06.06.2017</p>
<p>Original End Date³ <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 30 09.2018</p>
<p>Current End date⁴<i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 30 09.2018</p>

¹ The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to "Project ID" on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

² The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

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

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

Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.

Assessment/Review - if applicable *please attach*

Yes No Date:

Mid-Term Evaluation Report – *if applicable please attach*

Yes No Date:

Report Submitted By

Name: Joseah Mutai

Title: Monitoring and Reporting Officer

Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP

Email address: joseah.mutai@undp.org

PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1 Assessment of the current project implementation status and results

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

<i>Priority Plan Outcome to which the project is contributing.</i>
<i>Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project is contributing.</i>

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

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

Outcome Statement 1: National dialogue, peace advocacy and violence prevention enhanced.

Rate the current status of the outcome:

<p>Indicator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of reported and resolved election related incidents of violence (disaggregated by age, gender, location, type of violence) <p>Indicator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of people that express confidence in safety and security measures to enable them to participate in the electoral processes (disaggregated by age, gender and location) <p>Indicator 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of influence by media campaigns towards inclusion of marginalised and excluded persons (Women and PWD) 	<p>Baseline: 18 cases reported and resolved in 2012 by SLP (do not represent all actual cases)</p> <p>Target: At least 90% of all reported electoral-related incidents of violence are resolved in accordance with agreed SOPs</p> <p>Progress: On track</p> <p>Baseline: 83% of respondent confirmed that political competition did not lead to violence in communities in the 2012 election (KAP Baseline Survey, IGR, April 2017)</p> <p>Target: 25 % (midline target by December 2017); 30% (end-line target by May 2018).</p> <p>Progress: on track</p> <p>Baseline: No activity and/or assessment in 2012 (no baseline).</p> <p>Target: Respondents report greater understanding of the concerns of women and PWD and show greater willingness to vote for them.</p> <p>Progress: on track</p>
---	--

Output progress

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

- Supported Political Parties Registration Commission (PPRC) to review and validate Code of Conducts for Political Parties, All Political Parties Youth Association, and All Political Parties Women Association;
- Supported National Commission for Democracy (NCD) to launch non-violence campaign messages through radio, television and local platform meetings. Furthermore, a citizens' forum for sensitisation was established, while media houses committed to adhere to human rights centred reporting and prohibit use of hate speech;
- Supported Human Rights Commission (HRC) to engage with the media on responsible reporting and other key stakeholders on human rights and elections, and adopted a communique on human rights and elections;
- Supported Legal Aid Board (LAB) to build capacity of community advisory bureau members on handling electoral offences and referring cases to respective offices;
- Supported Judiciary to develop process flows and training manuals that will be used to train ten (10) High Court Judges appointed by the Chief justice to fast track electoral offenses in courts. Furthermore, the project supported publication of compendium of electoral legislation to ensure ease reference to relevant laws.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000-character limit)?

To prevent electoral related violence, the project supported Political Parties Registration Commission (PPRC) to review and validate Code of Conducts for Political Parties, All Political Parties Youth Association (APPYA) and All Political Parties Women Association (APPWA). The Code of Conducts will enable Political Parties, women and youths to commit to peaceful resolution of conflicts in the electoral cycle.

To promote and advocate for peace during electoral process, the project supported the National Commission for Democracy (NCD) to develop non-violence messages on peaceful elections. So far 96 jingles messages have aired and 18 open public sensitization on non-violence campaigns conducted in 18 constituencies as a means of sensitizing political parties and the electorate on non-use of violence during the electoral process. The project further supported the NCD to form and launch biweekly citizens forum for engaging national stakeholder groups and public mobilization and sensitisation for free elections. As of mid-November 2017, a total of four (4) biweekly forums had been conducted. The project further supported the Human Rights Commission (HRC-SL) develop and disseminate non-violence messages on human rights through radio and television. At a roundtable organized by the HRC-SL and hosted by the Sierra Leone Association of Journalists, a total of forty-four media houses committed to adhere to responsible and human rights centred reporting and avoid covering hate speech during campaigns.

To enhance access to justice for right holders including women and vulnerable groups, the project supported appointment of ten High Court Judges (8 men and 2 women) by the Chief Justice to lead the special electoral courts and ensure speedy adjudication and resolving of election related incidences of violence. The project also supported the Judiciary initiate mapping of legal process flow and develop a training module to be used to fast-track training of Judges and core support staff on handling of electoral related offences including GBV cases. The module will be concluded by 30 November

2017. Further support was provided to the judiciary through a compilation of a compendium of electoral legislations to ensure quick access for reference materials in support of the speedy adjudication of electoral cases.

A human-rights based approach has been applied in developing these activities, and human rights considerations have been integrated to the extent possible.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

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

Outcome Statement 2: Public security, civil protection, human rights promotion and peaceful response capacities sustained.

Rate the current status of the outcome:

<p>Indicator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of reported complaints of police response to election-related incidents with excessive use of force <p>Indicator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of members of public that express confidence with response of the police & other security personnel in addressing Human Rights violations and election-related offences including gender-based violence (disaggregated by age, gender and location) <p>Indicator 3:</p> <p>An effective and coordinated early-warning system is in place to prevent election-related conflict and violence</p>	<p>Baseline: 0% in 2012 elections Target: 50% success rate in 2018 Progress: on track</p> <p>Baseline: 14% of sampled population confirmed national security agencies are neutral (KAP Survey page 71 Proxy is public perception that security agencies are neutral) Target: 25% of sampled population confirmed national security agencies are neutral. (Midline: 25% target by December 2017); 30% (end-line target by May 2018) Progress: on track</p> <p>Baseline: In 2012 several situations rooms were in place but not fully coordinated in terms of reports and early response Target: Well-structured and coordinated situation room is operational by December 2017 Progress: on track</p>
--	--

Output progress

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

- Supported the Office of the National Security (ONS) to conduct the National Threat and Risk Assessment (NTRA);
- Supported development of the integrated election security strategy, comprehensive election security training manuals, and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for setting up an Integrated Election Security Situation Room;

- Supported Sierra Leone Police (SLP) to strengthen the Command and Control Centre; and conducted training of 1400 Police Officers on election security.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000-character limit)?

The project progress is on track towards enhancing public security, promoting civil protection and human rights and enhancing peaceful response capacities under Outcome 2.

To ensure there are effective and coordinated national and community based early warning and response systems, the project supported the Office of the National Security (ONS) to conduct a national threat and risk assessment to identify hotspots as well as institutional and geographical threats and risks that may influence the elections. This further aimed at ensuring that there is timely response to early warning issues reported to the situation room. Further support was provided to the Integrated Election Security Planning Committee (IESPC) to develop and implement an integrated election security strategy that informs on how different institutions (including all security institutions) are expected to respond to election security threats and risks while recognising the rights of people to participate freely in the electoral process. Further support was provided on development of a comprehensive training package for the training of the Integrated Election Security Planning Committee (IESPC) members on electoral violence, security, conflict prevention and management. The package includes human rights components on protection for freedom of expression and principles and guidelines on the use of force by the security forces. The project also supported development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the management of the election situation room. The SOPs outlines distinct roles and responsibilities, specifies the business model applicable and the structure for information gathering and reporting to ensure quality control and avoid misuse of data in the situation room.

To improve the level of preparedness of the Sierra Leone Police to respond to election security threats, the project supported establishment of police command and control centres through equipping the centres with necessary equipment and supplies at national and sub-national levels. Training of the police officers on election security is ongoing and is scheduled to be finalised by end of November 2017.

A human-rights based approach has been applied in developing these activities, and human rights considerations have been integrated to the extent possible.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

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

A natural disaster (mudslide) occurred on 14 August 2017 which shifted the attention of the national implementing partners who were in many instances drifted to provide emergency response to victims. The members of the Integrated Election Security Planning Committee (IESPC), which include the Office of National Security (ONS) and the Sierra Leone Police

(SLP), are two key partners of the project and their focus shifted to responding to the emergency. Their involvement slightly delayed implementation of the project.

With the departure of the HRA in June and her replacement only coming onboard in late October, there has been a gap in OHCHR involvement in the implementation of the project/human rights mainstreaming during the initial phases of the project. This has now been rectified with the arrival of the new HRA.

Outcome Statement 3: NA

Rate the current status of the outcome:

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

Output progress

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

Outcome progress

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

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

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

Outcome Statement 4: NA

Rate the current status of the outcome:

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

Output progress

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

Outcome progress

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

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

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

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

<p><u>Evidence base:</u> What is the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What consultation/validation process has taken place on this report (1000-character limit)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducted one consultative meeting with stakeholders in May 2017 to develop and validate the Results and Resources Framework and Annual Work Plan for the project; - Organised two Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meetings with stakeholders in May for the PBF component and October 2017 for UKAid component to appraise and validate project activities, outcomes and outputs; - Organised one technical committee meeting on 26 October 2017 to review project progress and identify areas of concern during implementation; - Participated in all meetings and consultations of the Integrated Election Security Planning Committee (IESPC) and provided technical input to the elections security strategy
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participated in the Joint Steering Committee Meeting on Elections involving SNEC and CPM Projects. - Provided technical assistance to three IESPC working groups namely: IESPC overall strategic planning working group, IESPC election security training working group; and IESPC Communication working group.
<p><u>Funding gaps:</u> Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The funding was timely and critical because it filled an existing funding gap in term of preventing and mitigation violence in the electoral process but also in ensuring that national capacities are built to respond to threats and risks to electoral relations violence within a human rights centred approach within a democratic space. This gap was also recognised by other donors and to the mobilisation of additional complementary funds the project outcome from the UKAid.</p>
<p><u>Catalytic effects:</u> Did the project achieve any catalytic effects, either through attracting additional funding commitments or creating immediate conditions to unblock/accelerate peace relevant processes? Briefly describe. (1500-character limit)</p>	<p>The project had catalytic effect and led to engagements with other donors and the mobilisation of additional \$1,879,490 from UKAid toward the same outcomes, outputs and indicators. The project also complemented the Support to National Electoral Commission (SNEC) project and led to a combined Election Steering Committee Meetings involving both the SNEC project and the Conflict Prevention in Electoral Cycle project.</p>
<p><u>Risk taking/ innovation:</u> Did the project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? (1500-character limit)</p>	<p>The project is taking both political and reputational risk by engaging with Political stakeholders to ensure peaceful elections and commitment to the use mediation and dialogue as a means of settling dispute. However, a risk and mitigation log has been developed. The project engagement with political stakeholders are not direct but through a national implementing partner; the Political Parties Registration Commission (PPRC).</p>
<p><u>Gender:</u> How have gender considerations been mainstreamed in the project to the extent possible? Is the original gender marker for the project still the right one? Briefly justify. (1500-character limit)</p>	<p>Yes. The original gender marker still stands. The design of the project was informed by a peacebuilding contextual analysis that included gender analysis and stakeholder consultations where women's voices and the issues faced by women were well represented. For example, under the mediation component, the project is supporting women involvement through the All Political Parties Women Association (APPWA), which is in line with UN-SC resolution (S/RES/1325) on women peace and security. The project indicators and activities also contained specific and measurable gender and inclusion components such as contained in the RRF.</p>
<p><u>Other issues:</u> Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that should be shared with PBSO? This can include any cross-cutting issues or other issues which have not been included in the report so far. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>With the departure of the HRA in June and her replacement only coming onboard in late October, there has been a gap in OHCHR involvement in the implementation of the project/human rights mainstreaming during the initial phases of the project. This has now been rectified with the arrival of the new HRA.</p>

PART 2: LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORY

2.1 Lessons learned

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

Lesson 1 (1000 character limit)	The first lesson on engagement and management of the project implementing partners. The project learnt that regular engagement with project partners is important to ensure close monitoring of project activities against targeted indicators and results. This lesson led to the dedication of project Focal Leads to each of the implementing partners. Each focal lead is responsible for monitoring progress for each of the IP, provide biweekly update and report to the project manager.
Lesson 2 (1000 character limit)	To second management lesson was the institution of internal biweekly meeting amongst all the project staff which includes OHCHR participation. This allows all project focal Leads to provide updates on activities and highlight result achieved the previous week and plans for next week. This is a way of ensuring that all project staff are aware of different activities with different partners
Lesson 3 (1000 character limit)	The third lesson is the inter project coordination lesson. Given that the project objective is aimed towards ensuring peaceful elections, the Country Office decision to set up a Joint Steering Committee Meeting with the SNEC project is a good lesson. Government and donor partners can discuss and engage strategically on both projects at the same time. Therefore, the Conflict Prevention Project Board which also serves as the Technical Committee focus on strategic issues around the project.
Lesson 4 (1000 character limit)	
Lesson 5 (1000 character limit)	

2.2 Success story (OPTIONAL)

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

PART 3 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure

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

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

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

Output number	Output name	Approved budget	Expensed budget	Any remarks on expenditure
Outcome 1: Political Parties and Aspirants develop and commit to peaceful and violence-free elections				
Output 1.1	Political parties and Aspirants Commit to Dialogue	416,957	122,782	
Output 1.2	Peace Advocacy and peaceful communication	533,818	310,923	
Output 1.3	Access to Justice	195,378	88,966	
Outcome 2: The National and Community-based Early Warning and Response Systems strengthened				
Output 2.1	Early Warning response	300,000	273,701	
Output 2.2	Election Security for Peaceful Response	386,800	171,046	
Outcome 3: Effective Project Management				
		752,985	95,844	
TOTAL:		2,585,937	1,063,262	

* Summary of state of project financial expenditure as of 15 November 2017

3.2 Comments on management and implementation arrangements

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

The project management and implementation arrangement is based on Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). To ensure coordination, ownership and partnership, the UNDP Country Office in Sierra Leone and the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) of Sierra Leone jointly convenes and managed the Project Technical Committee which also act as the Board. The board includes all the implementing partners as well as the donors.

The UNDP and Government of Sierra Leone established a Joint Steering Committee with the SNEC project to ensure coherence and ease of communication between and amongst donors, implementing partners and government.

The project, particularly with respect to the HRCSL component, builds upon an ongoing PBF project (IRF-95) ending in December 2017) supporting the HRCSL in implementing key human rights activities in Sierra Leone, with focus on business and human rights, the rights of persons with disabilities, and SGBV.

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

A lesson learnt study tour involving the government and implementing partners was conducted to Ghana in September for South-South exchange and to learn from the Ghana experience of managing electoral competitions, preventing and mitigating electoral violence. During the study tour, there were exchanges with 5 main political parties in Ghana through UNDP Ghana political party strengthening project, Ghana National Peace Council shared their experience and good practices from the 2016 elections in Ghana, the Electoral Commission of Ghana shared their experience on managing political competition and engaging with political parties, selected CSOs shared their experience on working with electoral and political stakeholders to ensure peaceful elections and the Ghana Police shared their experience on working with political parties on security of candidates and the use of non-government security operatives