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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Sierra Leone commissioned an evaluation at the close of its project on Support to Sierra Leone Constitutional Review 2013-2017. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the impact of the project and produce recommendations for future related projects. An independent evaluator, Lawrence Robertson, developed an evaluation that gathered data on project design, processes, performance, and outputs though document review and interviews in Sierra Leone in May 2017. The data, and findings and conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations drawn from them, have been used to examine the issues proposed for evaluation by UNDP and to answer an extensive list of evaluation questions.

**Introduction and Background**

Constitutional review has been seen as important for Sierra Leone since gaps and ambiguities in the existing 1991 Constitution were assessed as key contributing causes to the country’s 1991-2002 civil war. The President, in his election campaign, pledged his government’s support for revising the constitution in 2012. After the election, the President appointed an 80 person Constitutional Review Committee (CRC) in 2013 to review the constitution in light of prior efforts to update the constitution in 2007 and current perspectives on reform in the country.

UNDP developed the project on Support to Sierra Leone Constitutional Review in 2013; the project Document for a USD 4.1 million project was signed in December 2013 and work began to support the CRC through an experienced Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). The project, like the CRC, was designed to operate until March 2015. However, the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) outbreak led to limitations on the CRC’s outreach and to an extension of its timing; the CRC project was extended as well and concluded at the end May 2017. The UNDP CRC support project was organised through six outputs:

Capacity of CRC Members Enhanced

Capacity of CRC Secretariat Developed

CRC Communication Strategy

Civil Society Led Civic Education

CRC Led Civic Education and Public Consultations

Capacity of Members of Parliament, Political Parties, and Traditional Leaders Strengthened

**Findings and Conclusions**

The evaluation’s fieldwork accumulated and analyzed facts from document review, interviews, and small group discussions. The findings and conclusions emphasize that while the project successfully accomplished all six outputs described in the Project Document, some stakeholders and beneficiaries felt that the project should have been designed to support more of the full set of processes needed to get Sierra Leone to a new Constitution. The UNDP CRC project supported the presentation of the CRC’s Final Report to the President. This outcome was clearly the focus of the Project Document and was reached at the end of January 2017. However, some stakeholders and development partners felt that a more appropriate end goal for the project would have been the approval of a new constitution reflecting the views of the CRC through a referendum.

Factors, which facilitated or hindered the achievement of results, were identified as:

The detailed Project Document;

Leadership of the CTA;

Challenges of capacity of Sierra Leone;

EVD;

Limited financing;

Challenges with the timing of finances;

Challenges to timing from political stakeholders; and

Concerns about ending the project with a report.

The project’s strategy of supporting GoSL efforts was seen as appropriate, as was UNDP’s use of a basket fund to accommodate UNDP resources and funding from two development partners, the European Union (EU) and United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID).

The UNDP CRC Project focused on issues of gender, human rights and conflict prevention and management as central issues to address in a new constitution for Sierra Leone and attention to inclusive processes. The project was careful to monitor and manage unintended results, particularly in the context of the broader electoral calendar. Project design and methods were based on the theory that international support improves nationally driven and led processes by making processes more inclusive and transparent, which contributes to stronger outcomes that are substantively better and more widely known and accepted. Civil society organisations were key participants in the CRC process and important implementing partners of the UNDP project. Grants totaling USD 661,000 were provided to support constitutional reform (CR) through CSOs under the project.

Although few interviewees understood the design of the project, partners, beneficiaries, and stakeholders agreed that the project was highly relevant to Sierra Leone because of the relevance of a new constitution for the country and the importance of project technical assistance to the CR process. The project supported real needs and filled gaps in GoSL processes on CR. The project was designed to build existing capacity with an ambitious timeframe. Institutional sustainability was not a strong feature of project design as the CRC was not planned to endure; the project intended the CRC report to be a sustainable contribution to the longer-term process of constitutional review. However the project has contributed to what CRC members and CSOs assert will be their continued engagement in CR. Stakeholders were concerned that ending the CRC process and UNDP project to support the process with a report on the CRC might not be an appropriate end point; instead some stakeholders felt that support should continue for CR until the passage of a new constitution via referendum.

**Lessons Learned**

The findings and conclusions, as well as interviews themselves, suggest several key lessons learned:

Critical technical assistance and support for constitutional reform can be provided with limited funds;

Projects need to institutionalise processes beyond individuals;

Projects should retain flexibility;

Modest size and goals of projects can lead to some dissatisfaction; and

Political projects have political risks.

**Recommendations**

Findings and conclusions, as well as lessons learned, lead to a set of recommendations. Recommendations focus on three areas: the next steps in constitutional reform in Sierra Leone, UNDP projects in the country, and United Nations (UN) support to constitutional reform processes.

*Next Steps on Constitutional Reform*

While CRC has fulfilled the President’s charge to the Committee, and the UNDP CRC project its outcome of supporting the delivery of a transparently prepared and inclusive CRC report, the prospects for subsequent processes going forward to get a new Constitution for Sierra Leone drafted, discussed, and approved remain uncertain. In the context of the broader electoral calendar, UNDP and its development partners should consider supporting the GoSL with:

A ceremony and measures that recognize and reward CRC members and their partners for their years of work towards a new Constitution for Sierra Leone;

Completion of processes of cataloging and archiving records of the CRC’s processes;

The production of accessible content on the conclusions and recommendations of the CRC to be shared widely with key stakeholders and the population of Sierra Leone;

Continued advocacy the next steps needed for constitutional reform that incorporates the recommendations of the CRC: a White Paper from the Government, discussion and approval of the White Paper by the Cabinet, draft Referendum bill and subsequent legislation of the bill, a draft of a new Constitution, pre-legislative scrutiny of the Constitution, and discussion of the draft in Parliament (through two readings);

Substantial civic education efforts in the run up to any constitutional referendum on or after September 2018, and

*UNDP Projects in Sierra Leone*

UNDP should consider and develop ways to manage knowledge and institutionalize connections across Projects to utilize complementarities across initiatives through systems for developing, sharing, and storing information and using this information for management. UNDP also needs to continue to strive to improve shared understanding with its development partners.

*UN Support to Constitutional Reform Projects*

Finally, the CRC experience suggests recommendations for other UN projects that support constitutional review. UNDP should continue to support projects that help reform constitutions but should explicitly speak to the political nature of constitutional reform throughout the process. UNDP projects should maintain a focus on building public understanding and discussion throughout their work. The UN and UNDP should also – when possible - commit to project outcomes and resource projects at a higher level and for a longer period of time in order to reach stronger end points such as broad civic and voter education and constitutional referenda.
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1. **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

**Introduction**

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Sierra Leone requested an evaluation at the close of its project on Support to Sierra Leone Constitutional Review 2013-2017.

The introduction explains why the evaluation was conducted and the background of the project. The subsequent Methodology section outlines methodologies used in the evaluation, including the specific questions to be answered through the evaluation. The section explains the methods used by the evaluator to collect valid and reliable data on project processes, outputs, outcomes, and UNDP, partner, beneficiary, and stakeholder perceptions. The section also discusses limitations to the evaluation’s methods and the ways that were used to mitigate them. The third section describes the findings of the evaluation and the conclusions drawn from them. Findings are collections of accumulated facts about project processes, outputs, and outcomes reached through the methodologies used in the evaluation. Findings are not based on a single source but rather triangulated from several sources and methods (document review, interviews, and group discussions). Findings are summarized briefly as conclusions. Fourth, the evaluation provides lessons learned about the CRC project. Lessons learned are either based on conclusions or were directly volunteered by informants through specific questions soliciting possible lessons. Finally, recommendations are provided; again specific recommendations were either provided directly through the processes of the evaluation or follow on from the conclusions of the fieldwork.

UNDP listed multiple purposes for the evaluation in the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the impact of the project and produce recommendations for future related projects through specific objectives, which were to:

a) Review the performance of the Project in achieving the outputs as per the Project Document and their contributions to outcome level goals;

b) Identify factors, which facilitated or hindered the achievement of results, both in terms of the external environment and those internal, and document lessons learned at various implementation stages. This should include but not be limited to assessing the strengths and weaknesses in Project design, management, coordination, human resource, and financial resources;

c) Assess the appropriateness of the Project strategy including the Project institutional/ management arrangements and the basket fund modality to reach the intended outputs and outcomes;

d) Define the extent to which the Project addressed cross cutting issues including gender, human rights and conflict prevention and management;

e) Make clear and focused recommendations that may be required in future;

f) Learning lessons and deepening the understanding of how the CRC project was designed, set up, managed and delivered. The evaluation will generate useful lessons especially on the design, management and quality of results generated by the project for improving the quality of similar and future initiatives;

g) Account for all investments (to donors and partners) in terms of the intended and unintended results and how those results impacted the project;

h) Assess the underlining theory of change and political relevance of the project;

i) Assess the level of civil society participation from conception to the submission of final report phase

The TOR also included a large number additional questions under the headings of

Design and Relevance;

Achievements and Implementation and Development Effectiveness;

Effectiveness of Management Arrangements and Efficiency of Resource Use; and

Impact and Sustainability.

The Evaluation Report also develops findings and conclusions that answer these questions under these headings in the findings and conclusions section.

**Background**

As part of the campaign for the Presidency in 2012, the candidate for the All People’s Congress (APC), Dr. Earnest Bai Koroma pledged to revise the Constitution of Sierra Leone. The 1991 Constitution was adopted as the country was slipping into civil conflict; violence lasted from 1991 until 2002. The 1999 Lome Peace Accord that ended the most active period of fighting committed the parties to revising the Constitution. In the wake of peace, a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was formed to assess the causes of the violence. One of the causes of the civil war that the TRC Report identified was the flawed constitution; the TRC thus recommended developing a new constitution through a “wide and thorough consultative and participatory programme.” In 2007, as Presidential elections approached, the Sierra Leone People’s Party (SLPP) government created a commission led by Peter Tucker to revise the constitution. The Peter Tucker report came out in 2008; changes to the constitution were recommended – but not made. Few citizens saw the recommendations of the Peter Tucker Report, and few citizens were consulted in the four-month long process of the Commission.

The Constitution has been also noted as problematic by key international partners vis a vis international agreements and instruments that Sierra Leone is a partner to (Commonwealth Secretariat 2012, European Union Election Observation Mission 2012, Amnesty International 2017); the GoSL had emphasized revising the 1991 constitution as a way to support human rights (Human Rights Council 2015).

President Koroma announced that an 80-person Constitutional Review Committee would be tasked with reviewing the 1991 Constitution in light of the Peter Tucker Report and the sentiments of citizens. The CRC members were drawn from the registered political parties in the country as well as from civil society. CRC members were selected to represent the organizations to which they are a member. The President appointed a former Appeals Court Justice, past Speaker of Parliament and then Ombudsman the Honorable Justice Edmond Cowan as chair of the CRC. The CRC was launched on 30 July 2013. The target at that point for submitting a final report from the process of reviewing the Constitution was end March 2015.

The UNDP “Support to the Constitutional Review Project” was developed in 2013; approved 18 July 2013, the CRC project budgeted US $ 3,917,944 for the 21 month period envisioned for the project (July 2013-March 2015). For project formulation, a joint UN Department of Political Affairs and UNDP team visited Sierra Leone for consultations with UN Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone (UNIPSIL), the UNDP Country Office and its program teams, development partners, stakeholders, potential beneficiaries, and potential program partners. A project document was drafted, discussed, and approved by UNDP and the Government; at the time of approval, funding was available only from UNDP through USD 500,000 from the Thematic Trust Fund for Crisis Prevention and Recovery. The GoSL also had funding to begin the CRC’s work. Assurances had been made by two development partners, the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID) and the European Commission, that they would be funding the project through a basket fund mechanism. The funding contributed by the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL) went directly to CRC and its processes rather than going through UNDP. Oversight of the project was provided by a Project Steering Committee (SC) comprised of key national and international stakeholders.

The Project Document outlined ways to support capacity development of the CRC so that the Committee could expertly lead an inclusive, transparent, participatory and peaceful process of Constitutional reform.

The Project focused on six key outputs, and specified mechanisms for reaching these outputs:

1. Capacity of CRC members enhanced to undertake effective Constitution review process and produce final recommendations: Providing training and capacity development support to CRC members on process issues and technical/substantive issues, as well as on mediation, dialogue, negotiation and conflict mitigation. The latter training recognised that the constitutional review was both a technical and a political process, and CRC members needed to have the necessary skills to mediate between parties.

1. Capacity of CRC Secretariat to provide legal and research services to CRC enhanced: Providing technical and capacity development support to ensure the Secretariat can effectively support the work of the CRC while ensuring locally-contextualised legal analysis and drafting services are available to CRC members, as well as research.
2. CRC communication and messaging strategy designed and implemented: Supporting the development of a simple CRC Communications Strategy, to guide the CRC’s own efforts to communicate what it is doing. In addition, facilitating closer partnership between CRC and the media, to ensure that the media can responsibly and accurately support the CRC’s work.
3. Civil Society led inclusive transparent and informative civic education process completed: Supporting civil society’s efforts in conducting a countrywide civic education campaign and stakeholder consultations process - both over the long-term and short-term.
4. CRC led inclusive and transparent civic education and public consultation process completed: undertaking a highly inclusive process of consultation with the public in an effort to ensure buy-in for the constitutional review process across the country through developing and implementing a strategy for civic education and public consultation plan, including identifying issues that it should cover, geographical locations, timing and associated budget.
5. Capacity of Members of Parliament (MPs), democratic institutions, political parties and civil society strengthened to effectively support and participate in the review process; Developing capacity of MPs, democratic institutions, political parties and civil society to effectively engage with the work of the CRC in order to ensure a consensus-based, participatory process.

The Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) that reached epidemic proportions in the country in 2014 had serious effects on the CRC and the project. With the declaration of a state of emergency in June 2014, all public consultation activities were suspended – including the activities of CSOs under the project. The CRC, with the support of the project, redirected activities in this period to consult with GoSL ministries, departments, and agencies. At the CRC’s request, the President of Sierra Leone extended the Mandate of the CRC till March 2016; the UNDP project was extended by the project’s Steering Committee (SC) as well. Other delays in the CRC’s work (to be discussed in findings and conclusions) led to the extension of the project through March 2017. UNDP Project support ceased at the end of May 2017.

The project was directly implemented by UNDP Sierra Leone through the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) in consultation with program beneficiaries and development partners. Project partners under were both civil society organisations and national institutions, both ones set up by the government and organisations included in the Constitution (such as the Political Parties Registration Commission (PPRC) and National Council for Democracy (NCD)). DIM implementation meant that UNDP processes and procurement regulations were used for all funding through the project. Funding available UNDP for the project over 2014 through 2017 was USD 4,502,651, with USD 3,917,944 expended over 2014-2016.

**2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

UNDP and its development partners sought an evaluation of the processes, outputs, and progress towards the outcome of the CRC Project. The UNDP Country Office contracted with an individual consultant Lawrence Robertson for the evaluation. The office choose an independent evaluator with experience evaluating governance projects in Sierra Leone for the project evaluation through a clear TOR that had previously been shared with development partners. Robertson conducted the evaluation in May 2017, the final month of the project’s life, meeting the terms of the TOR.

The evaluator developed an inception report that explained the evaluation design, the methodologies to be used, and the plan for fieldwork for the evaluation for UNDP approval. The inception report proposed an organisation for the evaluation report based on answering the large number of questions in the TOR. Robertson held an introductory brief on the evaluation design for UNDP and development partners on 1 May 2017. At the request of DFID during the in-brief, the evaluation’s fieldwork was productively extended to reach outside of staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries in Freetown. After this modification, UNDP approved the Inception Report. Robertson then executed the plans in the inception report to collect valid and reliable data on CRC project activities, performance, outputs, and progress towards the outcome. This entailed a desk review, two weeks of fieldwork in Sierra Leone, presentation to a validation workshop at the end of fieldwork (12 May 2017), and drafting the evaluation report. Robertson submitted a draft evaluation report and revised the report after the receipt of written comments on the draft evaluation report for UNDP's approval.

The findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations are based on data collected through three methods: document review, individual interviews, and small group discussions. The evaluator first reviewed the relevant documents and materials produced by the CRC project (see Annex 1: List of Documents Reviewed). This desk review of documents was critical to understanding the methods used by the project, the outputs of the project, and the challenges faced in project implementation.

Individual interviews with more than forty key informants (see Annex 2: List of Individual Interviews and Small Group Discussions). Most individual interviews were conducted face-to-face in Freetown. Some interviews were held with more than one person from the relevant organisation present, such as several members of partner civil society organisations that implemented grants funded by the CRC project. Other interviews were conducted over the telephone or via Skype for informants not in Freetown. The evaluator drew up a list of institutional partners to conduct interviews with and after soliciting contact information from the CRC project, selected informants independently from this list. Interviews were conducted with all living CRC sub-committee chairs and a sample of a few additional members of the CRC. Interviews were held with all institutional partners – the organisations that were funded through UNDP grants - of the CRC project. Interviews were conducted with both women and men.

With the support of the UNDP CRC project, two group discussions were scheduled outside of the capital. Participants in key CRC processes in two districts of Sierra Leone were mobilized with the support of a former CRC staff person funded by the UNDP project to meet with the evaluator. One discussion was held in Makeni on 9 May 2017 with eight participants and a second in Bo 10 May 2017 with 12 participants (see Annex 2). Both women and men participated in these small group discussions; the evaluator led the discussion to ensure that all attendees participated actively in the discussion of CRC processes and the UNDP project’s support for the CRC.

The TOR listed nine key objectives for the evaluation. The Findings and Conclusions section of the report is organized to address these nine objectives by examining the findings of the evaluation’s fieldwork towards these objectives. Findings are facts found through the evaluation’s fieldwork, particularly facts commonly reported by informants. Conclusions are drawn by the evaluator from the analysis of accumulated findings. Conclusions were also in some cases the accumulated views of particular key informants. When these types of conclusions is reported on as a conclusion, the type of informant providing this summary conclusion is noted in the text.

The TOR for the evaluation then added a large number of additional questions to be addressed in the course of the evaluation. These additional questions were framed through four categories:

Design and Relevance;

Achievements and Implementation and Development Effectiveness;

Effectiveness of Management Arrangements and Efficiency of Resource Use; and

Impact and Sustainability.

These categories are used to organize the findings and conclusions for the 30 bullet points in the TOR under these categories. Specific headings are used to clarify the issue asked about by the question or questions under each bullet point.

**3. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

***Review the performance of the Project in achieving the outputs as per the Project Document and their contributions to outcome level goals*;**

The UNDP CRC project had six outputs, leading to a single outcome-level goal. The findings for the section thus first describe key aspects of the project and the achievement or non-achievement of outcomes. Brief conclusions are drawn for each of the six outputs in turn before turning to the question of contribution to outcome level goal of the project.

**Output 1: Capacity of CRC Members Enhanced,**

The full title of the output was “Capacity of CRC members enhanced to undertake effective constitutional review process and produce final recommendations.” The ProDoc envisioned putting USD 339 k to this output; resources expended 2014-2016 were USD 434 k. Support under this output provided capacity building for CRC members, supported CRC Plenary and Sub-committee work, was used for study tours to Kenya and Ghana to learn about their constitutional review processes, facilitated travel and meetings of the CRC, and supported document preparation/printing.

CRC leaders and members appreciated and valued the support of the UNDP project for their capacity building and to support their work. CRC leaders and members emphasised that the review would not have been successful without the support of the project, in particular without the support of the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). Funding from the GoSL was not available to support the operations of the CRC over much of the period; the modest support from the UNDP project was seen as critical to the operations of the CRC as well as to development of the capacity of its members, few of whom had worked together in the past. Some CRC members were critical of the size of the stipend paid as a sitting allowance for CRC members; others noted that it was a privilege to serve regardless of the small size of the sitting fee. CRC plenaries and sub-committee meetings proceeded with most members attending. The UNDP project also funded national experts to engage with and deliberate with CRC sub-committees. The project also managed the process of engaging with UN mediation support experts and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) experts. During the state of emergency caused by the EVD epidemic from June 2014 to March 2015, the CRC suspended its outreach and focused on plenary and sub-committee work and engagement with ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs) in Freetown.

*Conclusions:* The project as planned worked to provide information and knowledge that helped build the capacity of CRC members towards increasing their ability to generate a high-quality review of the Constitution and a report on this review.

**Output 2: Capacity of CRC Secretariat Developed**

The full title of the output was “Capacity of CRC Secretariat to provide legal and research services to CRC developed.” The ProDoc envisioned putting USD 759 k to this output. However UNDP expended substantially less, USD 193k; resources were used only in 2014, after which the output was considered completed in Annual Progress Reports. CRC, Secretariat, and UNDP interviews noted that GoSL resources went into supporting the Secretariat and that UNDP correspondingly did less as a result. Work under the output included:

Training for secretariat staff (approximately 20 seconded civil servants); and

Funding additional staff support for the Secretariat through United Nations Volunteers (UNVs) and national youth volunteers.

Support was also provided through Legal Technical Associates from the Attorney General’s Office (AGO) Law Office through GoSL resources. Minimal equipment and materials were provided by the CRC project, which reportedly only bought a couple of laptops over the course of the 4 and a half years of the project. The required equipment for the secretariat’s operations was provided by the GoSL. The output focused was on training and staffing the Secretariat which supported the CRC as a whole, plenary session, and the work of the sub-committees. The secretariat also supported the communications strategy, civic education, and communications strategy of the CRC. The executive secretariat was recognized to not have strong staff, and to be limited in number. The CRC project developed and implemented the low-cost strategy of recruiting national UNVs and getting legal support from government-funded sources through the AGO. The UNDP project developed and supported the web site and WordPress sites that were used by the CRC to make products public and available electronically at low cost; more resources were used in this area under Output 3 below. Training was provided on document management and archiving, report writing, communications, and interpersonal skills for staff in 2014.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP CRC project supported the staff of the CRC secretariat as needed in a very low-cost way for the CRC to be able to run transparent and inclusive processes and draft a CRC Report reflecting the inputs of organisations and individuals into this process.

**Output 3: CRC Communication Strategy**

The full title of the output was “CRC Communication Strategy designed and implemented.” The ProDoc envisioned putting USD 270,000 towards achieving the output. Over 2014-2016, instead spending was substantially larger, USD 571 k due to the longer time period of implementation and the many challenges of communicating effectively across Sierra Leone through the mass media. UNDP, under the component, financed:

Work with Secretariat on messaging and communications;

Media outreach to people across Sierra Leone on the Constitution, process of review, and thematic issues through SLBC and its partners;

Media outreach on the draft CRC report; and

Distribution of materials (from the 1991 Constitution onwards to limited support for the distribution of the final CRC report after its presentation to the President in January 2017).

A communications plan was developed by the Sierra Leone Broadcasting Corporation (SLBC) and CRC with the support of the UNDP project to disseminate CRC messages. The communications plan contracted with the SLBC to develop and broadcast content on the constitutional review on television (TV) and radio (including 18 partner radio stations). The network was needed to have a wide reach across Sierra Leone, which has an extremely fragmented media environment. The SLBC contracted with providers to produced television content, theme songs, and jingles translated into the seven main languages of Sierra Leone. The project supported a one-hour TV weekly programme called “Live with CRC” which was simulcast on radio, a biweekly 15-minute TV drama series to mainstream youth and women voices on topical issues, a Krio-language programme.

Interviews and small group discussions noted some awareness of these programs; the evaluation’s methods did not have independent ways to assess the viewership of these products years after their production and broadcast. The project monitored the Jam-Cast contractor media monitors that verified that programs were shown as planned. Media interviews recognized the difficult challenges of broadcasting in the country and assessed these programs as high quality, professional efforts to reach diverse audiences across Sierra Leone. The project also supported the dissemination of CRC products over websites, Facebook, YouTube, and WhatsApp. Printing is seen to be very expensive in Sierra Leone. As a response, the project produced and distributed content through computerized cards to key stakeholders with computers; these inexpensive methods were used to distribute hundreds of pages of data on constitutional reform and other constitutions.

*Conclusions:* Media outreach was developed and funded by the UNDP CRC project as necessary to reach the people of Sierra Leone to provide them with information on CR.

**Output 4: Civil Society Led Civic Education**

The full title of the output was “Civil society led inclusive and informative civic education process completed.” The ProDoc envisioned putting USD 1 million into grants; the project managed grants of USD 842 k over 2014-2016. The Project, with UNDP assistance, managed a grants process that made awards to six key partners: The six, and funding levels, were:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grants Under Output 4** | **USD 1,000** |
| National Council for Democracy | 105 |
| Sierra Leone Broadcasting Corporation |  70 |
| West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP-SL) | 119 |
| OXFAM & 50/50 | 147 |
| Campaign for Good Governance |  49 |
| Society for Democratic Initiatives | 169 |
| **Total** | **661** |

Interviews were held with leaders from all project grant partners. Grant partners noted that UNDP CRC project resources had been provided through competitive grant processes that were conventional in manner. Partners stated that the UNDP CRC project had funded, monitored, and supported their proposals in a normal fashion. One grantee however asserted that they had not been provided with the full payment due under their final tranche; UNDP sources stated that they would check but believed that the grant had been properly fully funded and closed.

Partner advocacy and outreach was funded as additional ways for information about the CRC process and the substance of constitutional reform (CR) to be shared with key stakeholder groups and people across Sierra Leone. As with CRC outreach under Component 5, civil society outreach had two main purposes: first, to inform citizens and provide information about CR and second to gather the views of organisations and people that could be used for CR by the CRC.

CSOs remained engaged in CR post-grant (although with less outreach) as part of the core work of their organisations. CSOs continued to monitor the work of the CRC and engage with the CRC to make recommendations about the content of the country’s constitution. Although the activities funded by CSOs under the project had concluded by 2016, CSOs leaders interviewed did not raise the issue that no UNDP CRC project support was available to help their organisations work on civic engagement for CR in 2016 or after.

*Conclusions*: Civil society organisations were key partners of the UNDP CRC project and a major way that the project used to reach out to citizens with information on constitutional reform in Sierra Leone.

**Output 5: CRC Led Civic Education and Public Consultations**

The full title of the output was “CRC led inclusive and transparent civic education and public consultation process completed.” The ProDoc envisioned putting USD 647 k to this and actual expenditures over 2014-2016 were USD 607 k. The UNDP CRC project resources funded:

National & sub-national civic education campaigns at the ward and regional level;

Civic education on the 1991 constitution, Peter Tucker Report, and process of revision; and

Public consultation on draft constitution produced by the CRC.

Activities under the output were used to publicize and print documents, particularly the public consultation forms developed by the CRC’s sub-committees and the Constitution and Peter Tucker Commission Report. Activities also supported the CRC’s travel and outreach, both within Freetown with MDAs, and outside the capital to districts and wards. Support included resources needed for regional and local participants, including for travel and logistics. Support was also used to help incorporate the findings of CRC-led consultations back into the development of the CRC’s Final Report.

*Conclusions*: Because of the importance of outreach to education citizens about the process and content of constitutional reform, the project needed to support the CRC’s own outreach to the population on constitutional reform in addition to supporting outreach through CSOs.

**Output 6: Capacity of MPs, Political Parties, and Traditional Leaders Strengthened**

The full title of the output was “Capacity of MPs, political parties and traditional leaders strengthened to effectively support and participate in the review process. The ProDoc envisioned putting USD 339,000 to this output. Over the course of the project 2014-2016, UNDP expended USD 112 k in activities under this objective for:

Engagement with Members of Parliament on consensus building;

PPRC engagement with political parties on CR;

Outreach through the Ministry of Local Government to Paramount Chiefs; and

Direct information sharing and networking with MPs, parties, and chiefs.

The output was the lowest resourced output in design, and was funded at a lower level than anticipated in 2013. The project found it challenging to engage Paramount Chiefs; Chiefs were the most challenging stakeholders and participants for CRC overall as well as for project-supported activities. The distance of most chiefdoms from Freetown and the limited education and training of some Paramount Chiefs made engagement challenging. The CRC did not develop plans to reach the Chiefdom level for public consultations.

*Conclusions*: The UNDP CRC project did work with MPs and traditional leaders in CR. The CRC did not manage to hold consultation meetings at the Chiefdom level. More effort was put in with political parties, as key to CR and since many CRC members came from political parties.

**Outcome-level Result**

Despite clear and strong results at the output level, the outcome has been challenging to assess. Consequently, the precise outcome goal has been viewed different ways by some stakeholders, thus framed in two different ways in the Project Document. In the text of the ProDoc, the outcome is described as “***Sierra Leone Constitutional Review Committee capacitated to have an expertly-led inclusive, transparent, participatory and peaceful process of constitutional reform***.” This is the goal that project staff consistently articulated and pursued.

However the Outcome goal was framed differently in the ProDoc’s Results and Resources Framework & Timeline. In these two places, the outcome goal was described as “***Sierra Leone Constitutional Review process finalised and revised constitution presented to parliament for adoption.”*** Some discussions were held with development partners about potentially working further towards this goal in the latter stages of the UNDP CRC project; however UNDP and development partners jointly decided that the end goal of the project would be the completion of the CRC Report. The outcome of a revised constitution put to parliament for adoption has not been achieved, although it may yet be achieved. The steps from a CRC Final Report to the presentation of a revised constitution to Parliament were not provided for in the ProDoc and were outside the manageable interest of the UNDP CRC Project. The GoSL has a set of standard processes for taking any legislation to Parliament: the drafting of a White Paper by GoSL staff; debate and support for the White Paper by the Cabinet; drafting of a bill by GoSL staff; and submission of the bill (in this case constitutional amendments or a revised constitution) to Parliament. These later steps are even more sensitive and political than the discussion of CR. Many stakeholders interviewed expect the GoSL to follow through on constitutional reform and take these steps. The concerns of many CRC participants and stakeholders are whether the White Paper and draft Constitution will accurately and completely reflect the will of the people as expressed in the CRC process.

*Conclusions*: The UNDP CRC project successfully supported the process of constitutional reform to the production of a Report on the CRC process to the President. The project and some development partners considered whether and how the project could or should have a different outcome, but jointly decided against a change.

*Identify factors, which facilitated or hindered the achievement of results, both in terms of the external environment and those internal, and document lessons learned at various implementation stages. This should include but not be limited to assessing the strengths and weaknesses in Project design, management, coordination, human resource, and financial resources;*

Eight main areas emerged from document review and interviews as factors that inhibited or facilitated results. These eight were:

The detailed Project Document;

Leadership of the CTA;

Challenges of capacity of Sierra Leone;

EVD;

Limited financing;

Challenges with the timing of finances;

Challenges to timing from political stakeholders; and

Concerns about ending the project with a report.

Documents and interviews noted that the UNDP CRC project had a detailed ProDoc that was developed in 2013. The detailed design did not anticipate some of the timing and political challenges that affected the project. However, UNDP project management, with development partners and Country Office support, were able to work with the CRC and adjust and manage in practice to support the six outputs and the outcome of a CRC Final Report. The SC supported the use of project resources in ways that were not overly proscribed based on the ProDoc.

The engagement and proactive leadership of the CTA was noted and praised by beneficiaries, stakeholders, and partners, who appreciated the continuous presence of the CTAas well as the ways the CTA provided technical advice on CR. The CTA’s style of respecting national leadership and engaging when invited or through making suggestions was widely appreciated. Development partners did note that times when they felt the CTA should have been more proactive in information sharing with them outside of regular forums.

The many challenges of limited capacity in Sierra Leone continued to pose issues throughout the project. Limited capacity of CRC members, staff, and partners shaped the kinds of ways the project supported capacity building, as well as the ways the UNDP CRC Project brought in additional staff and resources to fill existing gaps. Limited capacity also shaped how the project supported outreach to citizens through the CRC and through external partners. The 2015 census found that almost half of the population was illiterate; surveys show functional literacy rates are less than half of the population (e.g. BBC Media Action 2016). The project also chose multiple means of outreach through media in order to overcome the capacity limits that leave the electronic media market in Sierra Leone so fragmented.

The EVD epidemic directly affected the work of the CRC and thus the project. The CRC adapted to the limits on citizen engagement and movement of the state of emergency during the EVD epidemic June 2014 to March 2015 by focusing the CRC’s work and project support where it was feasible in Freetown through consultations between the CRC with MDAs. Staff, beneficiaries, and stakeholders lauded this strategy as critical for keeping momentum in the CR process when it otherwise would have waned under the pressure of the epidemic. The decision was influenced by the CTA who was willing to remain and support the CRC even during the epidemic.

The amount of funding for the project was based on contribution agreements between UNDP and its development partners. Of course the amount of financing available shaped what was feasible in terms of support for the CRC through the UNDP project. The ambitious project document and all six outputs were supported, in part by stretching out the financing to cover the longer time process for CR once the process had been extended by the President in the wake of the EVD. This did lead to reallocations of funding, with development partner support, over the course of the project. No additional funds were provided over and above what was originally agreed in the contribution agreements.

The UNDP CRC project staff reported managed the timing of finances with development partners. At the outset, funding from UNDP and DFID was available. The EUD successfully managed the processes of accessing EC funds through annual programs. After the first year of implementation, EU resources were available for use by the CRC project.

The project faced challenges to the timing of key deliverables from political stakeholders. As a process commissioned by the President, the CRC project was due to report to the President. As the CRC process was coming to a close, the Chair negotiated with the President on a proper submittal of the report. The Presidency reportedly chose 24 January 2017 for submission of the formal report, although the report had been completed earlier in December 2016. This led to several months of delay as the CRC and the Project could not advance the project further while awaiting the opportunity to present the Final Report to the President. The situation was reportedly similar for the submission of the earlier draft Report in 2016. The project and CRC could not move activities ahead while awaiting the formal submission dates agreed upon with executive branch leaders. These delays and limited information about the causes of these delays led to some frustrations with development partners.

Finally, staff, CRC partners, and stakeholders expressed concerns about what they saw as the truncation of the CRC project at its conclusion. Some CRC leaders and stakeholders felt that the end May 2017 date for closure of the UNDP project had been an abrupt change, which led to some hurt feelings among staff with positions terminated earlier than anticipated. The GoSL had also simultaneously been reducing its support for CRC processes as part of wrapping up the CRC. While the closure of the CRC is not related to the end of the UNDP CRC project, the winding down of the CRC and the UNDP project supporting the CRC occurred at the same time while the CRC still had important tasks remaining to complete its work. These tasks, such as archiving and transferring the records of the CRC and disseminating the CRC report, are especially relevant to future efforts to use the CRC process for the next steps of CR in Sierra Leone. Some stakeholders were concerned that the government’s wrapping up of the CRC process would reduce the potential for CRC members, partners, and stakeholders to monitor the government’s processes of furthering CR in ways that accurately reflected the processes and views of the public expressed through the CRC. These stakeholders wished that the UNDP CRC project was continuing to support this monitoring.

*Conclusions*: Key factors that partners and stakeholders noted as impediments to or supportive of results were the detailed Project Document, strong leadership of the CTA, the many challenges of low capacity of partners in Sierra Leone, the EVD epidemic, limited financing, challenges to timing from political stakeholders; and concerns about ending the project with a report.

*Assess the appropriateness of the Project strategy including the Project institutional/management arrangements and the basket fund modality to reach the intended outputs and outcomes;*

The UNDP CRC project’s strategy of supporting GoSL efforts was conventional and appropriate. The CRC was a government initiative with GoSL support; however funding became extremely tight with the worldwide decline in iron ore prices, an economic output slump with EVD, and pressing needs in fighting EVD. The UN also has the regional and international connections that were productively made to further the technical side of constitutional review.

The use of a basket fund for the UNDP CRC project was also conventional as the projected was funded by two development partners, DFID and the EU, plus UNDP itself. Development partners and UNDP noted the value added of having UNDP as multilateral organisation working in sensitive political areas like the constitution, which could be complemented by bilateral political engagement through the SC and Ambassadors if needed. Be as it may, working with several development partners raises administrative needs as reporting needs to fit several currencies and formats. Multiple donors also raise risks of financing delays and challenges in relations with development partners.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP CRC project used a basket fund since it was funded by two development partners and the UN. The project strategy was to support the GoSL’s constitutional reform process. Both were appropriate ways to strive towards outputs and outcomes for the project.

*Define the extent to which the Project addressed cross cutting issues including gender, human rights and conflict prevention and management*;

UNIPSIL and the UN viewed support for constitutional reform through the prism of conflict management. Support for CR originated in conflict mitigation, as the flawed constitution was seen to have been a cause of the civil war. Revision was thus also a question of the prevention of conflict in the future. The UNDP CRC project thus did not see conflict prevention and management as a cross cutting issue but rather as the main purpose of CR. The project however did not conduct an explicit detailed analysis of risks or assesses how to do no harm. Instead the CTA informally monitored issues and addressed conflict management through support for a transparent, open, and inclusive CR process.

Human rights was similarly central to constitutional reform – both for the UN and the CRC; the CRC, in reviewing the content of the 1991 constitution, recognized that human rights were lacking in the prior constitution. UN inputs into the process also emphasized human rights and their inclusion into modern constitutions.

Gender, particularly women’s empowerment, was targeted explicitly in the development and implementation of the UNDP CRC project. Gender inclusion was recognized as a challenge to CR, and addressed both as cross-cutting throughout the project and through particular partners that focused on women (such as OXFAM and 50/50). The composition of the CRC (61 men and 19 women) raised the importance of fully including women in CR processes from the outset. The UNDP CRC project recognized that one role was to augment the inputs of women through grants and engagement with civil society; UN Women was also brought in as a partner to further support women’s engagement through project and other UN Women resources.

*Conclusions:* The management and prevention of conflict and support for human rights were central to the origins of the UNDP CRC project, as the reasoning behind the CRC was that a new constitution was needed based on the contribution of the existing Constitution to the country’s civil war and the limited rights that citizens have under it. The project targeted women’s CSOs in order to have a stronger impact on the representation of women in CR processes

*Account for all investments (to donors and partners) in terms of the intended and unintended results and how those results impacted the project*

The UNDP CRC project reports expending the following amounts towards the six outputs of the project (see Annex 3: Draft Financial Report). These inputs yielded results in these six areas, which together addressed the outcome goal. Support for increasing the capacity of CRC members was seen as critical to the CRCs operations; UNDP CRC project support to enable CRC members to use inclusive, transparent processes for consultations, debate, and drafting was seen as critical to the success of the CRC. The project’s assistance with staffing, through UNVs, national youth volunteers, and training for ES staff was seen as important to providing adequate staff as needed for the CRC’s operations in sub-committee and plenary sessions. Substantial support to the media and communications across the country was one of the key ways that the CRC project supported the critical need for the Commission to be able to provide information to people about constitutional review in an environment when almost no one started out with knowledge of the Constitution. Support to Output 4 for civil society engagement was seen as a complementary way to spread information to the Output 3 way via the mass media, as well as a way to enlist CSOs in collecting data on people’s preferences for the new constitution. These inputs contributed to the production of the CRC Report. Project support was also seen as central to the successes of the CRC in conducting its own civic education and public consultation processes through Output 5. Finally, modest resources were utilized to do additional work to sensitize MPs, parties and Paramount Chiefs on constitutional reform and to solicit their inputs to the process.

Documents and interviews did not identify positive or negative unintended results from activities under any of the six outputs. UNDP particularly sought not to have any unintended results from the CRC’s processes affect the electoral calendar in Sierra Leone.

The evaluator is not able to account for all GoSL investment in the CRC process. GoSL documents and processes were not made available to the evaluator, as they funded the CRC directly.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP CRC project targeted a set of six output results; the project deployed resources towards all six and was able to achieve output-level results in all six. No unintended consequences of project activities were identified in the course of the fieldwork.

*Assess the underlining theory of change and political relevance of the project*

The ProDoc did not use or explain a theory of change (ToC). However there was a ToC implicit in the design. The implicit ToC came from the idea that national leadership is critical for national processes, and that international partners can provide support to these processes. The implicit ToC was that injecting international support to nationally-led processes can improve the processes, make processes more inclusive and transparent, and contributes to stronger outcomes that are substantively better and more widely known and accepted. This ToC appears to have been validated by the processes of the CRC and the support of the UNDP CRC project. Staff, partners, stakeholders, and beneficiaries noted that the processes of constitutional review was unprecedentedly transparent and inclusive; in the country’s history, all other constitution-making processes had been closed and quick. Instead the fact that the CRC operated in such an open way through long-lasting processes was credited in part to UNDP support, plus the need for more time due to EVD and political delays.

The UNDP CRC project was highly political and recognized as such. The political nature of the CRC project arises from the origins of the CRC process as well as the fact that constitutions all around the world are the foundations of political pacts and state-society relations. The president prominently pledged to revise the constitution in his 2012 campaign. The UNDP CRC project was designed to lend technical assistance (TA) in a non-partisan way to support inclusive and transparent review of the constitution and to maximize inputs into that process from stakeholders.

*Conclusions:* The CRC project had a conventional theory of change implicit to the ProDoc, which has been successful in guiding the UNDP project’s work with the CRC.

*Assess the level of civil society participation from conception to the submission of final report phase*

The UNDP CRC project engaged with Civil Society throughout the project’s lifespan through several mechanisms. The project worked with CSOs in the design of the project; in participation in the CRC; with the project’s grants process for public awareness and civic education; and through the CRC’s review processes of written comments and consultations. In the development of the project, the UNDP team consulted with civil society in the design of the project document. One civil society partner, CGG, also participated at SC meetings. Civil society leaders were prominent in the CRC itself; these civil society leaders, who represented key organisations in Sierra Leone, benefitted from the project’s work with CRC members and the secretariat. Civil society members also benefitted from the project’s work on communications and outreach, plus engagement with MPs and other key stakeholders. Civil society organisations were also prominent partners of the UNDP CRC project; the grants under Component 4 provided USD 661 k to six organisations for public awareness, civic education, and the management of public input into the CR process. Finally more than 150 civil society organisations and individuals submitted written comments and suggestions to the CRC. Of the 150 position papers listed in the bibliography of the final report (pages 583-590), 14 were submitted from political parties (some of which submitted more than one paper) and 80 appear to be from CSOs; CSOs benefitted from UNDP project support to the CRC and its sub-committees to manage, incorporate, and use these written comments in the production of the Final Report of the CRC.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP project was developed with consultations with all stakeholders, including civil society. The CRC project was able to work effectively with CSOs as partners in the implementation of activities to spread knowledge about CR. Civil society had many ways to insert their ideas and experience into constitutional reform processes.

***Design and Relevance***

Few partners, stakeholders, and beneficiaries interviewed had an understanding of the project design. Questions about design were only relevant for UNDP, development partners, and a few key partners that had an understanding of the whole project. Design focuses on the text of the Project Document and the understanding of staff, partners, and stakeholders up to and at the time of drafting and finalisation in 2013. As noted in limitations, this period is difficult to evaluate as there were few informants interviewed that were engaged with the project in 2013 or 2014. In addition, informants recalled events and understandings from 2013 and 2014 less well than more recent Project engagements. Relevance by contrast is a continuous process and question that does not depend on understanding the whole project and can focus on particular outcomes and activities; addressing relevance is less subject to the limitations with strong effects on relevance.

**Responds to real needs of beneficiaries**

CRC leaders, members, and Executive Secretariat (ES) staff interviewed appreciated that the design identified and addressed their needs for capacity building through Outputs 1 and 2 as well as the needs to have a communications strategy (Output 3), civic education, and public consultations (Output 5). CRC interviews also supported the use of civil society partners for civic education and public awareness (Output 4) and outreach to MPs, political parties, and traditional leaders (Output 6). CRC leaders, members, and the ES recognized that they needed support to be able to reach citizens across Sierra Leone to engage them in processes of constitutional reform.

UN, UNDP and development partners interviewed affirmed that the project’s design responded to the needs of Sierra Leone. The design that focused on making sure the CRC was fully operational through support for the CRC members and staff, developing and supporting as wide as possible civic education and participatory consultations on constitutional reform, and making sure that the process of constitutional reform benefitted from experiences with constitutional review around the world.

Most civil society and national institution partners interviewed did not know the project’s design. However they noted the importance of project activities to civic education overall, public consultations, and to the entire process of constitutional review; CSO interviews noted that their organisations were engaged in civic education, public consultations, and making submissions to the CRC both through the support of the UNDP project and via other or their own resources. The project responded to their needs for resources to engage the population with important although not large funding. CSO and national institution partners also recognized the need to capacitate CRC members and staff and for the CRC to do its own civic education and public consultations. Finally, CSO and national institutional partner interviewees validated the importance of reaching MPs and political parties through the project as the critical stakeholders for constitutional reform to move forward now that the CRC report is complete. Civil society and national institution partners however noted ways that the level of resources was not sufficient to allow them to reach as widely across Sierra Leone as they wanted; They were concerned about whether the project was able to respond adequately enough to the needs of citizens for information on CR and for a sufficiently wide range of ways to take citizen perspectives on CR into account in the CRC’s report.

*Conclusions*: While stakeholders, beneficiaries, and staff noted important ways that the UNDP CRC project responded to the needs of beneficiaries, concerns were noted that the efforts were not enough to provide citizens with sufficient information on CR across the entire country.

**Relevant and realistic outputs and outcomes**

Drafting of the ProDoc was challenging in the uncertain environment for funding from development partners. The budget envisioned of USD 4.1 million for the project was small; this established the need to set outputs and outcomes that were realistic given this level of resources. This also led to design and management decisions of what was feasible and realistic for project processes given this level of resources.

The project ambitiously was designed to support six outputs; all six were seen as necessary to achieve the outcome sought by the project: “Sierra Leone Constitutional Review Committee capacitated to have an expertly-led inclusive, transparent, participatory and peaceful process of constitutional reform.” Output 6, Capacity of MPs, Political Parties, and Traditional Leaders Strengthened was designed modestly sharing information about CRC processes and plans. It was not designed around what was required for the approval of a revised Constitution or the requirements for changing non-entrenched clauses of the Constitution through Parliament. These areas were seen by stakeholders as critical for the success of constitutional reform, but not critical for the finalisation of the Report of the CRC. In the final stages of the project, there was reportedly discussion about potentially working through the project to support the GoSL’s processes for moving constitutional reform forward following the submission of the Report of the CRC. However, UNDP and development partners agreed instead to have the UNDP CRC project conclude as intended with the completion and submission of the Report of the CRC.

*Conclusions*: The ProDoc outlined relevant, realistic outputs and outcomes for the UNDP CRC project. However some key stakeholders were concerned that the project had stopped with the production of a report, a realistic outcome, rather than continuing on to support the remaining GoSL processes for bringing a draft constitution to adoption through a successful referendum.

**Adequacy of analysis**

The recent analysis that Sierra Leone needed constitutional reform began with the drafting of the peace accord to end the civil war. Article X of the July 1999 Lome Peace Accord provided for amendment of the Constitution. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), established in 2002 also urged the Government of Sierra Leone to give “serious consideration” to the creation of a “new constitution”, in order to contribute to human rights. The previous SLPP government also recognized the need for Constitutional reform. This need led to the appointment of the Commission led by Peter Tucker and the report of that commission on constitutional reform in 2008. Constitutional reform was identified as a priority by President Koroma in 2012 during his campaign for re-election on the APC ticket.

The UN also had identified constitutional reform as a priority for Sierra Leone. UNIPSIL reportedly identified the need to support constitutional reform, as one of the three main areas that remained unaddressed in the country, in the processes around the closure of the Mission. The UN Technical Assessment Mission (TAM) in January 2013 identified the area as a priority and the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General in Sierra Leone and head of the UN Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone (UNIPSIL) briefed the UN Security Council on this priority in March 2013. UNIPSIL remained active in the processes of soliciting funding for the CRC Project and the development and implementation of the project until the end of the Mission at the end of March 2014.

President Koroma’s remarks opening the CRC process 30 July 2013 were seen as continuing evidence of this commitment to constitutional reform, as was the selection of the Ombudsman, a respected former High Court Judge and former Speaker of Parliament, as chair of the CRC. All of this analysis above featured in the Situation Analysis section of ProDoc, as did discussion of risks.

The risk log in the ProDoc was conventional and identified eight operational, financial, and political/strategic risks. These risks were seen to exist by the few interviewees that knew of the risk log. However the risks that the CRC process could be completed but the review not be turned into a White Paper for discussion by the Cabinet, not be discussed in Parliament, and/or not put to a referendum were not included in versions of the log in 2014; these risks were however discussed explicitly in the 2016 annual report. Unsurprisingly, no one anticipated the potential for an unprecedented epidemic of disease to change and delay project processes and timelines. The political risk could have been noted (and was noted in the ProDoc to have happened for the previous 2007 Peter Tucker report that reviewed the constitution at the time of the SLPP government). Development partners were not confident that the risks faced by the project were continually assessed by UNDP throughout implementation as discussion of risks and the risk log were informal rather than formal through the use and updating of the log.

*Conclusions*: CR rested on Sierra Leone’s analysis of the civil war and issues with the Constitution of Sierra Leone, as well as the efforts of the current and previous government. The UNDP project was designed from this base of analysis as well, plus specific analyses done by UNDP for the project development process. The base of analysis was adequate for the project.

**Use of existing capacity**

The CRC project was seen to have been designed to use the existing capacity of the CRC as well as the capacity of civil society, the media, Parliament, and traditional authorities. As a project with a small budget, the CRC project focused on using, strengthening, and complementing existing national institutions and their capacity to support constitutional reform. The project used both UN and government institutions at low cost; for example supporting LTAs from the AGOs office for legal support and using national UNVs to augment the capacity of the ES. The CRC project provided grants to the stronger national CSOs and state institutions that had the capacity to execute their awards. The project partnered other organisations to build complementarities when there were concerns about capacity; this built on the strengths of organisations such as OXFAM and 50/50 rather than expending resources to build capacity.

*Conclusions*: The project was developed to use existing capacity in the CRC and within civil society to develop and manage the engagement of citizens in constitutional review.

**Existence of gaps in the CRC process that the Project filled**

The project was designed in a comprehensive way in collaboration with the GoSL so that the project used UNDP funding and resources to fill gaps in GoSL processes. The GoSL committed to supporting the CRC and provided the authority for the Committee as well as staff for the Executive Secretariat. Plus the GoSL committed to more than USD 1 million to support the project. The balance of the USD 4.1 million project was provided by development partners through the project to fill the gaps that had been identified in the ProDoc: the need to capacitate CRC leaders and members, increase the capacity of the Executive Secretariat, conduct civic education and public consultations as the CRC and through CSOs and national institutions, and outreach to key decision makers in Parliament and political parties.

*Conclusions*: The UNDP CRC project was able to fill gaps in the CRC’s processes through the project. The project was able to help bring more transparent and inclusive processes to the work of the CRC and extend the reach of the CRC across the country. The project filled gaps in GoSL processes

**Clarity, realism and likely achievability of objectives**

The objectives for the project were determined by the TAM and spelled out in the Project Document. These objectives were seen by staff and development partners, the only groups familiar with the ProDoc, as clear but ambitious. Discussions in 2017 suggested the time line for the CR process outlined by the President for the CRC with March 2015 as the target for a final report was ambitious; by committing to support the process and this timeline, the UNDP CRC project committed itself to this ambitious timeline. With the state of emergency changing what was possible in civic engagement, an extension of the CRC logically let the SC to extend the UNDP project supporting the CRC. The achievement of the objectives of the outputs set out in the project document suggest that the objectives were realistic.

*Conclusions*: The UNDP CRC project developed outputs that were seen as achievable and realistic. Discussion continued at various stages of the project about whether and how the project should consider additional outputs and how the project might be able work more towards approval of a new constitution rather than conclude after the presentation of the Report of the CRC to the President.

**Appropriateness and usefulness of indicators and means of verification**

Only project staff and development partners were familiar with the indicators for the project in the ProDoc and reported on in the 2014 and 2015 Annual Reports. The means of verification for these indicators was project reporting. Indicators do not seem to have been used for the 2016 annual report. While numerical indicators could have been developed and used, instead the project reported on qualitative indicators. On the one hand, this tendency was positive; rather than reporting 18 for the number of community radio stations engaged, the status of indictors was reported on more broadly to explain how often stations used project-supported content. On the other hand, the project did not measure or report on some indicators, such as “% of CRC members (male/female) satisfied with the quality and support provided by the secretariat staff.” The timeline in the ProDoc ambitiously included a White Paper for discussion by the Cabinet and the drafting of the text of a proposed Constitution (page 26). This goal was not expressed as an indicator.

*Conclusions*: It was not clear that the CRC project used indicators in a systematic way for management. The main source of indicators remained project reporting. The different objectives put into the timeline in the ProDoc contributed to confusion about what the proper end-goal of the project should or would be.

**Identification of external factors and assumptions**

The analysis in the ProDoc did recognize the political and strategic context of Sierra Leone and was explicit about the risks the project and CRC process faced. The updating of the risk log in the 2016 Annual Report was comprehensive and outlined the risks the project and broader CRC processes faced at the end of the year.

*Conclusions*: The UNDP CRC project document identified factors outside of the project that might have effects on the project. The measurement and monitoring of these risks once identified however not become a part of processes to remedy these risks.

**Stakeholder commitment**

The main partners of the CRC project, the members and staff of the CRC itself, were committed to delivering on the President’s charge to the CRC: the delivery of a comprehensive final report that reviewed the 1991 Constitution in light of the Peter Tucker Report and the views of citizens. This led to strong partner commitment by most members and staff. The CRC decided to continue during the EVD epidemic as a way to maintain momentum towards CR; this demonstrated the commitment of CRC members to CR. The key stakeholders for the project were the GoSL, civil society, and the people of Sierra Leone. The GoSL was committed to the CRC process, and funded and supported the process as needed, including extending its lifespan. The commitment of the GoSL to a White Paper for discussion by the Cabinet, for discussion in Parliament, and to put a new Constitution to a referendum is not clear. Civil society organizations also demonstrated their interest and commitment in pressing on with CR.

*Conclusions*: Key stakeholders of the CRC, who were also the key stakeholders of the UNDP project, were committed to the process of Constitutional Reform for Sierra Leone.

**Sustainability strategy in design**

UNDP, CRC, and partner staff noted that the UNDP CRC project was not designed to be sustainable. The point of the CRC project was to support the conclusion of a process: the review of the constitution by the CRC in a transparent and inclusive manner. The project planned to conclude with the production and dissemination of a report of the CRC, fulfilling the mandate of the Committee. In the final stages of the UNDP CRC project, DFID discussed with UNDP whether the project should consider supporting additional GoSL processes that moved beyond the production and dissemination of the CRC’s report. However, DFID and UNDP decided to continue with the plan developed in the ProDoc and wrap up the project as planned after the production of the Report of the CRC.

*Conclusions*: The design and implementation of the project considered ways to support sustainability, although not in an explicit manner.

***Achievements and Implementation and Development Effectiveness***

**Results**

UNDP documents and staff emphasized that the project had reached all of its output targets; development partners, while noting that the project had reached all of its output targets, felt that the CRC project had only reached the outcome level results intended to some extent. This difference in emphasis again revolves around the issue of how proper it was to have the project conclude with a comprehensive report which completed the mandate of the CRC rather than continuing the work as needed until the approval of a new constitution through a referendum.

CRC leaders, members, and ES staff interviewed were pleased with the results of the project, but did not focus on the achievements of particular outputs. Instead all emphasized the ways the project had worked with them. Civil society and national institution partners interviewed were not conversant with the whole project and outputs; they focused on the fact that they had reached their output and outcome goals funded through the CRC grants. They also focused on their successful engagement in the CRC process and roles strengthening, synthesizing, and submitting views on constitutional reform in conjunction with beneficiaries of their work with the CRC project and other stakeholders that work with their organisations.

**Aspects with greatest achievements**

UNDP interviews emphasized the achievements of supporting the CRC process and internal workings; After appointment at end July 2013, the CRC was said to have been largely inactive until the arrival of the CTA in December which led to project approval and activities beginning in January 2014.The major achievement of the CRC itself is fulfilling its charge: presenting a Final Report reviewing the constitution that is a product of a wide, open, and inclusive process of consultations across Sierra Leone. CRC leaders, members, and ES staff interviewed emphasized this achievement. Third, civil society and national institution partners interviewed noted the successes of their outreach and civic education efforts; they noted the importance of working with civil society as well as GoSL institutions for the UN and how these channels lead to wide discussion and dissemination of knowledge. Civil society informants also noted the value in using CSOs to gather and organize public comment on CR, including specific recommendations for the CRC.

Planned commitments to some Outputs were quite large; expectations for achievements should also be substantial, such as expending USD 842 k towards a civil society led civic education process. However the difficult terrain of the country – in terms of both physical geography and human geography – makes outreach extremely challenging, as does the diverse set of partners awarded resources and different methods that they used. Interviews noted that the project was successful in making this process of constitutional review more inclusive and participatory than any other review in the history of the country.

*Conclusions*: More substantial outputs were achieved by the UNDP CRC project through the outreach to the public through CSOs and in the project’s work with CRC members and staff over the sustained period of time needed to draft and finalize the Report.

**Areas with fewer achievements**

Smaller amounts of funding allocated to some outputs led to achievements that are also relatively small. USD 112 thousand toward Output 6 meant that engagement with MPs, Political Parties (beyond their members that were CRC members), and outreach to Paramount chiefs was modest; the UNDP CRC project also has fewer achievements to report under this objective. Project staff,

CSO staff, and CRC members noted that working with Paramount chiefs was particularly challenging. This challenge came from a number of different reasons. These issues included the geography of the country, which meant that most Paramount chiefs that were CRC members were from outside of Freetown and the Western Area. This inhibited their ability to participate in the CRC. The different levels of knowledge of Paramount chiefs that were members of the CRC relative to the understanding of CR held by many other CRC members were also reported to be a challenge. Outreach to Paramount chiefs that were not members was also challenging, both by the CRC and its civil society partners; geography and limited knowledge and education were also the challenges that made outreach to Paramount chiefs difficult in sensitizing chiefs about the process and soliciting comments from paramount Chiefs. Paramount Chiefs did engage in the CRC process. The Council of Paramount Chiefs and two chiefdoms made position paper submissions to the CRC, The head of the Council served in the CRC and on a sub-committee until eventually stopping attending (and not signing the final report); another chief remained engaged as an SLPP member of the CRC.

Political parties remained engaged with the CRC throughout the review process. Registered political parties had the largest numbers of representatives on the CRC, with six each for the SLPP and APC, and for members each for the other registered political parties. These members were expected to work for the CRC but also to represent the interests of their parties and their members in the CRC. However, CRC leaders and project staff noted that the CRC members from the parties were not the most prominent party members. CRC leaders and project staff pointed out the limited engagement of these members with their parties led to challenges near the end of the CRC process, as some key political parties objected to a few recommendations of the CRC. These objections were seen as basically driven by one party, which then aligned the other parties behind them in support. The CRC managed this late set of objections by eight political parties to the CRC’s recommendations by adding Section 22 to the CRC Report- an addendum “Some comments from political parties” that thus included their comments and objections in the report.

*Conclusions*: Fewer achievements appear to have been achieved in the projects work with MPs and with Paramount Chiefs as the CRC did not hold consultation meetings at the Chiefdom level due to financial constraints and timeframe issues.

**Collaboration between participating organisations**

UNDP and UN Women noted ways that they collaborated in project implementation; UN Women brought additional resources from other sources to support popularization and additional inputs into discussion of CR. CRC leaders and members interviewed emphasized that through their roles as leaders of organisations, the project’s work with them supported institutions. As representatives of organisations, CRC members noted that they had responsibilities to represent the interests of their organisations and networks in CR.

Civil society and national institution partners interviewed had limited knowledge of the work done by the UNDP CRC project with other partners. CSOs and government organisations basically knew only of their own activities under their grants, not what other CSOs were doing to support CR. Some grantees however were already heavily collaborating: the grant to Society for Democratic Initiative (SDI) for example went to support the activities of a broader group of CSOs, the Coalition for Constitutional Change (CCC).

*Conclusions*: The UNDP CRC project had systematic ways of collaborating with partner institutions in the UN family and with civil society.

**Stakeholder engagement and ownership in implementation**

The UNCP CRC project employed a range of stakeholders in the implementation of project activities. UNDP interviews emphasized the collaboration with CRC leaders in implementation and the partnership with committed CSOs through the grants process. These partnerships they noted brought in substantive rich comments relevant to CR as well as a wide range of different ways to raise public awareness of CR and foster discussion of a new constitution for Sierra Leone. Civil society and national institution partners interviewed appreciated the opportunity to partner with UNDP and support CR; all saw constitutional reform as core to their mandates as organisations. The ideas for how to support the CRC process came from and were owned by these organisations, who then implemented these ideas with project-provided resources.

*Conclusions*: The project worked through CRC processes to engage government and civil society partners in the implementation of the CRC project. Both of these types of stakeholders were encouraged to continue to participate in engagement with stakeholders.

***Effectiveness of Management Arrangements and Efficiency of Resource Use***

**Strategic allocation of resources**

The UNDP CRC project was managed by the CTA with the support of the Country Office under the supervision of the Country Director. The project held seven steering committee meetings to manage the project; SC meetings included development partners, the CRC, and a representative of civil society. The SC process was used to modify funding levels between components modestly, including to increase the resources to civil society. The SC process was also used to extend the period of implementation as the CRC itself was extended by the President.

The ProDoc allocated resources across the six outputs for an 18 month project. As the CRC project was extended to provide support with the lengthier time frame for the CRC itself due to the EVD outbreak, the resources that remained were stretched over this longer time period (through May 2017). The use of more resources in the early stages of the CRC process when implementing an 18 month project left the project with fewer resources to use in its latter years. More substantial resources may have gone into the dissemination of information about the CRC and soliciting information, as well as disseminating the draft CRC report. By the time the President had accepted the CRC Report, few resources remained in the project to support the dissemination of the Final Report or to make the final report was accessible to most people in the country. Few in Sierra Leone would read a 680 page report in English even if they had access to the report. A more strategic allocation of resources over time may have left additions funds available to produce accessible final versions of the report and resources to support widespread popularization of the main recommendations of the CRC through radio and other means that can reach rural areas and illiterate populations in Sierra Leone. CSOs also noted that their ongoing advocacy efforts and continued work on constitutional reform was more difficult without access to a printed copy of the CRC’s Final Report. Other organisations sought more accessible summaries for use with their stakeholders in addition to full text reports for their own use.

*Conclusions*: With the major changes to the timeframe for the UNDP CRC Project as needed to manage CR in the EVD epidemic, the allocation of resources was stretched and may have become less strategic, with lower levels of funds available to support the latter stages of printing, disseminating, and sensitizing people about the final report of the CRC.

**Efficiency of resource use**

UNDP interviews noted both ways that the project had used resources efficiently as well as some inefficiencies in project performance. UNDP appears to have followed the required procedures and processes of the organisation; the project will be audited in June 2017 to assess this. That the CTA had to manage all administrative matters as well as all technical aspects of support was seen as a shortcoming by some UNDP interviewees that noted how often heavy operational responsibilities did not allow the CTA to focus on the technical aspects of supporting CRC processes. A stronger support staff could have led to more efficient use of technical assistance. The ways that the project provided human resources to support the CRC through LTAs and UNVs was seen as a low cost way to inject quality staff support (thus efficient).

CRC leaders and members were supportive of the ways the project had operated, which they assessed as efficient. ES staff interviewed lauded the gains from working with UNDP-provided staff, which helped the CRC operate more effectively. This they also viewed as efficient.

Civil society and national institution partners interviewed noted that the UNDP had to follow rigorous international procedures and policies. While some saw this as inefficient, they understood that these rules and regulations were UNDP requirements under DIM. Partners did not note delays in receipt of tranches of grant funding or that any delays affected their project implementation.

In terms of value for money, UNDP staff noted ways that the CRC project worked to minimise costs while maximizing outputs, thus being more efficient and effective. The UNDP CRC project chose to work with a single broadcaster for some television content that could be simulcast over the radio as well rather than produce separate content for radio. Radio was recognized to be the way to reach the largest audience possible across the country, especially in rural areas, but television was also seen as important to reach key urban populations most active in constitutional review. The simulcast approach allowed one program to reach both types of audiences, as well as much larger audiences, with minimal additional costs. This approach was seen as good value for money. Radio shows were also repeated more often by stations on their own initiative; this allowed programming to reach larger audiences at no additional cost. The UNDP CRC project also chose not to print many – or any - copies of some products. For example, materials on constitutional reviews from other countries were disseminated via computerized cards rather than in hard copy as a cost saving measure. The types of people that sought this quantity of information were more likely to have access to computers than most people in Sierra Leone. There was thus not to be a substantial demand for these materials in hard copy not being met among people who did not have computer access.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP CRC project worked with the CRC on the processes the Commission had to have to operate effectively; these were also pursued as more efficient. The projecthad ways to minimize costs while striving for outputs that can be considered efficient; value for money was considered in developing these approaches. Efficiency criteria and the small size of the project encouraged the use of low-cost alternatives in the project, such as national UNVs, rather than professional staff.

**Timeliness of funding and activities**

UNDP, other UN, and development partners interviewed recognized challenges with the timeliness of activities. The EVD changed the type of activities and the timing of what the project and CRC could do in the field. After completing a draft report and later the final report on the CRC’s work, the CRC and UNDP project had to wait for three or four months Presidential acceptance of these reports before moving on to the next activities in the work plan. These processes led to longer delays in implementing the project.

Other than the postponement of activities under grants during the state of emergency, civil society and national institution partners interviewed did not note that they were affected by any delays in receiving funds from the UNDP project or that they had any other delays in their activities.

*Conclusions*: The project was delayed by the EVD and in waiting for the acceptance of the draft and final reports of the CRC by the President.

**Political, technical and administrative support from national partners**

The project design, documents, and interviews for the CRC project evaluation identified ways that the UNDP project received political, technical, and administrative support from national partners. The GoSL committed itself to supporting CR with the formation of the CRC; the GoSL pledged resources to the CRC through the signature of the AGO on the Project Document. These resources supported the CRC in ways that were similar to the ways that UNDP used donor and UN resources to support the CRC.

Some political support to the project was provided through PPRC work with the political parties and associations. Members nominated by the registered political parties in the country made up the largest number of CRC members. The PPRC worked with the parties and these members. Party disagreements rose at the end of the process, and led to the compromise position of including addendums at the end of the CRC Final Report from seven political parties.

National partners supported the work of the CRC project as partners; this support came from beneficiaries like CRC members as well as from civil society and national organisations that were grantees of the UNDP project. Their technical capacity was used to reach the people through the mass media (SLBC and its network) as well as through grass roots activism, particularly outside of Freetown.

*Conclusions*: The GoSL provided political, technical and administrative support for the CRC. CSOs were also able to provide support for sensitizing the public about the process of CR, the draft report, and circulation of public comments on CR.

**UNDP value added**

UNDP have a strong comparative advantage to support the constitutional review process as a trusted partner and neutral broker in Sierra Leone since the end of the war. A strong “One UN” approach is been instituted in support of this Project to ensure that the UN’s longstanding engagement across sectors can be leveraged for the benefit of this Project. Bilateral partners saw ways that the UN’s multilateral status was a benefit in programme approval and implementation in political areas like constitutional review.

CRC leaders, members, and ES staff noted that a benefit of the UNDP was the ability of the organisation to bring knowledge of other countries and their experiences with CR to the CRC, or to manage study trips for key CRC counterparts. The CRC also appreciated the ability of UNDP to mobilize additional staff for the CRC through UNVs and other mechanisms.

Civil society and national institution partners interviewed most valued the ability of the UNDP to provide grants; partners also appreciated information sharing about CR, which they sought to be engaged in. CSOs whether partners or not valued the UNDP project’s support for convening open and inclusive CRC meetings and processes. Even when meetings were sometimes viewed as not open to some stakeholders, determined activists nevertheless reported ways that they had included themselves in CRC meetings that were project supported.

*Conclusions*: UNDP value-added was recognized by development and national partners of the project. Neutrality and the ability to broker support as well as provide international and national expertise as well as resources were the most noted ways that the UNDP was seen to add value to the CRC process.

**Gender and human rights in implementation**

Gender and human rights were incorporated into project design and used in implementation. Partners were selected in civil society to emphasize work on women and human rights; UN Women also maintained an emphasis on reaching women and addressing issues that were a priority for women in Sierra Leone in the CR process. The UNDP CRC project did not develop systematic procedures to focus on gender and human rights in the CRC’s operations. However, CRC and leaders members, particularly those from women’s organisations and human rights groups, kept a focus on these issues in CRC processes.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP CRC project mainstreamed human rights approaches and gender into implementation; most attention to these issues was through UN Women and CSO partners that focused on these areas.

**Monitoring performance**

While UNDP interviewees felt that appraisals and information flowed readily to development partners at the initiative of the CTA, development partners asserted felt that they instead received information more slowly than they would have preferred and often had to ask – or ask repeatedly – for information from the UNDP CRC project. Annual reports were produced that summarized project activities and performance. DFID and the EUD reportedly received quarterly narrative and financial reports as needed for their monitoring and evaluation. As noted in monitoring performance above, some development partners would have preferred more substantial and frequent information sharing from the project.

The project was seen to have developed strong connections with UNDP Country Directors. However it was not clear how the project engaged with the Country Office as a whole, with the Governance Office, or with other related UNDP projects such as the electoral cycle project.

The UNDP CRC project’s civil society partners noted ways that the project had monitored their activities under their grants. Civil society partners noted the engagement of the CTA and participation or observation of their activities by UNDP staff.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP CRC project monitored civil society partner activities funded by grants of the project. Development partners at times were not satisfied with the level of information sharing by the UNDP CRC project outside of the regular processes of reporting.

**Documentation and dissemination of knowledge**

A core part of the work of the UNDP CRC project was to support knowledge dissemination about CR and to support the content of CR with the CRC. The CRC project produced the newsletters for the CRC and other documentation that it posted on the CRC’s website. The project facilitated the work of the CRC so these products focused on the work of the CRC rather than the contributions of the project to the work of the CRC.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP CRC project supported the communications and information dissemination of the CRC, particularly through electronic methods. This outreach was stronger at earlier stages of the project than with the Final Report of the CRC.

***Impact and Sustainability***

**Contribution to the stabilization of Sierra Leone and democracy**

The contribution of the UNDP CRC project at its close in May 2017 to stabilization and democracy in Sierra Leone was not seen to be final at this point. UNDP, other UN agencies, and development partners interviewed noted that the processes supported by the project were important for stabilization and democracy in the ways that they supported an inclusive process of civic education, public discussion, and public consultation of the Constitution. This was in contrast to the lack of public input in constitutional design throughout the history of the country, including in the 2007 Peter Tucker four-month review process. The open and transparent CRC process was seen as an important precedent for how things should be done in Sierra Leone. However, development partners and UN staff focused on the uncertain prospects for constitutional reform going forward that will determine whether and when Sierra Leone goes to a referendum and/or makes changes non-entrenched clauses through Parliament. CRC members, civil society leaders, UN staff, and development partners were also concerned about how reflective a White Paper, Cabinet and Parliamentary debate, and the text of a new constitution would be of the recommendations of the Report of the CRC. All of these processes depend on the GoSL and are outside of the management of the CRC, UN, CSOs, and development partners.

CRC leaders, members, and ES staff interviewed were proud of their contributions to the CRC process and appreciated the support of the CRC project, which they recognized was critical to their achievements. All the while, however, they focused on the uncertainty that remains about the adoption of a new constitution for the country. They noted the importance of many provisions suggested for a new Constitution in the Final Report of the CRC for a more stable, just Sierra Leone.

*Conclusions:* The UNDP CRC project contributed substantially to the CRC’s processes that stakeholders and partners noted were valuable contributions to the stabilization of Sierra Leone and democracy in the country. However most informants focused on the expected contribution to stability and democracy of an approved Constitution informed by the CRC Report as the contribution they sought that would stabilize Sierra Leone and democracy in the country.

**Sustainability of capacity building**

Views on sustainability also focused on whether and how the CRC’s recommendations would be reflected in constitutional amendments and/or a new constitution. UNDP, other UN agencies, and development partners interviewed did not feel that the goals of the project were to build sustainable capacity on constitutional review or sustainable capacity in this CRC. As a temporary body, they noted that its sustainability was never a goal or aspiration. Instead the impact of the project was the goal – an inclusive and transparent process of constitutional review. While there are hopes that the processes and lessons of this process contribute to more inclusive and transparent processes in other areas, this was never a goal of the project or an expected outcome.

CRC leaders, members, and ES staff interviewed were proud of their work on constitutional review and praised the project’s support for the capacity they needed to lead a more inclusive and transparent processes and bring the process of constitutional reform to the point of a Final CC Report. Their concerns about the future where not about sustainability but impact – whether the process and recommendations of the CRC would be adequately included in the government processes needed now to get to a new constitution (the drafting of a Government White Paper, cabinet discussion of the paper and approval, parliamentary discussion and approval, the text of a Constitutional amendments and/or a draft Constitution, voter education on the draft Constitution, and a successful referendum leading to passage of the new Constitution).

Civil society and national institution partners interviewed noted that the project was not designed to support their capacity and thus did not focus on sustainability or capacity development. However some partners felt that nevertheless implementing awards from the UNDP CRC process had strengthened their institutions and build their capacity in the course of executing project activities. CSOs interviewed noted how this work which supported their organisations’ missions raised their profiles and thus also supported their sustainable engagement with society in constitutional reform. All of the CRC project’s partners interviewed continued to be engaged in the process of constitutional reform and asserted that they would continue to work towards a new constitution for Sierra Leone that reflected the wishes of the people and their organisations’ interests as one of their key mandates or goals. The NCD, CCC, CGG as organisations are sustainable through the work of their members, the support of other funders, and GoSL resources for national institutions.

*Conclusions:* Although the UNDP CRC project did not focus on sustainability, the processes supported by the project have some lasting positive impacts on partners in the CRC and civil society. These processes did strengthen the profiles and capacity of CRC members and the UNDP project’s partners.

**Sustainability in implementation**

UNDP, other UN agencies, and development partners interviewed noted ways that issues of sustainability were raised in implementation. CRC leaders, members, and ES staff interviewed felt that sustainability was reflected in the project’s emphasis on working with nationals of Sierra Leone; the people engaged in the CRC would continue to work on constitutional reform with greater knowledge, stronger networks, and/or greater skills as a result of the CRC project. They also noted the important decision that the CRC and the project would continue to work even during the state of emergency in order to not lose momentum in the constitutional review process. Adapting to consult with MDAs as a feasible way to continue the CRC’s work during the EVD period was seen as smart because it kept momentum. This was seen as supportive of sustainability, as well as of the completion of the CRC’s work. Some members sought to continue on rather than have the completion of the CRC report the end of the Committee; these CRC members wanted to keep working as a Committee to take Sierra Leone all the way through the processes needed for a successful referendum on a new constitution.

Civil society and national institution partners interviewed noted that their engagement early in the project supported their engagement later; thus the 2014 grants to support civic education and public consultation contributed to their later engagement in commenting on and synthesizing comments on the recommendations coming from the CRC process as well as consultations and debate on recommendations to the CRC by and through their organisations.

*Conclusions:* While sustainability was not a focus of the UNDP CRC project, the ways that the project used national capacity supported sustainability as did project practices that continued to engage the same partners in discussion of CR over a prolonged period of time.

**Durability of results**

UNDP, other UN agencies, and development partners interviewed were concerned about whether the results of the CRC’s processes and the draft would endure. This was specifically a concern about whether a new Constitution would emerge from the GoSL processes and whether this new constitution would accurately reflect the work and recommendations of the CRC. CRC leaders, members, and ES staff interviewed were also concerned about the impact of their work (done with the support of the project, which they noted was essential to their successes). In the last few weeks of the UNDP CRC project, the materials from the CRC need to be catalogued and archived so that they are potentially of use (beyond the interim and final reports, and other published products from the UNDP project). The skeleton staff remaining in the ES in May 2017 was thought of as challenged by these tasks. Links with the AGO’s office needed further development to transfer the most relevant records to that office so that they may inform the drafting of the White Paper and potential draft Constitution and/or amendments.

Civil society and national institution partners interviewed also noted concerns about the durability of results; the issue was the same: would the GoSL choose to proceed with the drafting of a White Paper, Cabinet review, legal drafting, Parliamentary review, and a referendum – and if so … when? Many civil society leaders sought to keep the spirit of the CR alive while focusing for now on the national 2018 elections. Other leaders had heard or expected that a referendum might be held in September 2017. While this would keep CR moving, they were concerned that the lack of public awareness and civic education would leave the public unable to participate in the referendum with adequate knowledge.

*Conclusions:* The durability of the recommendations in the Report of the CRC remains uncertain and depends on GoSL processes.

**Replication and scaling up**

As addressed through the evaluation, replication and scaling up refer to the approaches used by the UNDP CRC project - not the replication and scaling up of Constitutional reform in Sierra Leone. UN and UNDP interviews and development partners that addressed questions of replication and scaling up felt that the inclusive and transparent approaches used through the CRC project could be continued by project partners and used in other areas of activity, not just for constitutional reform. National partners used the approaches of the project to spread information and have more transparent, open dialogue on CR. The partners could extend these approaches to other issue areas and could scale up these approaches if provided with the resources to do so. However national partners noted that their organisations did not have substantial capacity as organisations to carry out this work. And CSO leaders reported that replication and scaling up largely depended on resource availability; without resources replication would be limited and civic education and public consultations would remain limited.

CRC leaders, members, and ES staff interviewed sought ways to continue to support the stabilization and democratization of the country through civic education, dialogue, public consultations, and the media and sought the resources to do so through their organisations (as CRC members were selected by national institutions). Civil society and national institution partners interviewed noted that they wanted to do more towards constitutional reform but needed funding to do so.

Both CRC members and the UNDP CRC project’s organisational partners noted that they would continue to be engaged in the process of constitutional reform with or without resources – but asserted that they would have limited ability to conduct activities without funding. This would not be scaling up. Engagement would be modest and limited to participating in existing networks, dialogues, and media events, which they do as a matter of course as a key part of their mandates. Engagement could also be continued through activities supported by other donor-funded projects.

*Conclusions:* The ability to replicate and scale up efforts supported by the UNDP CRC project after the project concludes was seen by CRC members and CSOs as a question of the ability of CRC members and the project’s CSO partners to continue to operate in the area of reform through transparent and open processes. CRC members and the project’s CSO partners asserted that they would continue to use these methods and processes, but would be hampered in their ability to scale these techniques up by limited organisational capacity and limited funding.

**4. LESSONS LEARNED**

Developing lessons learned was one of the specific objectives of the evaluation. The TOR noted that the evaluation should examine “*earning lessons and deepening the understanding of how the CRC project was designed, set up, managed and delivered. The evaluation will generate useful lessons especially on the design, management and quality of results generated by the project for improving the quality of similar and future initiatives.”* Prominent lessons learned that emerged from the evaluation’s methods include the following.

**Critical support for constitutional reform can be provided with limited funds**

UNDP Sierra Leone thought a modest-sized project provided important support to increase the transparency and inclusiveness of constitutional reform. Increased awareness, knowledge, and participation in constitutional reform can be supported through national institutions via a relatively small dedicated UNDP project.

**Institutionalise beyond individuals**

The UNDP CRC project was relatively small in scale, and very small in staffing. The continuity of the single CTA over three and a half years of project implementation was impressive and critical to project success. However, detailed knowledge of project processes and outputs was limited beyond the CTA. UNDP needs to institutionalise beyond individuals; UNDP needs to develop systematic ways to share knowledge and information rather than depend on individuals. Projects cannot count on this kind of continuity; UNDP should develop ways that make knowledge held in the institution rather than by key individual managers within it. This would also increase the potential to work fruitfully across projects on shared initiatives.

**Projects should retain flexibility**

The CRC project was managed in ways that enabled adjustments in priorities and timing. Although the project had a detailed ProDoc, with funding proscribed down to the sub-output level, and an expected lifespan of 18 months, UNDP and project management were able to work with project partners and development partners to manage much more flexibly to keep momentum and have a longer life as was required to support the CRC’s efforts under prevailing conditions in Sierra Leone. The efforts of the Country Office and CTA and the understanding and support of development partners was essential to stretch out and modify project processes to keep the momentum of the CRC process alive during the EVD outbreak and during periods where the CRC was awaiting actions to be taken by the President.

**Modest size and goals of projects can lead to some dissatisfaction**

The design and funding of the UNDP CRC project was always likely to lead to questions of whether this effort at assistance was sufficient to reach the broader goals of the CR process. A modestly sized project and 18 month effort to popularize constitutional reform and gather feedback across Sierra Leone on interest group and popular perspectives on what the content of constitutional reform should be was always going to face issues of whether this effort was sufficiently transparent and inclusive, given the size of the country, low rates of civic engagement, limited literacy, and difficulties with travel and communications. These challenges were compounded with the extension of the time period for the project due to the EVD epidemic without the injection of more resources. Stakeholders could and did have some disagreements about whether the goal of the ProDoc, a completed transparent and inclusively produced CRC report, was sufficient or whether the project should have been designed or continue on until a referendum leads to a new Constitution for the country.

**Political projects have political risks**

Finally, it is important to remember that the fundamental law of the land – the constitution – is a political document and results from a set of political processes that differ in all countries. The UN and UNDP need to explicitly recognize and consider these political processes in the decision making to engage in and support constitutional reform. Support for constitutional reform has inherently political risks. Technical assistance and capacity building may not be what is needed for constitutional reform to reach the final stages of approval and referendum. The UN and UNDP should also be prepared to engage politically to support the technical assistance provided through projects like the CRC project in Sierra Leone.

**5. RECOMMENDATIONS**

One of the main objectives of evaluation was to m*ake clear and focused recommendations that may be required in future.* Recommendations were both solicited directly through individual interviews and come out of lessons learned and conclusions from the evaluation’s fieldwork. As with lessons learned, recommendations made here based on interviews and small group discussions were broadly held and triangulated with the evaluation’s fieldwork. Recommendations emerged on next steps on constitutional reform, for UNDP projects in the country, and for other UNDP efforts that support constitutional review in other countries.

**Next Steps on Constitutional Reform**

With the Report of the CRC submitted to the President at the end of January 2017, the charge of the CRC is nearly over. The CRC has been closing, with the Secretariat down substantially in number and the Committee and sub-Committees no longer meeting. The UNDP project ceased at the end of May 2017.

The CRC has fulfilled the President’s charge to the Committee, and the project its outcome of supporting the delivery of a transparently prepared and inclusive CRC report. However, the prospects for subsequent processes going forward to get a new Constitution for Sierra Leone drafted, discussed, and approved remain uncertain.

Next steps recommended include some measures that recognize and reward CRC members and their partners for their years of work towards a new Constitution for Sierra Leone. Beneficiaries and stakeholders saw this ceremony as a GoSL responsibility that would wrap up the CRC’s work properly. **UNDP should participate in the planning and arrangements for a Government-led ceremonial end to the CRC process in a culturally appropriate way**. Participation in another ceremony at the conclusion of the CRC process may also increase the prospects for the passage of the new constitution later.

The CRC also needs to finish the process of cataloging and archiving records of the CRC’s processes. These records are important because of the emphasis CRC members and civil society put on the idea that the next constitution should accurately reflect the will of the people expressed through the CRC. Without records, it cannot be clear enough what the will of the people was; clear records are needed so that civil society and former CRC members can check and verify whether and how any new constitution put forth addresses the recommendations of the people put forward through the CRC. **UNDP should consider supporting the CRC’s archiving and knowledge management to help people in Sierra Leone examine and check whether the CRC’s recommendations are adequately incorporated into the GoSL’s processes of constitutional reform, potentially through a modest continuing effort with development partner support.**

**The UN, development partners, and civil society should continue to advocate for processes that might lead to a new constitution and keep the focus on the next steps needed for constitutional reform that incorporate the recommendations of the CRC to go forward**: a White Paper from the Government, discussion and approval of the White Paper by the Cabinet, a draft of a new Constitution, and discussion and support for the draft in Parliament (through two readings). A CRC ceremony can also be used as a contribution to advocacy for these steps. The new Constitution would then need the support of the people through a referendum, which in turn would require substantial civic education on the constitution to inform voters ahead of the referendum. **UNDP, through the support of development partners, GoSL, and civil society should consider supporting substantial civic education efforts in the run up to any constitutional referendum to assist citizens with making an informed vote in a referendum.**

CRC leaders and members as well as civil society partners in Freetown and the provinces expressed concerns that the processes that led to the Final Report of the CRC should not end with the publication of the report. Additional work is needed to produce accessible content on the conclusions and recommendations of the CRC to share widely with key stakeholders and the population of Sierra Leone. **The GoSL should take steps to summarize and popularize the findings of the CRC.** This needs to be more accessible than the full 680 page English-language report. Brief, accessible written summaries are needed as are simple radio and television messages and debates. Ways to simplify findings and discuss these to reach regional and non-literate audiences are needed; these could be on the model of the successful debates and discussions done by the CRC project through television and radio simulcasts. Summarizing and popularizing now falls outside of Project as closing. **UNDP, with the support of development partners, should consider supporting GoSL and civil society efforts to summarize and widely popularize the findings of the CRC.**

The UN, development partners, and civil society need to continue to be politically engaged to continue the momentum towards the development and adoption of a new constitution. **UN leaders, development partners, and civil society leaders should to continue to advocate for debate and discussion of the CRC’s recommendations through GoSL processes**

**Projects in Sierra Leone**

UNDP should consider and develop ways to manage knowledge and institutionalize connections across Projects to utilize complementarities across initiatives. **UNDP should develop a system for developing, sharing, and storing project and country-office products**. Now UNDP project have areas of work that complement each other. But these connections, such as between the CRC project and the past and current electoral cycle project, are personal and depend on personal relationships across CTAs. Information is also compartmentalized and held within projects, in the person of the CTA. Both these factors make it difficult to work across projects and to act on shared interests and goals across projects. Institutional memory instead needs to be shared and held by the country office; this could be done through management at the office level under the direction of the Country Director as well as through information technology. The Country Office should develop a database to be used to manage projects as well as store and share documents. The Country Office should also develop shared operating procedures to be used across projects to ensure that project-produced data is of high quality, well understood, and can be used across projects. **Office-level management should be empowered to manage complementarities and shared interests across projects. Staff should be trained in and required to use these Country-office processes and systems for project management, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting.**

UNDP also needs to continue to strive to improve shared understanding with its development partners. Embarking on projects with different views of goals and end-points leaves tensions between UNDP and partners. As part of developing and institutionalizing processes and practices that institutionalize knowledge and make it more useable for management, **the Country Office should build in systematic processes to better and more regularly communicate with development partners as part of learning and knowledge management.**

**Constitutional Reform Projects**

Finally, the CRC experience suggests recommendations for other UN projects that support constitutional review. **UNDP should continue to support projects that help reform constitutions and should explicitly speak to the political nature of constitutional reform throughout the process.** Affirming the political nature of constitutional reform should be a part of the UN’s building political engagement into all expectations and processes of constitutional reform. While the bulk of UNDP project support may be technical (improving office processes and the quality of outreach activities for example), this needs to always be situated in the larger political context of constitutional review.

While UNDP cannot always support all of the processes involved in constitutional reform, **UNDP projects should maintain a focus on building public understanding and discussion throughout their work**. This should in particular include lengthening the activities of projects to promote civic education at the end of the constitutional reform process and as constitutions approach ratification by parliaments or referenda. Efforts of UNDP projects and UN leaders may be especially important at these stages when impartial, apolitical information about constitutional reform is most needed. These stages are also ones where constitutional reform may have higher risks of being politicized and failing in various ways.

**The UN and UNDP should also – when possible - commit to project outcomes and resource projects at a higher level and for a longer period of time in order to reach stronger end points – perhaps ultimately the adoption of well-known, inclusive and transparently developed Constitution that adequately protects human** **rights**. This goal does commit the UN not only to work through more processes like referenda to support constitutional reform reaching the final conclusion of a new constitution but also to some normative UN goals. While the UN and UNDP should support processes that expand the participation of people in constitutional review and transparent, fair ways of drafting these measures, the UN and UNDP should also be clear that the community of states has certain objectives that should be included in any constitution as part of protecting fundamental human, economic, and social rights. Most countries have already committed themselves to the main international instruments in these areas and these commitments should be reflected in the fundamental laws of these countries.
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Project Document: The Republic of Sierra Leone Constitutional Review Programme, July 2013-March 2015

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT, United Nations Development Programme, Sierra Leone, The Republic of Sierra Leone Constitutional Review Programme, 15 December 2014

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT, United Nations Development Programme, Sierra Leone, The Republic of Sierra Leone Constitutional Review Programme, December 2015

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT, United Nations Development Programme, Sierra Leone, The Republic of Sierra Leone Constitutional Review Programme, December 2016
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Snapshot CRC Process, <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/snapshot_crc_process.pdf>
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Report of the Constitutional Reform Committee, 24 January 2017 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/crc_final_report16.pdf>

Constitutional Reform Committee Abridged Draft Report, February 2016

Report of the CRC Secretariat for First Quarter 2015
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Minutes of Fourth Sitting

Minutes of Third Sitting

Minutes of Second Sitting
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IEC, CRC Sub-Committee Progress Report, 2014
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REPORT ON DISTRICT (BONTHE, MOYAMBA & BO) LEVEL CONSULTATIONS 2015.
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REPORT ON WESTERN AREA WARD (326-329, 346-349, 350-352, 353-355) LEVEL CONSULTATIONS. 2015. <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/team1_western_area_report.pdf>
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REPORT ON WESTERN URBAN AND RURAL DISTRICT CONSULTATIONS (Wards - 386 - 394, 342 – 345) <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/team5_western_area_report.pdf>

Newsletters

The Constitutional Review Committee. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Monthly Newsletter January-May 2016. Issue 1, Volume 1 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/2016_january-may.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. December 2015. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1. Issue <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/2015_oct_december_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. September 2015. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1. Issue <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/2015_august_september_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. July 2015. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1. Issue <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/2015_june_july_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. April 2015. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1. Issue <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/2015_march_april_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. January 2015. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1. Issue <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/2015_january_edition1.pdf>

Monthly Newsletters

The Constitutional Review Committee. November 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1. Issue 11 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/november_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. October 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 10 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/october_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. September 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 9 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/september_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. July-August 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 7-8 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/july_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. January 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 6 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/june_edition1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. January 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 5 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/web_version_may_edition.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. January 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 4 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/april_edition_web1.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. January 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 3 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/web_version_march_edition.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. January 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 2 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/web_vers_newsletter_feb.pdf>

The Constitutional Review Committee. January 2014. Sierra Leone Constitutional Review. Volume 1, Issue 1 <https://constitutionalreviewblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/crc-newsletter-1-1-2014-1.pdf>

**Documents of the Government of Sierra Leone**

The Constitution of Sierra Leone Amendment Act

The Sierra Leone Constitution (1991)

Statistics Sierra Leone. December 2016. *2015* *Population and Housing Census Summary of Final Results: Planning a Better Future*. Freetown: Statistics Sierra Leone. <https://www.statistics.sl/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/final-results_-2015_population_and_housing_census.pdf>

**Other Documents**

BBC Media Action. May 2016. “Communication in Sierra Leone: An Analysis of Media and Mobile Audiences.” London: BBC Media Action.

Human Rights Council. 17 November 2015. National report submitted in accordance with paragraph 5 of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21 Sierra Leone. Human Rights Council Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review. Twenty-fourth session 18–29 January 2016 <https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/sierra_leone/session_24_-_january_2016/a-hrc-wg.6-24-sle-1-e.pdf>

ITASCAP, 2016, Summary of Results: Afrobarometer Round 6 Survey in Sierra Leone, 2015 <http://afrobarometer.org/sites/default/files/publications/Summary%20of%20results/srl_r6_sor_en.pdf>

Amnesty International. 22 February 2017. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL REPORT 2016/17: THE STATE OF THE WORLD'S HUMAN RIGHTS: SIERRA LEONE 2016/2017. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/africa/sierra-leone/report-sierra-leone/>

Commonwealth Secretariat. Sierra Leone National and Local Council Elections 2012 Commonwealth Observer Group Final Report. <http://thecommonwealth.org/sites/default/files/project/documents/Sierra%20Leone%20National%20and%20Local%20Council%20Elections%202012%20Commonwealth%20Observer%20Group%20Final%20Report.pdf>

European Union Election Observation Mission. “Sierra Leone: Final Report – Presidential, Parliamentary and Local Council Elections 17 November 2012.” 2012.

**Annex 2: List of Individual Interviews and Small Group Discussions**

**Constitutional Review Committee (CRC), Members**

Justice Edmond Cowan, Ombudsman, Chair

Dr. Habib Sesay, Member Representing the People's Movement for Democratic Change Party, Chair Sub-Committee on the Executive Branch

Justice Nicholas Brown Marke, Chair Sub-Committee on the Judiciary

Dr. Abu Bakarr Kargbo, Member Representing National Commission for Democracy, Chair Sub-Committee on Local Government and other Ancillary Divisions of Government

Morlai Conteh, Member Representing National Youth Coalition, Chair Sub-Committee on Information, Communication and the Media (ICM)

Gibril Thulla, Member Representing Citizens Democratic Party, Chair Sub-Committee on the Legislature

Olatungie Campbell, Member Representing Women’s Forum, Chair Sub-Committee on the Fundamental Principles of State Policy and Human Rights

Glenna Thompson, Member Representing Sierra Leone Bar Association

Olatungie Campbell, Member Representing Women’s Forum

Solomon Sogbandi, Member Representing Amnesty International

**CRC Secretariat**

Saa Kpulun, Executive Secretary

Sam Coker, former Executive Secretary

**Development Partners**

**Department for International Development (DFID)**

Sarah Barnett, Governance Advisor

Samina Bhatia, Governance Advisor

**European Union Delegation (EUD)**

Sven Ruesch, Team Leader Governance and Civil Society

Julius I.K. Foday, International Aid/Cooperation Project Manager

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

Samuel Doe, Country Director

Sudipto Mukerjee, former Country Director

Annette Nalwoga, Governance Team Leader

Charmaine Rodrigues, former UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) and former Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS) staff

**UNDP Constitutional Reform Committee Project**

Sanaullah Baloch, Chief Technical Advisor (CTA)

Mahmoud Conteh, Finance Officer

Allie Josiah, former Communications Officer

**Other United Nations’ Agencies**

**UN Women**

Marbey Sartie, Programme Specialist

Baindu Massaquoi, Programme Specialist

**Civil Society and Government Partners**

**Society for Democratic Initiative (SDI)**, lead partner in the **Coalition for Constitutional Change (CCC)**

Janyne Flynn-Sankoh

Alpha Satieu Ndoleh

Emmanuel Sei Fode

Patrick A. Kanneh

Haja Baun

**OXFAM Sierra Leone**

Phebeans Weya

**West Africa Network for Peacebuilding Sierra Leone (WANEP-SL)**

Edward Jombla, former National Network Coordinator

**Campaign for Good Governance (CGG)**

Valnora Edwin, Director

**Sierra Leone Broadcast Corporation (SLBC)**

Michael Kargbo, Corporate Communicaton & Resource Mobilization Manager

Fatima Koroma, Director of Commercial Services

**National Commission for Democracy (NCD)**

Dr. Abu Bakarr Kargbo, Chair

Bai John Contech, Commissioner Northern Region

**Political Parties Registration Committee (PPRC)**

Zainab Umu Moseray, Acting Registrar

Josephene Lebbie, Mediation and Programmes Manager

**50/50**

Fatou Taqi, President

**Other media Institutions**

**BBC Media Action**

Rebecca Wood

**Small Group Discussions**

**Makeni Round Table**

Abdulah John Kadokoh, Alliance Democratic Party (ADP)

Mary Yabonette Conteh, WOCEGAR

Kizito G. Bangwra, Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone

Issa M. Swamy, Statistics Sierra Leone

Mohamed Saffa, Sierra Leone People’s Party (SLPP) Bombali

Patric Pieus Lawernace, Center for Accountability and Rule of Law (CARL) Bombali

Gerald Alex Sesay, UNIMAK

Ahe M. Kargho, All People’s Congress (APC)

**Bo Round Table**

Mohamed Kamara, APC

Alie Kianiaro, APC

Alpha Tholley, APC

Eric Jarfrei, General Transport Workers Union

Jim Bunnccel, APC

Fode S.K. Daol Angley, Civil Society Movement for Good Governance and Livelihoods

Jarrai Barriz, Foundation for Human Rights and Democracy

Rose-Marie H. Jallah, Councilor, Bo City Council

Mary N. Kamara, Councilor, Bo District Council

Aniie Moiuba, Landowners

Turad Senseie, Lecturer, Njala University

Mohaded E.K. Allie, SLPP

**Annex 3: Draft Financial Report**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation period: 01/01/2014 - 31/12/2016** |   | \* $ 1 = € 0.82 |
|  |   |   |   |   |   | \*\* $ 1 = € 0.7341937 |
| **Indicative Activities** | **DFID, EC and UNDP Budget and Expenditure (01/01/2014 - 31/12/2016)** |
|  | ***Revised Budget in USD*** | ***Revised Budget in EUR \*\**** | ***Expenditure incurred in USD*** | ***Expenditure incurred in EUR\**** | ***Budget Balance in USD*** | ***Budget Balance in EUR*** |
| ***Capacity of CRC members developed to undertake effective constitutional review process and produce final recommendations*** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  Conduct induction training on the goals and principles of constitution … | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  | 21,011.77  | 17,229.65  | (1,011.77) | (2,545.78) |
| Support development of the Rules of Procedures  | 22,000.00  | 16,152.26  | 12,191.13  | 9,996.73  | 9,808.87  | 6,155.53  |
| Support development of TORs for CRC Sub-Committees | 7,000.00  | 5,139.36  | 3,937.37  | 3,228.64  | 3,062.63  | 1,910.71  |
| Conduct training for CRC Sub-Committees on key constitutional issues … | 17,000.00  | 12,481.29  | 19,405.17  | 15,912.24  | (2,405.17) | (3,430.95) |
| **Provide high level constitutional expertise and technical advice to CRC Plenary** | 108,000.00  | 79,292.92  | 127,619.01  | 104,647.59  | (19,619.01) | (25,354.67) |
| **Support preparation of draft amendments/proposals and final report**  | 263,000.00  | 193,092.94  | 248,917.52  | 204,112.37  | 14,082.48  | (11,019.42) |
| Support conduct and reporting on National Constitutional Conference  | 38,000.00  | 27,899.36  | 588.81  | 482.82  | 37,411.19  | 27,416.54  |
| **Sub-Total for Output 1** | **475,000.00**  | **348,742.01**  | **433,670.78**  | **355,610.04**  | **41,329.22**  | **(6,868.03)** |
| ***Capacity of CRC Secretariat to provide legal and research services to CRC developed Develop organisation structure ……..*** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Recruit and conduct induction training for Secretariat staff  | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  | 26,831.83  | 22,002.10  | (6,831.83) | (7,318.23) |
| **Support the Attorney General's office (Law Office) to draft the Amendment Bill** | 90,000.00  | 66,077.43  | 60,779.11  | 49,838.87  | 29,220.89  | 16,238.56  |
| Provide ongoing capacity development support to all Secretariat staff  | 45,000.00  | 33,038.72  | 87,834.31  | 72,024.13  | (42,834.31) | (38,985.42) |
| Commission papers from national/ international experts on topics, as requested | 37,000.00  | 27,165.17  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 37,000.00  | 27,165.17  |
| Provide quality assurance and technical advice to support Secretariat  | 70,000.00  | 51,393.56  | 17,817.67  | 14,610.49  | 52,182.33  | 36,783.07  |
| Supplemental offices supplies and equipment to complement the contribution …. | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| **Sub-Total for Output 2** | **262,000.00**  | **192,358.75**  | **193,262.92**  | **158,475.59**  | **68,737.08**  | **33,883.16**  |
| ***CRC Communication & Messaging Strategy designed and implemented*** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Develop a simple Communication & Messaging Strategy to explain the CRC’s work,  | 245,000.00  | 179,877.46  | 203,117.62  | 166,556.45  | 41,882.38  | 13,321.01  |
| Provide ongoing capacity development support to all Secretariat staff … | 30,000.00  | 22,025.81  | 2,566.21  | 2,104.29  | 27,433.79  | 19,921.52  |
| Support the maintenance of the CRC website, twitter and Facebook pages …. | 10,000.00  | 7,341.94  | 891.01  | 730.63  | 9,108.99  | 6,611.31  |
|  Produce monthly CRC newsletter for website and in print  | 5,000.00  | 3,670.97  | 5,036.26  | 4,129.73  | (36.26) | (458.76) |
| Develop a communication programme with community and other radio stations | 8,000.00  | 5,873.55  | 1,142.86  | 937.15  | 6,857.14  | 4,936.40  |
| Provide constitution making training to journalists, editors, media house executives  | 13,000.00  | 9,544.52  | 9,310.03  | 7,634.22  | 3,689.97  | 1,910.29  |
| Print and distribute copies of the 1991 Constitution, 2008 CRC report …. | 32,000.00  | 23,494.20  | 63,695.07  | 52,229.96  | (31,695.07) | (28,735.76) |
| Support CRC to review the 1991 Constitution and 2008 CRC Report … | 15,000.00  | 11,012.91  | 373.63  | 306.38  | 14,626.37  | 10,706.53  |
| Supp. CRC to dev. a conflict & gender sensitive, human rights based & peace-building … | 5,000.00  | 3,670.97  | 615.38  | 504.61  | 4,384.62  | 3,166.36  |
| Support the design of CRC Communication & Messaging strategy for effective civic education | 40,000.00  | 29,367.75  | 37,101.80  | 30,423.48  | 2,898.20  | (1,055.73) |
| Support the printing and distribution of the Amendment Bill and draft report | 170,000.00  | 124,812.93  | 162,694.89  | 133,409.81  | 7,305.11  | (8,596.88) |
| Support the conduct of nationwide civic education on the Amendment Bill | 30,000.00  | 22,025.81  | 25,185.73  | 20,652.30  | 4,814.27  | 1,373.51  |
| Develop and implement a programme to engage youth in the constitutional reform process | 55,000.00  | 40,380.65  | 58,961.13  | 48,348.13  | (3,961.13) | (7,967.47) |
| **Sub-Total Output 3** | **658,000.00**  | **483,099.45**  | **570,691.62**  | **467,967.13**  | **87,308.38**  | **15,132.33**  |
| ***Civil Society led inclusive and informative civic education process completed*** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Conduct a civic and legal awareness baseline survey, including integrating | 10,000.00  | 7,341.94  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 10,000.00  | 7,341.94  |
| Prepare detailed proposals pertaining to CSO involvement … | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  | 551.72  | 452.41  | 19,448.28  | 14,231.46  |
| Conduct independent research on specific issues especially by interest …. | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  | 4,956.04  | 4,063.95  | 15,043.96  | 10,619.92  |
| Prepare conflict and gender sensitive focused civic education strategy & program | 30,000.00  | 22,025.81  | 1,219.78  | 1,000.22  | 28,780.22  | 21,025.59  |
| Conduct national & sub-national civic education campaigns ….. | 700,000.00  | 513,935.59  | 815,150.24  | 668,423.20  | (115,150.24) | (154,487.61) |
| Produce findings of consultations process, print and distribute to public …. | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  | 19,890.11  | 16,309.89  | 109.89  | (1,626.02) |
| Conduct consensus building, coordination meetings and workshops between the CRC  | 5,000.00  | 3,670.97  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 5,000.00  | 3,670.97  |
| **Sub-Total Output 4** | **805,000.00**  | **591,025.93**  | **841,767.89**  | **690,249.67**  | **(36,767.89)** | **(99,223.74)** |
| ***CRC led inclusive and transparent civic education and public consultation process completed*** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Prepare, print and disseminate public consultation materials.. | 75,000.00  | 55,064.53  | 60,829.58  | 49,880.26  | 14,170.42  | 5,184.27  |
| Conduct training of trainers on public consultation for CRC, media and civil society | 5,000.00  | 3,670.97  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 5,000.00  | 3,670.97  |
| Support the CRC to undertake civic education throughout the country at ward level:  | 197,000.00  | 144,636.16  | 130,167.86  | 106,737.65  | 66,832.14  | 37,898.51  |
| Support organization of constitutional dialogue conferences, including for MPs, traditional chiefs, CSOs .. | 70,000.00  | 51,393.56  | 37,669.92  | 30,889.33  | 32,330.08  | 20,504.22  |
| Work with Secretariat to distribute civic education materials (brochures, posters, CDs, radio spots, illustrations, etc.) | 265,000.00  | 194,561.33  | 365,772.52  | 299,933.47  | (100,772.52) | (105,372.14) |
| Conduct training of trainers on civic education and public for CRC, MPs, media and civil.. | 7,500.00  | 5,506.45  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 7,500.00  | 5,506.45  |
| Produce recordings / transcripts of all relevant public discussions and dialogue | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  |
| Support the design of web site interface to receive public inputs.  | 15,000.00  | 11,012.91  | 12,342.46  | 10,120.82  | 2,657.54  | 892.09  |
| Support the CRC to undertake additional public consultations on the CRC’s Draft Recommendations | 32,000.00  | 23,494.20  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 32,000.00  | 23,494.20  |
| Support the Government & Parliament to undertake additional public consultations on the draft Constitutional Amendment Bill | 25,000.00  | 18,354.84  | (37.75) | (30.96) | 25,037.75  | 18,385.80  |
| **Sub-Total Output 5** | **711,500.00**  | **522,378.82**  | **606,744.59**  | **497,530.56**  | **104,755.41**  | **24,848.25**  |
| ***Enhance capacity of MPs, political parties and traditional leaders to effectively support and participate in the review process***  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Share best practices on key constitutional issues through information exchange | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  | 28,313.67  | 23,217.21  | (8,313.67) | (8,533.34) |
| Providing training on dialogue, mediation and conflict resolution to MPs in support . | 10,000.00  | 7,341.94  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 10,000.00  | 7,341.94  |
| Support specific dialogue & outreach work between the CRC & (i) MPs and (ii) political parties. | 20,000.00  | 14,683.87  | 39,662.31  | 32,523.09  | (19,662.31) | (17,839.22) |
| Conduct consensus building meetings & workshops between the CRC and MPs and political parties on the CRC draft … | 7,000.00  | 5,139.36  | 4,257.67  | 3,491.29  | 2,742.33  | 1,648.07  |
| Work with the Ministry for Local Government and other stakeholders to develop outreach  | 11,000.00  | 8,076.13  | 26,208.96  | 21,491.35  | (15,208.96) | (13,415.22) |
| Share best practices on key constitutional issues through information exchange | 15,000.00  | 11,012.91  | 14,150.00  | 11,603.00  | 850.00  | (590.09) |
| Develop & implement a programme to promote gender equality issues in throughout the constitutional review. process & content,  | 48,200.00  | 35,388.14  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 48,200.00  | 35,388.14  |
| **Sub-Total Output 6** | **131,200.00**  | **96,326.21**  | **112,592.61**  | **92,325.94**  | **18,607.39**  | **4,000.27**  |
| ***Project Start up and Implementation*** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Recruitment of CTA (18 moths) | 1,049,731.38  | 770,706.17  | 930,176.58  | 762,744.80  | 119,554.80  | 7,961.37  |
| National Staff (admin/Finance, civic educations, gender and youth) | 60,000.00  | 44,051.62  | 47,487.19  | 38,939.50  | 12,512.81  | 5,112.13  |
| Regular Steering Committee meetings | 5,000.00  | 3,670.97  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 5,000.00  | 3,670.97  |