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Executive Summary

Background: With funding support from development partners (EC and DFID), UNDP facilitated the implementation of a project “Support to the Development Assistance Coordination Office” between 2010 and 2013. The overarching outcome of the project was to ensure the effective coordination and management of aid in Sierra Leone. This final draft is a product of the findings by the evaluation consultant of the three-year project. The evaluation was conducted by the National Consultant Dr. Hindowa Momoh under the supervision of the UNDP focal person.

Scope of Work and Methodology: The evaluation assessed, among others, the effectiveness and efficiency of the project with regards to achievement of its planned objectives; the relevance and adequacy of the project; to codify the challenges in project implementation and make recommendations; to assess whether lessons and recommendations of the 2009 evaluation were taken on board. The evaluation used a wide range of data collection methods and tools, which included but not limited to: document review, entry and exit de-briefing meetings, in-depth key informant and group interviews and observations. The evaluation included field visits to the three regional headquarters of Makeni, Kenema and Bo. Key stakeholders who were consulted included: UNDP, MOFED senior officials, DACO, Field Monitors and donors. Data collected was analysed and informed the evaluation results whose highlights are shared in this executive summary.

Key Findings:

Project Relevance: Looking at the overall project objective and the indicative outputs: strengthened capacity for aid coordination; increased coordination at sector and district levels; improved quality and quantity use of aid information and improved monitoring of aid accountability, the project has remained relevant in the overall management of the aid architecture in Sierra Leone. The evaluation acknowledges that the project is aligned to national priorities and policies especially in its support to the preparation of the PRSP, in the preparation of the Development Assistance Report of 2012 that provides the overview of aid flows to Sierra Leone, the New Deal that focuses on national compact for aid effectiveness and its role in the International Dialogue on Peace Building and State Building. The provision of computer and office equipment; the recruitment and capacity development of DACO staff both in the field and at HQ; the alignment of DPs sector strategies with GoSL priorities; the strengthening of the DAD albeit with limitations; the establishment of database for donors; the development of the Mutual Accountability Framework among others have remained strategic in contributing to the project outcome.
Effectiveness

Output 1: This output focused on *Strengthened Capacity for Aid Coordination*. Project performance for this output was rated as “Done”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Overarching Outcome: Effective Aid Coordination in Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Strengthened Capacity for Aid Coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Key Activities</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Partially Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance MoFED and line ministries capacity to perform regular aid coordination and monitoring functions</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSL to establish DHACC to review the progress in aid effectiveness Action Plan and endorse donor projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSL participates in regional and international AE fora</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District working groups identified and operational</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District training given to focal points in District councils</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitization on aid policy at district and local level</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPAC to meet quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building support coordinated</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA demand-driven, build national capacities and represent value for money</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating for Output 1: Done

Highlights of key activities include: DACO recruited 3 contract staff, 1 senior UNV; UNDP has paid for internet provided by AFCOM to DACO and has procured 8 computers and accessories, 3 printers, 1 server and 6 months internet services; a capacity building plan has been developed and the Ministry’s IT capacity strengthened; DACO provided technical support for the preparation and formulation of the PRSP III; DEPAC meetings were held per schedule save for the third quarter of the third year; DACO senior staff attended various international conferences thereby enhancing their capacities and the Minister of Finance invited to share Sierra Leone’s experience in peacebuilding and State Building at a High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan South Korea at the end of 2011.

Assessment of results: The evaluation concludes that the fundamental activity to enhance MoFED’s capacity, and by implication, DACO’s capacity for aid coordination has not been fully strengthened during the period under review as mentioned earlier. Discussions held with key Ministry officials and DPs reveal that capacity deficiency remain a systemic problem plaguing national institutions, and therefore, not unique to DACO. This is attributable to two major factors. First, the country has not still fully recovered from the brain drain resulting in institution decay following the internecine civil war that lasted for 11 years (1991-2002). Second, the pay structure within the civil service is a disincentive for qualified and fully capacitated personnel to work for and be retained in mainstream civil service. To a large extent, capacity building support at national level has not been properly coordinated especially among MDAs to be fully integrated into the aid coordination architecture. District working groups have been established but remain un-operational, which affect the links created and information flow between SWGs, DWGs and DACO.
**Output 2**: Focusing on *Increased Coordination at Sector and District Levels*, the bulk of this output were achieved. Performance rating, therefore, is categorized as “Excellent”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Overarching Outcome: Effective Aid Coordination in Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: Increased Coordination at sector and district levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Key Activities</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Partially done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWGs identified and operational in priority areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs sector strategies align with GoSL sector strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs agree to work with frameworks agreed in SWGs and other frameworks of cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWGs verify and utilize DAD data to upgrade budget data</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue between MoFED and SWGs (so that aid info gets integrated into budget)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral meetings to agree on DP lead in each sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs and GoSL continue with successful PBAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs and GoSL implement PBAs in new sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average rating for Output 2**: Excellent

**Key activities of this output were**: UNDP support helped in piloting the DWGs, linked SWGS with DWGs and facilitated the establishment of DEPAC/SWG reporting lines; coordination meetings at the district level feed into the SWGs and these in turn feed into DEPAC; DPs plans aligned with national plans and priorities especially the Agenda for Prosperity; at least one DWG piloted in 2010 and several others initiated in 2011-2012; SWGs sent report to DACO assessing their first six months of operations; SWGs activated in non-priority sectors incorporating lessons learned from existing SWGs.

Assessment of results include: While DWGs and SWGs were established and the SWG did finally function as envisioned, process management by DACO was not effective in order to ensure that data is continuously entered, analyzed, packaged and disseminated. There is the need to improve upon the DAD system with the objective of improving the quality and reliability of aid information and the development assistance reports. Areas that require improvement in the DAD system include: increasing the level of its user friendliness; expanding and improving the outreach program on data collection/entry by the donor community- including NGOs.

**OUTPUT 3**: This output focused on *Improved Quality and Quantity use of Aid Information*. To a large extent, some of the activities were successfully carried out *albeit* some challenges in others. Performance rating is categorized as “Done”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Overarching Outcome: Effective Aid Coordination in Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 3: Improved Quality and Quantity use of Aid Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Key Activities</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Partially done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAD is strengthened offline elements improved, KIs integrated)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish database of development partners including non-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional, database integrated into existing systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor encouraged to break down commitments on annual basis in</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line with MTEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors encouraged to update district data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue on integration of NGO data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of annual aid data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP supported</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and training of new DAD officers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two DACO staff work with donors to improve data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs disburse GBS according to disbursement schedule</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs disburse other forms of aid according to commitment schedule</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSL and Dos conduct joint missions and joint analytical works</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average rating for Output 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Done</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key achievements include: Improved communications between DACO-Development Partners through the establishment of a quarterly e-Brief; DAD strengthened, offline elements improved and KPIs integrated; database established of development partners; donors encouraged to break down commitments on annual basis in line with MTEF; Synergy International Systems renewed the contract for the operations of the DAD; district council employees trained on how to access the DAD check for consistency of the data relating to their respective districts; DAD compatibility with data systems of key line Ministries explored; through UNDP, DACO supported development of Aid Effectiveness Compact between the GoSL and DPs; DACO provided technical support and module linking Chart of Accounts with the DAD; quality and quantity of DAD data available on the systems; and Annual Aid Report produced using updated and improved DAD data.

**Assessment of results:** An Aid Information Management System (AIMS) serves as an integral part of the national aid coordination architecture. Ultimately, the main purpose of an AIMS is to support the effective allocation and coordination, as well as transparent and accountable use of foreign assistance in line with national development priorities and respective domestic budget allocations. Consequently, an AIMS should allow tracking of funding flows against the background of the national development plan. Further, it should be linked to the Financial Information Management System used to prepare the domestic budget and to monitor its execution, in order to promote complementarity of domestic and foreign funding in support of the same objectives.

As seen above, not much improvement has taken place regarding the quality and quantity of aid information. One of the success cases mentioned by DPs has been the availability of data on budget support.
**OUTPUT 4:** Focusing on *Improved Monitoring of Aid Accountability for Commitments*, the bulk of planned activities were achieved. Performance rating for the output is “Excellent”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Overarching Outcome: Effective Aid Coordination in Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4: Improved Monitoring of Aid Accountability for Commitments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Key Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual accountability framework developed by MoFED and shared with DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework agreed and adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs institute peer review mechanisms in country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average rating for Output 3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key achievements:** The project supported the drafting and production of the mutual accountability framework, which has been discussed and signed; DACO has been producing quarterly and yearly reports on progress made on the operations of the framework; independent monitors produced yearly report on the agreed actions in the framework; first and second ratings on the agreed actions successfully carried out; DACO successfully carried out the 2011 Paris Declaration survey and Fragile States Principles Monitoring survey; all DPs were involved in the drafting of the MAF.

**Project Efficiency**
The evaluation acknowledges that the project management structure and implementation modalities were, to a large extent, efficient and in sync with the project stated objectives. In the short and medium term, the placement of DACO within MoFED tended to generate efficiencies in project management. Of particular importance is the collaboration and coordination between DACO and other units within the MoFED such as the EPRU to consolidate effort in aid coordination and management.

UNDP assisted in capacitating DACO by recruiting a Finance Officer to assist in the management and efficient utilization of resources in accordance with UNDP financial management guidelines and practices. The 2013 Auditors report clearly stated among others that “the procurement activities carried out by the partner were not motivated by purchase orders validated by the Project Coordinator; the contracts between the partner and focal persons are not supported by evidence supporting documents; and the entity does not have all these invoices as mentioned in our report on statement of expenses”. Overall, the project was efficiently executed with the project outputs demonstrating some evidence of good use of resources. Resources were also targeted to planned activities.

**Lessons Learned**
One of the key lessons learned was the need for the GoSL to strengthen Inter-Ministerial coordination to allow consistency and consensus building especially before DEPAC meetings. It was also discovered that DACO, as a unit in the governance structure, means well and its staff working very hard to meet the challenges of aid coordination and management in Sierra Leone.
was noted that there exit gaps in resource persons with institutional memory on aid coordination and management at UNDP. Frequent changes in personnel working on economic development issues especially at UNDP tend to negatively impact the effectiveness of DACO. Another important lesson was the need for a mechanism for partnership building between DPs and the GoSL with clear defining roles and expectations with regards to financial reporting and updating the DAD.

Impact

The evaluation noted that DACO has always taken the lead and serving as the Secretariat in the preparation of Sierra Leone Poverty Reduction Strategic Papers (I, II and III), provided support for the preparation of the New Deal and Post-MDG Agenda. In particular, DACO coordinated the preparation and launch of the Agenda for Change and the Agenda for Prosperity. The Agenda for Prosperity serves as the country’s strategic document for poverty alleviation for five years. It outlines all activities the government intends to undertake during that period and it presents a results framework which will be used to monitor these activities effectively and efficiently. DACO organized a ministerial meeting on the Agenda for Prosperity in August 2013 with the view to establishing ministerial pillar working groups and to assign ministerial Chairs and Co-Chairs for each of the pillars. DACO provided the leadership and guidance in the development of these strategic documents.

Recommendations to the GoSL

- It is recommended that the MoFED be designated the lead coordinating agency for all external assistance. In this regard, it is further recommended that the GoSL takes full responsibility and ownership of DACO in all of its form. That is, the government should take the full resource support and management of DACO, recruit and capacitate more core staff and institutionally strengthen DACO’s internal processes, procedures and systems;
- The GoSL should put premium on pre-DEPAC meetings of Ministers to ensure consensus building around strategic aid coordination and management issues. It is key for the government to strengthen Inter-Ministerial coordination to limits clash. Government must be seen to be more proactive;
- It is recommended that the government embarks on implementing the civil service payroll with the view to enhancing the morale of civil servants across board. This will improve the level of performance and increase retention of capacitated staff;
- It is recommended DACO organizes quarterly workshops for all DAD focal persons with the view to have live exercise on the new features of the DAD;
- It is recommended that the government provide support to DACO to coordinate the implementation of the Agenda for Prosperity, the coordination of the New Deal and post-MDGs;
- It is important for the government to establish clear role differentiations between and among agencies dealing with aid inflows and external assistances to Sierra Leone. This will limit competition and duplicity of roles by government agencies.
Recommendations to the DPs

- It is important for DPs invest more on strengthening capacities of core government institutions rather than establishing and dealing with parallel structures;
- It is recommended that DPs provide support to the MoFED through a multi-donor support framework predicated on a comprehensive needs assessment, a joint capacity development strategy and a common funding mechanism;
- It is recommended that DPs focus more on long term institutional capacity development of core institutions that are sustainable rather than on short term results and procedural issues; and
- There is need for DPs to ensure the timely availability of data to be fed into the DAD.

Recommendations to UNDP

- It is recommended that UNDP ensures timely disbursement of funds to avoid delays in the implementation of projects;
- It is also recommended that UNDP provides technical assistance to DACO and other MDAs by training and capacitating more core staff to enhance performance;
- It is important for UNDP to review its position on the DWGs who have not been functional largely due to funding gaps;
- UNDP should endeavor to attract and encourage other non-traditional donors to come on board with the view to enhancing the aid effectiveness and management system in Sierra Leone; and
- UNDP should provide assistance to DACO to develop a communication strategy to facilitate greater dissemination of development assistance as well as the activities of the PRSP to the general public.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background and Context

Sierra Leone has taken visible strides towards a stable developing country after a decade-long civil conflict. Notwithstanding the progress made thus far, the country remains highly dependent on donor funds to support its budgetary activities. It is estimated that foreign assistance accounts for more than 50% of the national budget, which by implication, suggests that the effective and efficient coordination and management of external resources is critical to peace consolidation and sustainable development in Sierra Leone.

Immediately after the war in 2002, aid was mainly focused on emergency humanitarian support; but as state institutions were rehabilitated and developed, and peace and security gradually returned and consolidated, there was a corresponding shift to aid for enhancing recovery and development culminating in the development of a comprehensive National Recovery Strategy in 2002.¹ This was immediately followed in 2003 by the development of a National Long Term Perspective Framework otherwise known as Vision 2025. This document emphasized on reconstruction and peace-building, sound economic management, democratic governance and strong leadership as prerequisites for sustainable development.

To actualize and operationalize Vision 2025, donor partners and the GoSL immediately embarked on the preparation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) in 2004. Emphasizing three themes: good governance, peace and security; macro-economic stability and growth; and human development, the first PRSP was launched in 2005. For a sustained contribution to the country’s security sector and overall development assistance, the Poverty Reduction Coordination Unit was established in the Development Assistance Coordination Office (DACO) located in the Office of the Vice President with the remit for: the preparation of the PRSP and coordinating its implementation activities by MDAs, monitoring and evaluation and tracking development assistance to Sierra Leone.

Since its establishment, the DACO has made significant contributions to the development of the first, second and third generation Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP I, II and III, and the coordination of donor assistance, through introducing Development Assistance Database (DAD), producing annual donor assistance report, convening the regular donor coordination meetings. The DACO was also instrumental in the implementation of the Paris Declaration in Sierra Leon), and to the coordination of donor assistance, through introducing Development Assistance Database (DAD), producing annual donor assistance report, convening the regular donor coordination meetings. The DACO was also instrumental in the implementation of the Paris Declaration in Sierra Leone, and successfully completed the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey, which was presented at the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in September 2008.²

---

¹ See Project Evaluation of 2009 for details
² For details, see Annual Progress Report of 2009
The Government of Sierra Leone conducted the OECD-DAC survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in 2008. This was aimed at collecting baseline data on the Paris Declaration indicators and targets, which are designed to measure the effectiveness of both Government and development partners in internationally agreed principles. The survey also sets targets to be achieved in country by 2010. The results give an indication of the baseline situation and targets for aid effectiveness in Sierra Leone, but it should be stressed that these are reliant on international rather than national framework of assessment.

With aid making nearly 18% of the national GDP, its effective and efficient use is of key importance to development and peace consolidation in Sierra Leone. The 2009 Sierra Leone Aid Policy endorsed by the GoSL and DPs recognizes that such use is not currently the norm stating that: ‘Sierra Leone remains well short of internationally agreed targets on Aid Effectiveness.’

The aid policy speaks directly to the lack of national ownership and alignment, poor transparency and aid information, the unpredictability of aid and the sub-optimal use of technical assistance and capacity development support as the main issues that need to be addressed. The analysis is reflected in the 2008 monitoring of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness where the country scores poorly in terms of aid recorded on budget (54%), coordinated capacity development (22%), use of public financial management systems (20%), in-year predictability (30%), and use of common arrangements (27%).

The commitment of the country DPs to reinvigorate their effort and take positive action to addressing these issues, and to practically translate the promises of aid policy is reflected in the agreement issued after the Development Partners Committee (DEPAC) meeting held in Freetown in May 2010. In this meeting, donors pledged to step up their support in the area of aid effectiveness. Furthermore, donors and GoSL ensured that donor policies and international protocols outlined in, for instance, the UN Vision, the Paris Declaration, the New Deal and post-MDG activities in Sierra Leone are aligned with government priorities, national policies and strategies such as the Agenda for Prosperity and Vision 2025.

1.2 About the Assignment

The evaluation was commissioned by UNDP with the main objective to undertake an Outcome Evaluation of UNDP “Support to the Development Assistance Coordination Office” between 2010 and 2013. With the view to evaluating the achievements, documenting the challenges in the evolving aid management environment, codifying lessons learned and recommending for future aid architecture. The following objectives will be examined:

- To evaluate and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project with regards to achievement of its planned objectives and outputs as set in the project document and annual work plans since 2010 when the 'Support to Aid Policy Implementation'
commenced. This will also include the evaluation of expenditure against the planned and actual budget,

- To assess the relevance and adequacy of the project in light of the changes that have taken place and the identified and emerging challenges,
- To codify challenges in project implementation and make recommendations to address them, given the lessons learned,
- To review the emerging and evolving aid management environment, and make recommendations on the best modalities to enhance the effectiveness of the aid management in Sierra Leone,
- Assess whether lessons and recommendations of the evaluation in 2009 were taken on board in informing DACO operations. If not what are the challenges? And
- Recommend the programme framework for the future support to the rationalized aid coordination body.

The scope of the evaluation will cover the programme period 2010 to 2013 and will focus on a number of key areas in line with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.

1.3 Structure of the Report

The report is divided into five parts. Part 1 deals with the background context of the assignment and structure of the report. The second portion of the report examines the methodological design. Part 3 looks at the assessment of performance concentrating on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, partnership, sustainability, impact and the future of DACO. The fourth part examines the lessons learned while the final portion of the report draws conclusions and proffers recommendations for future aid coordination and effectiveness in Sierra Leone.
2.0 OBJECTIVES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

2.1 Objectives and Scope of the Study

The overall objectives of the assignment and responsibilities of the consultant include:

- To evaluate and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project with regards to achievement of its planned objectives and outputs as set in the project document and annual work plans since 2010 when the 'Support to Aid Policy Implementation' commenced. This will also include the evaluation of expenditure against the planned and actual budget,
- To assess the relevance and adequacy of the project in light of the changes that have taken place and the identified and emerging challenges,
- To codify challenges in project implementation and make recommendations to address them, given the lessons learned,
- To review the emerging and evolving aid management environment, and make recommendations on the best modalities to enhance the effectiveness of the aid management in Sierra Leone,
- Assess whether lessons and recommendations of the evaluation in 2009 were taken on board in informing DACO operations. If not what are the challenges? And
- Recommend the programme framework for the future support to the rationalized aid coordination body.

The scope of the evaluation will cover the programme period 2010 to 2013 and will focus on a number of key areas in line with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.

2.2 Limitations

The current evaluation has taken place at a time when key staff officials involved in the inception and implementation of the project and who possess the institutional memory of DACO are no longer with the project. Most of these officials especially at UNDP have left the project leaving behind a big memory gap. This knowledge gap was experienced during field work.

It was also difficult to access senior officials at the MoFED and DPs for interviews. The consultant noted that most senior officials at the MoFED had little or no institutional memory on DACO. This was problematic because the consultant had to rely on annual and quarterly received from DACO and interviews especially from the Director and Deputy Director who have substantial knowledge on the operations of DACO. The consultant could only reach and interview two DPs: WB and ADB. The situation was not very different at UNDP where most, if not all, of the focal persons were not well grounded in DACO activities in Sierra Leone. These created problems for the consultant to draw conclusions on key development priorities and major outcomes of the project.
Moreover, the assignment commenced during the festive season of December when officials were either on official leave or on holidays. Most of the key informants identified by UNDP who could have provided reliable information were not available for interviews. In the absence of these key stakeholders, the evaluator found it difficult or rather impossible to gather reliable data that would inform the final report, hence the delay in the development and submission of the report.

3.0 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

3.1 Evaluation Matrix

The consultant has used the following framework to appraise the achievement of project results. In addition to the DAC evaluation criteria, the matrix throws light on the result level being evaluated, the scope of the evaluation, key questions relating to whether or not the project results have been achieved, and data sources and tools employed to undertake the assignment.

The examination of progress towards achieving project objectives used the criteria for evaluating development cooperation projects developed by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)\(^7\). The OECD and DAC criteria were complemented by others to evaluate particularly partnerships arrangements, which remain critical elements in UNDP projects. In this context ‘partnerships’ refer to project-related partnerships, in particular assessing the extent to which the donors built and used partnerships to foster project implementation and achievement of project objectives.

**Box 1: Evaluation Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Result Level</th>
<th>Scope of Assignment</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>The extent to which the project support to DACO and the DACO activities are suited to national priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did the project design address the issues eminent in 2010?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did the project objective remain relevant throughout implementation phases?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project still relevant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Assessment of Output</td>
<td>The extent to which project activities attain its objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) For details, See: [www.oecd.org/document/22/0234,en_2649_34435_20866550](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0234,en_2649_34435_20866550)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>Efficiency Management</th>
<th>Partnership Coordination and synergy</th>
<th>Impact Results</th>
<th>Sustainability Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - How many of the project output were delivered as planned?  
- What has been the overall contribution of the project to aid effectiveness in SL?  
- Were funds utilized as planned? | - Log frame  
- Monitoring reports  
- Progress reports  
- Interviews  
- Document review | - Prodoc  
- Financial reports  
- Monitoring reports  
- Interviews | - Interviews with stakeholders and doc. Reviews  
- Paris Declaration | - Prodoc  
- Log frame  
- Stakeholder interviews  
- Document review  
- Quarterly and yearly reports | - Interviews with stakeholders in govt., donors and beneficiary institutions  
- Progress |
3.2 Methodological Approach
The consultant has used a wide variety of methods or an eclectic approach to undertake this evaluation. Highlights of the methodology are outlined below:

**Document Review and Content Analysis:**

The consultant reviewed relevant program documents. The review provided insights into the project as well as provided background data that informed data collection tools. Such documents included but are not limited to: CPD &CPAP (2012-2015), Project Document, UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, PRSP I, II and III, First Project Evaluation Report, Project Document, Quarterly and Yearly Reports, Annual Donors Assistant Reports, Donor Coordination Minutes, Donor Assistance Reports, Log Frame, Implementation Plans, Monitoring Plans/Reports and any other relevant literature.

**Debriefing Meetings:**

The consultant held a number of debriefing meetings with key stakeholders at UNDP and DACO. In particular entry de-briefing meetings provided a broad overview of the project. It also provided an entry point for the consultant to determine which areas to focus on, key stakeholders in the must-see-category and the organization of logistical support required for the assignment. After data collection, preliminary results were shared internally with UNDP. This provided a broad overview of emerging findings, identification of information gaps and areas requiring further analysis.

**In-Depth Interviews and Observations:**

Key informant interviews involved conducting in-depth interviews with key stakeholders from UNDP, DACO, Donor Partners, national and local partner institutions. Focal persons with institutional memory on the project already identified by UNDP were either interviewed individually or in groups. Key observation also formed an integral part of data collection tool especially at DACO and partner/beneficiary institutions.
The consultant focused attention purely on collecting data in Freetown and in 3 districts in each province to ensure that the evaluation has a national flavor. The consultant purposefully targeted the following category of stakeholders:

- UNDP Senior Management Staff
- Senior officials at DACO
- Members of the National Technical Committee
- Members of the Inter-Ministerial Committee
- Funding partners, particularly EC, DFID, WB, ADB, Irish Aid and GIZ (interview schedules to be facilitated by UNDP)
- Districts Focal Persons

**Data Analysis and Report Writing:**

The consultant commenced data collation from the field immediately after end of data collection. Data analysis was guided by the key outcome areas and key evaluation pillars which included analysis to inform: relevance; impact; effectiveness; efficiency; sustainability; partnership; lessons learned and recommendations. The draft evaluation will be initially shared with UNDP and the feedback captured from stakeholders will be incorporated in the final evaluation report.
4. FINDINGS: EVALUATION OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE

This chapter sets out to assess the relevance, performance and sustainability of the UNDP support to the DACO project. Section 4.1 assesses the overall relevance of the project; section 4.2 looks at the effectiveness of the four output areas addressing the achievements, challenges, impact and efficiency; Section 4.3 examines the efficiency and sustainability of the project; Section 4.4 situates the project partnership management while section 4.5 assesses the impact; Section 4.6 explores the sustainability of the project, and the finally section 4.7 investigates the future role of DACO.

4.1: Project Relevance

This section of the report details to what extent did the project support to DACO and DACO activities were aligned to the priorities and policies of the country. It also examines the appropriateness of the project and whether this has remained relevant to date. As an Outcome Evaluation, this section will also provide the changes in development conditions at DACO as a result of the interventions by the DPs. It will particularly speak to the short, medium and long term results as against the project objectives. However, these will be prefaced with a snap assessment of DACO prior to the UNDP Support to Aid Policy Implementation in 2010.

Issues eminent in DACO prior to the project in 2010

Some of the critical prevailing issues at DACO prior to the commencement of the project in 2010 include but are not limited to the following:

- There were weak incentives for aid alignment including financial reporting among agencies involved;
- There was no clear capacity development strategy based on a comprehensive capacity needs assessment;
- DACO did not have the required capacity (which is a systemic problem haunting institutions nationally and regionally) to undertake effective aid coordination and improve aid information management;
- UNDP CO did not have institutional memory on DACO largely due to changes in personnel;
- DACO has been integrated into the MoFED and at the Development Partners Committee meeting in Freetown in May 2010, donors pledged to “step up their support” in the area of aid effectiveness;
- “Sierra Leone remains well short of internationally agreed targets on Aid Effectiveness”;\(^8\)
- DACO was very involved in the design, implementation and monitoring of the country’s first Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers; and
- “The DACO project is a typical example of an attempt by donors to fast-track development by avoiding existing government institutions.”\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) See Project Document for more details, p. 1
\(^9\) For details, see the End of Project Evaluation, 2009, p. 42.
In retrospect, DACO has undergone some functional changes. DACO was initially created under the Office of the Vice President in the immediate post-war period in 2003 at a time when the utmost national development priority was the timely completion of the PRSP I within the context of satisfying HIPC conditionalities. DACO’s profile in 2005 was very high and it received tremendous support from government to coordinate meetings and dialogue with donors and the government. The unit had two major objectives: it served as a forum for the GoSL and donors to discuss the inflow of aid and aid effectiveness, and to create and establish a database to enable donors and the government know what everyone was doing. It was recorded from the interviews that DACO could not solely perform these functions without support from other MDAs.

Alignment to National Priorities and Policies
The evaluation noted that the project support to DACO and DACO activities are in synch with the priorities and policies of Sierra Leone. In the short term, one can argue that DACO, as a nodal unit for the preparation and monitoring of the government’s poverty reduction strategy paper, has been largely relevant in light of weak capacities within MDAs particularly at MoFED and the longer time framework required to develop capacities across board within the Ministry.

Donor intervention and support provided has resulted in DACO serving as the Secretariat for the preparation of the government’s strategy papers. To be sure, Donors and senior ministry officials agree that there has been a tremendous improvement in DACO contribution for the preparation of the AfP with a rudimentary resources framework, which was lacking in the Agenda for Change. It has helped government to establish ministerial pillar working groups and to assign ministerial Chairs and Co-chairs for each pillar particularly of the AfP.

Aid coordination is essentially about meetings and networking with other stakeholders. In this regard, DACO has remained an effective participant in various aid effectiveness initiatives such as the Collaboration African Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI), the International Aid Transparency Initiative and the International Dialogue on Peace Building and State Building and other preparatory meetings leading to the Busan high level forum. Sierra Leone is a signatory to the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States adopted at the HLF4 on Aid Effectiveness. DACO was able to coordinate the SPU, MoFED, SLANGO and Parliament to attend the HLF4 meeting in Busan, South Korea in December 2011. In this light, the project has remained relevant and is aligned to government’s priorities.

The development imperatives of the project regarding aid coordination functions reveal that capacitating other units within MoFED would have better served the long term objectives. Prior to project implementation in 2010, DACO’s capacity has been built with the view to enhance the preparation and implementation of the country’s Poverty Reduction Strategy documents. The enhancement and increased capacity development of DACO has strengthened its ability to provide both technical and administrative services in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of the PRSP, and to provide support and monitoring of the New Deal. As stated earlier, DACO has served as the central unit and Secretariat for government’s poverty reduction agenda especially the preparation, implementation and monitoring of the PRSP I, II and III. This has been achieved from several fronts: First, DACO has provided training and capacity building for local councils in the monitoring of the PRSP through the provision of District Focal Persons.
with the responsibility to facilitate the work of the District Monitoring Teams. In terms of development results, these focal persons have been responsible for collecting data that have fed into the DAD. Second, DACO’s has also continued to play a critical role in integrating the monitoring framework at the national level through the establishment of the Sector and Pillar Working Groups by assigning ministerial leads for each of the pillars with the view to ensure that the country’s strategic plan is a success. Additionally, DACO has played an important role in providing data and information on government priority to the Budget Committee at the MoFED. The outcome has been both donors and the GoSL rely on the DAD generated by DACO, through the Aid Information Specialist based at DACO.

DACO has remained very visible both at national and international fora. Aside of the leading role it continues to play in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of the GoSL agenda for poverty reduction, DACO represents Sierra Leone on the Steering Committee of the International Dialogue on Peace Building and State Building. As such the Director participated in the Working Group Meetings on Aid Instrument and Capacity Development hosted by DR Congo in April of 2011. DACO has also served on the Steering Committee of the International Aid Transparency Initiative, a new initiative aimed at making information about aid spending easier to access, use and understand. One of the major outcome of these invaluable activities resulted in the request of the ADB for the Minister of Finance to share Sierra Leone’s experience in Peace Building and State Building at the regional workshop on conflict affected countries held in Addis Ababa in September 2011.

However, DACO will only continue to be relevant in the long term taking the lead in aid coordination when its capacity weaknesses are effectively addressed. It is acknowledged among some donors that DACOs progress has not reached its optimal level largely due to capacity deficiencies, which is a systemic problem affecting all sectors of governance in the country. Aside of the Director and Deputy Director who have enormous capacity to steer DACO in its aid coordination and management processes, the other staff are either ad hoc and or UNVs who are not capacitated enough and well remunerated to function and stay at DACO. One of the fundamental problems responsible for this is low incentive particularly unattractive pay package to government workers. Because workers are poorly paid, government institutions cannot retain staff resulting in brain drain and loss of institutional memory.

The government of Sierra Leone should take the lead to enhance capacity of its workers by working with DPs such as the ADB that has and continue to provide substantial assistance to capacity development in Sierra Leone. Second, a comprehensive civil service reform, an initiative to improve conditions of service for civil servants, should target key institutions such as DACO with attractive pay packages. This will assist in two ways: Retention of staff and strengthen national institutions, and help the government move away from dependent on PIUs funded by donors.
4.2: Project Effectiveness

With regards to measuring project effectiveness, the evaluation examines the extent to which the project attained its objectives by looking at the following: 1. How many and which outputs were delivered as planned; 2. To what extent has the project contributed to the overall aid effectiveness of Sierra Leone; and 3. Where the funds utilized as planned?

The assessment of performance is structured around the outcome Effective Aid Coordination in Sierra Leone and the corresponding outputs. The review and analysis of this outcome and outputs is divided into 2 sections. First is the review of activities; and second is the assessment of results.

**Review of activities:**

DEPAC and DHACC Secretariats and meetings: Quarterly and Yearly reports indicate that DHACC has been established with the Minister of Finance serving as Chair and co-chaired by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to approve new donor projects every month; DEPAC schedules meetings were facilitated and systems for agenda setting minutes taking and follow up established; recruitment of Contract Staff to provide secretariat services for DEPAC was carried out; DEPAC and DHACC secretariats established and functional.

Enhance MoFED, Line Ministries and support Capacity Building:

Interviews with key informants noted that DACO has been integrated into the mainstream of government; DACO recruited 3 contract staff, 1 senior UNV, 1 administrator to work with DACO for 3 years, and one Aid Information specialist in May 2010; UNDP has paid for internet provided by AFCOM to DACO and this has been extended throughout 2013; work is underway in the ICT department at MoFED to update DACO page in the MoFED website; a capacity building plan has been developed and intensive training programs for DACO staff and focal points in councils have been carried out; training and capacity development of DACO staff has been ongoing; Ministry’s IT capacity strengthened: procurement of 8 computers and accessories, 3 printers, 1 photocopier, 1 server and 6 months internet service provided; DACO action plan, deliverables, organogram, services standards and asset management policy agreed and operationalized; trainings for MoFED staff were carried out.

Provide support for implementing the New Deal for the preparation of the PRSP III and post-MDG agenda:

With support from UNDP, DACO provided technical support for the preparation and formulation of the PRSP III including support for national consultations and capacity building for monitoring of the implementation of the strategy; DACO provided technical support for the costing of the PRSP III projects; provided support for editing and printing of the final PRSP III document; DACO coordinated the launching of the PRSP III in July 2013.

Regional and International Conferences:

Work plans and reports indicate that DACO has been engaged internationally: DACO Director attended an international conference in South Africa on Aid Transparency in April 2011; the
Director accompanied the Minister of Finance to a conference in Brussels on the merits and challenges on budgets; the Deputy Director attended the IATI meeting in Paris, France which agreed on publishing aid information; the Deputy Director also attended a meeting in Liberia on the Second Global Forum International Dialogue on Peace building and State Building in June 2011. These activities, no doubt, led the request of the ADB for the Minister of FED to share Sierra Leone’s experience in peace building and State Building at a High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan South Korea at the end of 2011.

**DWGs established, operation and focal points trained:**
The evaluation established that DWGs have been established in all districts and but not yet operational; clear procedure and reporting lines established between DACO and SWGs/DWGs with some difficulties getting information particularly DWGs; systems and procedures for facilitating SWGs links with DACO, SWGs and line Ministries established; DAD training given to focal points in district councils; SWGs and DWGs sensitized on aid policy at district and local levels.

**Key achievements of this output were:**
4 UNVs hired; capacity building plan drafted by long-term TA jointly by DACO and UNDP; training sessions for staff held as per capacity building plan; DACO and DEPAC TORs developed and agreed; DEPAC held quarterly meetings as scheduled *albeit* some challenges; PDU fully established; trainings for MoFED staff carried out; procurement of 8 computers, 3 printers, 1 photocopier, 1 server, and 12 months internet services provided; long term TA in-house for 12 months to link DHACC and PDU with DACO;
Noted Challenges:

Sierra Leone experiences fragmented systems of aid coordination that have undermined attempts to achieve a shift in ownership in favor of the government. This has led to weakened incentives for alignment, a situation that has not fundamentally changed since 2010. On the donor front, there is a continued tendency on the part of some donors to pursue their own agendas outside of the alignment regime with little clear strategies against which to align. In other words, micromanagement of projects by some donors has been unhelpful to strengthening local systems. Sierra Leone continues to be stuck with traditional donors (for instance WB, EU DFID); the country is yet to attract non-traditional DPs such as the BRICS, IBSA the Scandinavian countries etc; project changing hands especially at UNDP thereby creating gaps in resource persons; no National Economic Adviser at UNDP with the expertise and institutional memory on aid coordination and effectiveness; there is need for a strengthened DACO to link and work with the MFAIC and the Chief of Staff to follow up on the MCC and other aid coordination activities in the country.

Impact:
The availability of the TA for 12 months in-house helped built the capacity of DACO staff; the recruitment of UNVs added value in terms of providing the much-needed support to the lean DACO operational staff; capacity building sessions for DACO staff has greatly enhanced the capacity of national staff much-required in the country; the establishment of SWGs and DWGs and their link with DACO facilitated the flow of information and the upgrading of the DAD; the establishment of DEPAC Secretariat facilitated a pre-DEPAC meeting by donors, which invariably allowed them to brainstorm and discuss the agenda providing them the opportunity to create a consensus.

Rating for output 1

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Overarching Outcome: Effective Aid Coordination in Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1: Strengthened Capacity for Aid Coordination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Key Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance MoFED and line ministries capacity to perform regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aid coordination and monitoring functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSL to establish DHACC to review the progress in aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness Action Plan and endorse donor projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSL participates in regional and international AE fora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District working groups identified and operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District training given to focal points in District councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitization on aid policy at district and local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPAC to meet quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Performance

The above table shows that the performance of output 1 is rated as “Done”. But the fundamental activity to enhance MoFED’s capacity, and by implication, DACO’s capacity for aid coordination has not been fully strengthened during the period under review as mentioned earlier. This has short and long term effect on the development aspirations of the country. Discussions held with DPs reveal that capacity deficiency remain a systemic problem plaguing national institutions, and therefore, not unique to DACO. This is attributable to two major factors. First, the country has not still fully recovered from the brain drain resulting in institution decay following the internecine civil war that lasted for 11 years (1991-2002). Second, the pay structure within the civil service is a disincentive for qualified and fully capacitated personnel to work for and be retained in mainstream civil service. To a large extent, capacity building support at national level has not been properly coordinated especially among MDAs to be fully integrated into the aid coordination architecture. District working groups have been established but remain un-operational, which affect the links created and information flow between SWGs, DWGs and DACO.

OUTPUT 2

The second output of the project focused on Increased Coordination at Sector and District Levels. The evaluation noted that the planned interventions were very well done as against the project objectives. Performance rating for output 2 is categorized as “Excellent” albeit some minor challenges (see Table 2).

Review of activities:

SWGs established:
The evaluation noted that SWGs have been established for Health, Education, Agriculture, Roads and Water and Sanitation with GoSL taking the lead; existing structures created and new ones established where none existed; several meetings were held to align the work of SWGs with DACO; focal points for SWGs recruited with agreed TORs; DACO participated in SWGs activities to collect data and get updates from the sector groups; DPs worked within established frameworks agreed in SWGs and other frameworks of coordination; SWGs helped in verifying and utilizing DAD data to upgrade budget; dialogue established between SWGs and the MoFED to ensure that aid information gets into the budget; formal linkages established between SWGs and Budget Committees; formal linkages established between SWGs and DWGs; DPs and GoSL continue with successful PBAs and they implemented PBAs in each sector.
Division of labor established between DPs:

DPs agreed on the analysis of development partners sectoral involvement, perceived comparative advantages, programming cycles and future plans; agreement reached on rationalization measures such as joint strategies, programs, sectoral concentration, realignment etc in order to improve division of labor; and DPs commenced actions to implement this agreement. It was also noted that a clear division of labor was ensured (see assessment of results below for details)

Key achievements of this output were:

The evaluation established that the UNDP support helped in piloting the DWGs, linked SWGS with DWGs and DEPAC/SWG reporting lines established; coordination meetings at the district level feed into the SWGs and these in turn feed into DEPAC; DPs plans aligned with national plans and priorities especially the Agenda for Prosperity; at least one DWG piloted in 2010 and several others initiated in 2011-2012; SWGs sent report to DACO assessing their first six months of operations; SWGs activated in non-priority sectors incorporating lessons learned from existing SWGs

Noted Challenges:
In practice, the DWGs are not currently operational because of lack of funding; Laptops provided to District Focal Persons are not utilized for the purposes they were bought for; retention of UNVs (poor remuneration) have limited DACO activities in many ways; there are delays on the part of some donors to provide timely data for the DAD.

Impact:
The evaluation noted that activities at the SWG level fed into the discussion at DEPAC thereby ensuring strong linkages and information flow between these sectors; development plans are aligned with government’s priorities and strategies; budget plans at district level are used by the Local Government Finance Department at MoFED to make allocations for councils; and a strong link is being created between MoFED and SWGs through coordinated meetings and workshops both at national and local levels. This has increased participation of national actors in the whole aid coordination landscape.

Table 2: Rating for Output 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Overarching Outcome: Effective Aid Coordination in Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: Increased Coordination at sector and district levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Key Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWGs identified and operational in priority areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs sector strategies align with GoSL sector strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs agree to work with frameworks agreed in SWGs and other frameworks of cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWGs verify and utilize DAD data to upgrade budget data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue between MoFED and SWGs (so that aid info gets integrated into budget)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sectoral meetings to agree on DP lead in each sector | X |
DPs and GoSL continue with successful PBAs | X |
DPs and GoSL implement PBAs in new sectors | X |
**Average rating for Output 2** | Excellent

Assessment of Results

While DWGs and SWGs were established and the SWG did finally function as envisioned, process management by DACO was not effective in order to ensure that data is continuously entered, analyzed, packaged and disseminated. While this can be considered a major achievement of the project, there is the need to improve upon the DAD system with the objective of improving the quality and reliability of the development assistance reports. Areas that require improvement in the DAD system include: increasing the level of its user friendliness; expanding and improving the outreach program on data collection/entry by the donor community- including NGOs.

Senior officials at DACO and DPs noted that they all agreed in the DEPAC meeting to focus on specific sectors and to align focus areas to national development priorities. Since 2009, EU focused on political and economic governance and education (SABABU project); DFID on health particularly the Free Health Care service and some elements of governance; the ADB economic governance, infrastructure (power, energy, WATSAN and transport) and some agriculture and education projects. This has helped government track what each DP’s focus area was and whether the areas were aligned to national development priorities. However, DPs noted that there is no website at DACO to provide instant information at a press of a button on investment projects in each sector, and or data on budget support to MDAs.

**OUTPUT 3:**

The third output focused on Improved Quality and Quantity use of Aid Information. The evaluation noted that the planned interventions were done. Performance rating for output 3 is categorized as “Done” (see Table 3 below).

Review of activities:

**DAD established and made operational:**
Quarterly reports indicate that there is improved communications between DACO-Development Partners through the establishment of a quarterly e-Brief covering progress pm aid policy, outstanding commitments and new programs and projects that have been approved; database established of development partners including non-traditional partners and database integrated into existing systems; donors encouraged to break down commitments on annual basis in line with MTEF; Donors encouraged to update district data; dialogue on integration of NGO data; Synergy International Systems renewed the contract for the operations of the DAD; upgraded version of the DAD has been released; district council employees are now trained on how to access the DAD check for consistency of the data relating to their respective districts; DAD
compatibility with data systems of key line Ministries explored; DPs agree that Data on budget support has improved but data on investment project remain quite sketchy; Donor contribution to various areas improved

**Provision of technical assistance and DACO capacity strengthening:**
Training sessions and capacity development of DCO staff carried out; quarterly and annual report on development assistance to Sierra Leone produced; DCO provided support to the DWG focal persons; Through UNDP, DCO supported development of Aid Effectiveness Compact between the GoSL and DPs; DCO provided technical support and module linking Chart of Accounts with the DAD

**Management information systems for aid:**
Quarterly reports from DCO indicate that MoFED, line Ministries and DPS proposal for specific improvements to the DAD in terms of field, operation and reporting carried out; improvements implemented along with online flagging system to notify status of development partners data and details on project and program fit with the individual Paris Declaration commitments on aid effectiveness; DAD compatibility with data system of key line Ministries explored; Annual Aid Report produced using updated and improved DAD data; DPs agree that management information systems for aid require further support from donors/UNDP and such discussion have been kept alive at DEPAC meetings

**Improved aid information flow and regular updates on donor activities:**
Donors were encouraged to make full update of all of their projects and programs on the DAD, with high quality information in the correct format; quarterly e-Brief from DCO to donors covering progress on aid policy, outstanding commitments and new programs and projects were established but not fully functional; DCO continued to follow up with DP focal persons to ensure that the DAD is regularly updated and aid information improved, which still remain critical; maintenance and hosting of the DAD in collaboration with Synergy Team-DAD system providers;

**Key achievements of this output were:**
One of the noted achievements is the establishment of the e-Brief which is now operational and produced quarterly; DPs have provided data on their activities for 2009 and projections made for 2010-2013; the evaluation found that frantic efforts on the part of DPS have led to updating the DAD especially for tracking donor activities; the aid report has been developed and the Aid Policy developed; reliability on data has been improving because donors want to see the reflection on what they do; brochure on Development Assistance to Sierra Leone 2012 produced; dialogue on the integration of NGO data into the DAD has been discussed; the Development Assistance Report, which is the DACOs flagship report, continue to be produced yearly; Technical Assistance provided to help identify DAD improvements; District Focal Persons trained; sensitization of the DAD conducted at council level.

**Noted Challenges:**
One noted challenge is the integration of NGO data into the DAD because some NGOs have been either slow or unwilling to share information on their activities in the country; Donors complain that they cannot easily assess information on investment project in each sector by the
click of a button; some DPs remain slow in updating the DAD; internet facilities remain a major constraint for DACO; difficulties to incorporate the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) and Arab countries into donor community remain a challenge

**Impact:**

The evaluation found that there is an established flow of information emanating from the sector and technical working groups right up to DEPAC; discussions at all levels are shared with other groups; council employees are now capacitated how to access the DAD, check for consistency and data relating to their respective districts; Annual Aid Report produced using updated and improved DAD data; the regular update of the DAD has improved information on aid inflow into Sierra Leone.

**Table 3: Rating for Output 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Key Activities</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Partially Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAD is strengthened offline elements improved, KIs integrated)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish database of development partners including non-traditional, database integrated into existing systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor encouraged to break down commitments on annual basis in line with MTEF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors encouraged to update district data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue on integration of NGO data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of annual aid data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP supported</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and training of new DAD officers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two DACO staff work with donors to improve data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs disburse GBS according to disbursement schedule</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPs disburse other forms of aid according to commitment schedule</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSL and DPs conduct joint missions and joint analytical works</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average rating for Output 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Done</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Results**

One can argue that an Aid Information Management System (AIMS) serves as an integral part of the national aid coordination architecture. The major drive behind an AIMS is to support the effective allocation and coordination, as well as transparent and accountable use of foreign assistance required to be in sync with national development priorities and respective domestic budget allocations. This means AIMS should allow tracking of funding flows from foreign assistance against the background of the national development plan. As seen above, not much improvement has taken place regarding the quality and quantity of aid information. DPs agree
that there has been some improvement in the availability of data on budget support particularly foreign assistance to Sierra Leone. What remains missing is the non-access to data on investment projects by each sector. For instance, donors and end users would want to know the bulk of investment in water supply, infrastructure, agriculture, and these should be readily available at DACO.

It is generally argued that an AIMS is considered to be operational if the system is technically functioning (easily accessible, smooth navigation through data entry screens, smooth report generation, no calculation errors, no technical bugs); improved coordination mechanism; and if the system contains data of sufficient quality (timeliness, completeness, level of disaggregation, degree of double-counting). DACO requires further support to achieve the above two in order to improve the quality and quantity of aid information in Sierra Leone.

**OUTPUT 4:**

The fourth output for the project focused on Improved Monitoring of Aid Accountability for Commitments. To a large extent, the bulk of planned interventions were achieved. Performance rating for output 4 is categorized as “Excellent” (see Table 3).

**Review of activities:**

**Mutual Accountability Framework:**

The framework has been drafted and was signed in February 2014 by the GoSL based on existing Aid Policy Action Plan matrix; Aid Policy document has been developed and now operational; DACO has been engaged in regular monitoring of agreed actions and progress reports on activities recorded; there has also been independent monitors on activities annually; DACO has been carrying out follow-up on outstanding activities/actions especially in the field; individual rating for each DPs and GoSL on aid effectiveness carried out.

**Table 4: Rating for Output 4**

| Project Overarching Outcome: Effective Aid Coordination in Sierra Leone | Output 4: Improved Monitoring of Aid Accountability for Commitments |
|---|---|---|
| **Planned Key Activities** | **Excellent** | **Done** | **Partially Done** |
| Mutual accountability framework developed by MoFED and shared with DPs | X |  |  |
| Framework agreed and adopted | X |  |  |
| DPs institute peer review mechanisms in country |  | X |  |
| **Average rating for Output 3** | **Satisfactory** |  |  |

---
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Achievements

The evaluation noted that DACO led in the drafting and production of the mutual accountability framework; the final framework has been discussed and signed; DACO has been producing quarterly and yearly reports on progress made on the operations of the framework; independent monitors produced yearly report on the agreed actions in the framework; first and second ratings on the agreed actions successfully carried out; DACO successfully carried out the 2011 Paris Declaration survey and Fragile States Principles Monitoring survey; all DPs were involved in the drafting of the MAF.

4.3 Efficiency

As stated in the TOR, this section of the report examines and reviews the project management structure with the view to ascertaining whether it was suitable for the effective implementation of project activities and the achievement of project objectives. It further looks at the smooth nature of resource mobilization processes and whether a different type of interventions led to similar results at a lower cost.

Project Implementation and Management Structure

The project adopted the National Implementation (NIM) modality and it was fully owned and implemented by the MoFED through the DACO with administrative support from IPAU. Throughout the project circle, MoFED took the responsibility for the management and utilization of project funds; financial and substantive reporting; implementation of activities; and the achievements of intended results. DACO, a quasi-governmental institution, took the lead on aid coordination and effectiveness efforts on behalf of the government. IPAU, on the other hand, was the project implementing unit with strong administrative capacities and was responsible for financial and operational management and reporting. Overall, guidance was provided by the Project Board composing of senior staff at the MoFED and development partners who participated in the project.

In addition to financially contributing to the project, UNDP provided project management support for the NIM modality, which included project facilitation, advancing funds to the Ministry on a quarterly basis, monitoring progress, reviewing financial and field reports, facilitating implementation and the production of outputs, ensuring the quality of final donor reporting and many others.

Donor partners provided the much-needed financial resources; provided access to international knowledge resources and best practices and facilitation of for the project implementation. The GoSL co-financed the project and the resources were subjected to similar financial procedures and procurement rules, planning processes and reporting requirements as all other funding s
under the project. Procurement was done according to the agreed LoAs signed between MoFED and UNDP.\textsuperscript{11}

**Assessment of Performance**

The evaluation acknowledges that the project management structure and implementation modalities were, to a large extent, efficient and in synch with the project stated objectives. In the short and medium term, the placement of DACO within MoFED tended to generate efficiencies in project management. Of particular importance is the improvement in the collaboration and coordination between DACO and other units within the MoFED such as the EPRU to consolidate effort in aid coordination and management.

It also contributed to reducing tensions that had hitherto characterized relationships between DACO and MoFED when DACO was initially located in the Office of the Vice President. The adoption of the NIM, which was prompted by the intervention in 2010, provided room and space for DACO to build its capacity in financial management much required for long term sustainable development. Some senior officials at UNDP argue that DACO continues to struggle with proper financial reporting systems on activities. This was also captured in the audit report provided by UNDP.

It must be noted, however, that there is need to both increase and develop staff capacity at DACO with appropriate pay package and knowledge development beyond the Director and Deputy Director to ensure retention, efficiency and effectiveness, and to guarantee the sustainability of long term development gains scored in the last three years (2010-2013). This view is shared with DPs who argue that DACO has not reached its “optimal efficiency” largely due to the overall systemic capacity deficiency experienced nationally and regionally. To them, the GoSL should take the lead in effecting the Civil Service Pay Reform and to strategically target national institutions such as DACO to directly benefit from better conditions of service.

**DACO’s role**

The Project Document states clearly the management of the project in terms of the institution responsible for the execution and implementation of the project. The MoFED was charged with the responsibility to carry out both functions through DACO with administrative support from IPAU.

DACO is a quasi-governmental entity within the MoFED with the Minister of Finance acting as the co-Chair of DEPAC-the highest policy making body for aid coordination in Sierra Leone. The physical location of DACO at the MoFED clearly has advantages and disadvantages to note. First, DACO’s strategic location at the MoFED has increased government’s ownership of aid coordination and management. Second, it has enhanced government’s participation in DACOs

\textsuperscript{11} See Progress report of 2012
work by creating collaborative networks. On the negative side, DACO’s heightened visibility experienced in the pre-election era of 2007 has diminished and political decisions pertaining to DACO’s work are not made in a timely manner thereby slowing down its operations.

It is established that the key interventions were designed and implemented in an efficient manner. The following were noted during the interviews: M&E created in the MDAs and in the councils countrywide continue to function and PWG/SWGs have been set up with clear reporting lines. SWGs have been established for Health, Education, Agriculture, Roads and Water and Sanitation. These have long term effect on national development aspirations.

Facilitation of the creation of M&E units in the Ministries of Agriculture, Health and Education was also undertaken efficiently during the first half of the project, as considerable funding for PRSP was allocated to these three sectors. Focal persons were appointed to facilitate the work of the already established district council monitoring teams instead of creating an M&E unit in each district council. It ensured value for money by tagging onto existing structures to attain the desired output.

**Efficient utilization of resources**

UNDP assisted in capacitating DACO by recruiting a Finance Officer to assist in the management and efficient utilization of resources in accordance with UNDP financial management guidelines and practices. Since this exercise is not an audit assignment, the evaluation will focus on financial and audit statements made available to the consultant. In particular, the evaluation will pay particular attention to the comprehensive audit report entitled “Independent Auditors Report: January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2012”.

The following observations were recorded in the above report:

**Deficiency in the justification of expenditures**

- The procurement activities carried out by the partner were not motivated by purchase orders validated by the Project Coordinator;
- The contracts between the partner and focal persons are not supported by evidence supporting documents; and
- The entity does not have all these invoices as mentioned in our report on statement of expenses.

**No accounting software for record of transactions and budgetary monitoring**

- The partner has not been equipped with an application for accounting and budget monitoring. Thus expenditures on UNDP funds are centralized on an unsecured Excel sheet. Accounting operations were combined and recorded as a single Journal Entity.

---
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The report, therefore, recommended the following corrective measures to be implemented by DACO:

- The entity needs to improve its procurement system by introducing a system of purchase order to be signed by the Coordinator and Finance Officer;
- The entity should improve the collection and archiving of supporting documents for expenses;
- DACO should have an accounting software that would allow it to improve its accounting and budgetary management; and
- UNDP should assist in capacitating the entity in the areas of accounting and financial management.

To a large extent, resource mobilization was in line with project requirements. Unlike the Agenda for Change that had no Resources Framework, the Agenda for Prosperity had a rudimentary Resources Framework that helps in measuring results and progress in a more precise manner for the development of future Poverty Reduction Papers. It also precisely presents development activities that help donors to identify areas requiring support. DACO has been effective in providing information particularly on the shortfalls on the AfP to DPs. This was done through the Consultative Group and contacting different development agencies in Sierra Leone.

A different type of intervention will lead to similar results at a lower cost because DACO has improved as an institution since 2010 when this project commenced. Prior to 2010, the project design for the first phase was hurriedly carried out that led to shortcomings regarding the overall intervention logic and management arrangements. It remained a project for donors to fast-track development by avoiding existing government institutions. Further, DACO lost its focus on its overall objective to enhance government’s capacities. It became too involved in performing line functions and direct service delivery. And it used the DEX modality with heavy dependence on UNDP and donors.

In 2013, DACO has immensely improved its focus on aid coordination and management regardless of the stated challenges, particularly capacity weaknesses, it continues to face. The project document was appropriately designed and implemented and the four key outputs areas systematically carried out. Adopting the NEX modality and with some improvement in the financial management system (UNDP hired and placed a Finance Officer at DACO) coupled with the call for improved conditions of service based on the current civil service reform, there is every reason for one to conclude that a different type of intervention will lead to similar results at a lower cost.

**4.4 Partnership**

Partnership here presupposes project-related partnerships defining how the GoSL, UNDP and funding partners established synergies with the objective to bringing together partners in order to
foster project implementation and achievement of objectives. Clearly, the project endeavored to enlist the cooperation of four Sierra Leone’s traditional development partners (UNDP, DFID, WB and EC). Partnership of the project can be easily seen within the context and prism of the role of DEPAC.

At the national level, the Development Partnership Committee (DEPAC) is a high-level forum for dialogue between GoSL and development partners. DEPAC is chaired by the Minister of Finance, and co-chaired by the World Bank Country Manager and the ERSG. It is the highest level policy and decision making entity not only in the aid landscape but also in addressing sustainable development and poverty reduction issues.

DEPAC comprises development partners notably the WB, EC, UNDP, DFID, Ministers and Heads of Agencies, CSOs and other stakeholders are invited based on the agenda under discussion. The DEPAC is meant to meet on a quarterly basis. Between 2010 and 2011, DEPAC met its target of meeting every quarter. It, however, slipped on its target during 2012 and 2013 where it met three times instead of four. The Office of the ERSG is responsible for providing secretarial support to the DEPAC. Judging from the comments by different interviewees, it seems that the quality of the dialogue needs to be enhanced considerably, in order to improve its contribution to coordination. This is particular true with the GoSL where senior government officials at DEPAC meetings openly disagree on critical policy issues relating to aid coordination and effectiveness in the country. Participants tended to make individual statements, instead of stating a coherent government position and engaging in a real discussion.

Below the level of DEPAC, are Sector and Pillar Working Groups. These are collective dialogue and coordination mechanisms fora organized around sectors or themes. They are based on priority ‘pillars’ of the PRSP serving the government’s agenda for poverty reduction in the country. Although PWGs have received mixed assessment, the PBF used the PRSP sub-working groups to make the initial selection of project proposals. To avoid too much duplication, this arrangement was preferred over the original plans of setting up a special Technical Committee.

Additionally, established District Working Groups (DWG) meant to meet monthly and comprising representatives from the District Councils, the Paramount Chiefs, key district sector representatives, CSOs, Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) and the Decentralization Secretariat (DECSEC) have been operational. In the past, it appears that not all districts had functioning working groups as intended. Some DWGs had only just been constituted and some were meeting prior to the build-up to the elections in 2012 but then ceased their activities. In addition to disruptions caused by the elections, reported shortcomings in a number of areas including lack of capacity, resources, independence, incentives and technical know-how have been noted. However, in some cases regular meetings took place and information collected at district level was fed into the Pillar Working Groups.

UNDP’s relationship with the GoSL is predicated on establishing linkages between national priorities and strategies and the UN Vision. The Joint Vision served as the strategy document for the Peace-building Commission, the Peace-building Office and the country team, replacing the UN Development Assistance Framework. The consolidation of planning frameworks was a key
achievement strengthening internal cohesion and facilitating interaction with the GoSL. Key achievements within the project period (2010-2013) include but not limited to: improved democratic governance to help establish the institutional frameworks and capabilities required to secure peace and improve respect for human rights; facilitation of multi-partner efforts for peace consolidation with UNDP providing fund management and implementation services for multi-partner efforts; and employment generation and development of productive sector to enable the National Youth Commission to start up its operations.

UNDP will seek to expand partnerships through a variety of means: scaling up work, for instance, in local development by incorporating them into public investment programmes and co-financing by international financial institutions; expanding collaboration with India, Brazil and South Africa; tapping international investor interest to raise resources for socially responsible investments; reinforcing links within the country team – such as with the International Labour Organization and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization – on employment; addressing performance issues so as to attract additional funding from bilateral donors; and pursuing new opportunities presented, for instance, by dialogue and action on the ‘New Deal’ for fragile states. In order to underpin this strategy and the wider programme, UNDP will look beyond the change process implemented during the previous cycle to address next-generation issues such as improving conditions for attracting high-quality national and international staff, especially women; adopting creative options to attract specialized talent from universities at an affordable cost; aligning the office structure to enable collaborative work across programme areas; and seeking out cost savings that do not undercut operational performance.13

Overall, UNDP’s partnership with the GoSL and DPs has been rated as effective as the contact and facilitating agency for the UN system and leading implementer of donor investments in Sierra Leone. UNDP was very much involved in the placement of DACO from the Office of Vice President to the MoFED and have since been integral to DACO’s development over the years. It has strategically coordinated DPs to mobilize funds required to fund national development priorities and policies defined in the Poverty Reduction documents and the MDGs. It has, through the Deputy Country Director, effectively shared information on development related issues with DPDs and DACO.

4.5 Impact
The effective and transparent coordination and management of foreign aid is contingent upon a holistic approach. The MoFED plays a critical role in the overall process, especially when it has a central responsibility in the domestic budget process, including the mandate to plan and oversee the use of all public resources, domestic and foreign. At MoFED, DACO is responsible for the Aid Coordination, which is essentially about meetings and networking with other stakeholders particularly DPs. In this regard, DACO has remained an active participant in various aid effectiveness initiatives such as the Collaborative African Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI), the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and the International Dialogue on

13 For details, see the Draft Country Programme document for Sierra Leone, 2013-2014
Peace-Building and State Building and other preparatory meetings leading to the Busan high level forum. Sierra Leone is currently the pilot country for the New Deal.

DACO has always taken the lead and serving as the Secretariat in the preparation of Sierra Leone Poverty Reduction Strategic Papers (I, II and III), provided support for the preparation of the New Deal and Post-MDG Agenda. In particular, DACO coordinated the preparation and launch of the Agenda for Change and the Agenda for Prosperity. The Agenda for Prosperity serves as the country’s strategic document for poverty alleviation for five years. It outlines all activities the government intends to undertake during that period and it presents a results framework which will be used to monitor these activities effectively and efficiently. DACO organized a ministerial meeting on the Agenda for Prosperity in August 2013 with the view to establishing ministerial pillar working groups and to assign ministerial Chairs and Co-Chairs for each of the pillars. DACO provided the leadership and guidance in the development of these strategic documents.

During the project period (2010-2013), DACO has organized series of DEPAC meetings. Of particular note was the July 16, 2013 meeting which was chaired by the Minister of Finance and co-chaired by the WB Country Manager and the ERSG. The meeting reflected on the launch of the Agenda for Prosperity and discussed the next steps in its implementation including funds mobilization through convening s Consultative Group (CG). The meeting also discussed the monitoring tool for the Mutual Accountability Framework, the dashboard.

The Development Assistance Report (DAR) provides an overview of aid inflows to Sierra Leone. DACO has remained key in the preparation of this document which was at its preparatory stage in the third quarter of 2013. The report is being collated from the DAD and the Multilateral Project Division in the MoFED. It is a key document that outlines DPs continued support to development in Sierra Leone.

The DAD continues to be regularly updated to support the availability of current and reliable aid data. UNDP’s assistance to DACO has helped in following up with Donor Focal Persons to ensure that the DAD is regularly updated. To make DAD more effective and increase transparency and accountability between the government and DPs, DACO is in discussion with IPFMRP for the linking of the DAD with the IFMIS Char of Account with the view to making it possible for data from IFMIS to be automatically transferred into the DAD. DACO and Synergy International are also in discussion to expand the DAD to cover monitoring and evaluation as well as a module to track public investment. The purpose of this approach is to make the DAD more useful and beneficial to the ministry and other users.

UNDP assistance helped DACO to conduct field monitoring of the DWGs in July 2013. The purpose was to monitor the activities of DWGs in the districts, build their capacities to write their own reports and to brainstorm on the challenges they face in the field.

The evaluation noted some critical challenges in this sector. Of particular importance is DACO’s inability to build national capacities for aid coordination. Although one of the main objectives of the project was to enhance GoSL’s capacities, there has not been a clear capacity development strategy based on a comprehensive capacity needs assessment. Currently, DACO’s staff capacity
relies on three core staff: the Director, Deputy Director and the Aid Information Specialist. These three are well-grounded in the aid coordinating architecture. UNVs and Districts Focal Persons recruited have limited capacity to function within the aid coordinating environment. They are also poorly remunerated and as such, retention. As a matter of fact, DPs are not currently functional because of lack of financial support.

The sustainability of any project and its impact rests with the retention of staff equipped with institutional memory of that project. The frequency of Focal Persons on the part of DPs and UNDP has negatively impacted on project implementation. On the part of UNDP, focal persons for aid coordination keep on changing giving birth to the recruitment of project focal persons with limited knowledge in aid coordination issues.

The use of PIUs tends to generate resentment among MDAs, to such an extent that some MDAs in Sierra Leone (MoFED, MoFAIC, Trade, SPU, etc.) were spending a huge amount of effort trying to attract donor resources instead of focusing on service delivery.

4.6 Sustainability

The TOR requires the evaluation to look at whether the benefits of the DACO related activities are likely to continue after project funds are exhausted; whether the outputs delivered through the project be sustained by national capacities; whether a follow up support after the project duration have been discussed and to what extent did the progress have a catalytic effect on national actors. The evaluation discovered that the sustainability aspect of the project is mixed.

National Ownership:

DACO has played a strategic role in the design and implementation of the project, which form the buy-in and credibility for sustained impact. As a national institution, DACO has core staff who have been central in the implementation of the project during the period under review. It can be argued that with improved capacity at all levels within DACO and with enhanced visibility as the central aid coordinating unit, one would conclude that their activities are likely to continue after the exhaustion of project fund.

Furthermore, national capacities of the DWGs, M&E officers and UNVs in data gathering, collation and reporting have been built, which, in all intents and purposes, are critical to national ownership of the project after its expiration. One of the recognizable limitations to this, however, is the fact that DACO has only three core staff with institutional memory and in any given situation where new horizons are opened for them to leave DACO will negatively impact on aid coordination and management in Sierra Leone.

It is commonplace for Development partners to fall into the trap of undermining national ownership, particularly in highly aid-dependent countries with weak capacities. Donors calling for more government leadership also have to appreciate the complexity of local politics and the
fact that ownership is a goal to be striven for, not an established fact that simply needs to be recognized. National ownership cannot be engendered simply through participatory stakeholder consultations. Rather, it is about developing national capacities in all its forms to ensure that national stakeholders take responsibility of their own development priorities and aspirations. It is about investing in institutional capacity development with the view to strengthen national structures that are capable of identifying and seeking solutions to their problems. This is currently not well entrenched at DACO where capacity deficiencies are not uncommon.

**Sustainability of outputs delivered**
The evaluation found that some of the outputs delivered cannot be sustained by national actors largely due to limited numerical strength of DACO core staff and remuneration issues that make retention of staff difficult. As mentioned severally, there are only three core staff at DACO and the district focal persons have not been functional because of funding constraints. Besides, the retention of national actors is the responsibility of central government and until government puts a transparent recruitment policy and attractive pay package for core government staff, this can hardly be achievable. Government should, as an antidote, facilitate the Civil Service Pay Reform to targeted institutions such as DACO with the view to building national capacities and ensuring retention much required in state institutions.

Office equipment such as computers have been bought for district staff and training of councils in data collection for the DAD undertaken. The piloting of three district working groups in each region and the provision of equipment to ease their work will go long way to build their capacity. Furthermore, systems and procedures for facilitating district working groups with DACO, SWGs and line ministries have been established and made operational.

The DAC principles highlight not only the significance of a joint understanding of the country context, but also the significance of long-term strategies that focus on building state capacities. Although development partners in Sierra Leone have, to some extent, shifted their focus from piecemeal, ad hoc and reactive approaches with a focus on short-term results, Sierra Leone still has a long way to undertaking enduring and long-lasting solutions to its development challenges. At times development partner behavior seems to be driven by a perception of constant urgency, which is used as a common justification for focusing on ‘quick fixes’, instead of long-term solutions. This issue is aggravated by the comparably high staff turnover in most development agencies, which have shorter tours of duty for post-conflict countries.

In the various DEPAC meetings, DPs have been discussing follow up support after the current project ends because they recognize DACO to be relevant to the long term development aspirations and sustainability of the country. One way to address this is to provide institutional support by improving DACO’s capacity to better function as an aid coordinating agency for the country. DPs want to see DACO taking the lead in aid coordination and therefore, urge the government to expedite the process by seeking funding from the Banks (ADB and WB) by identifying targeted areas for financing.
**Catalytic effect on National Actors:**

The UNDP support to DACO has had a catalytic effect on national actors to engage in further aid effectiveness activities and donor support. From 2003 to date, DACO has been transformed from being a project located in the Office of the Vice President to a unit within the MoFED. As a unit, DACO’s remit remains to be (a) forum where the GoSL and donors meet to discuss aid effectiveness and coordination (DEPAC) and (b) create and establish a database for everyone to know what all else is doing with regards to aid inflow into Sierra Leone.

To a very large extent, the 2010 Evaluation Recommendations have been taken on board by DACO. For instance, the evaluation found that DACO has remained very active in aid coordination and effectiveness activities such as its role in the Collaborative African Budget Forum Initiative, the International Aid Transparency Initiative, the localization of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness in Sierra Leone and the International Dialogue on Peace-building and State Building initiatives. Collective dialogue and coordination mechanisms are closely linked to the entire aid business process.

DEPAC, which meets quarterly, is the highest forum for collective dialogue between the government and donors. It provides a forum for collective dialogue and decision making on technical issues related to development coordination. It has played a critical role in the formulation of the PRSP and monitoring progress in its implementation including funding gaps and potential overlaps. DEPAC’s discussions are informed by the work plans of sector and technical working groups. Sector and technical working groups are the main platforms for collective dialogue and decision making on operational issues, and are seated below DEPAC. This clearly indicates that aid coordination and effectiveness trickle down to the sectoral level meaning a holistic approach to aid effectiveness and management in Sierra Leone. Additionally, DACO has developed the Aid Policy as recommended by the last evaluation.

Generally, the international donor community has formulated a number of principles that are meant to guide development interventions in fragile states and situations because of the challenges associated with working in fragile states. It should be noted that fragile state principles relate specifically to the need to change development partner behavior, and do not involve mutual commitments between development and country partners. In this case, the fragile state principles complement and go beyond the Paris Declaration principles in two ways. First, they seek to identify specific issues that arise for improving aid effectiveness in fragile situations. Second, they emphasize the importance of the wider agenda of state-building, encompassing the role and significance of non-aid instruments of engagement, whole of government approaches and policy coherence in the political, security and development sphere. These are key for any development assistance in Sierra Leone.

---
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4.7 The future role of DACO in Aid Coordination Landscape

From the discussions with DPs, UNDP and some senior government officials at DACO, one can argue that the effective and transparent coordination and management of foreign aid requires a holistic approach. In that regard, MoFED has a key role to play in the overall process, given its central responsibility in the domestic budget process, including its legal responsibilities to plan and oversee the use of all public resources. Accordingly, MoFED should rework its existing structure to ensure that the necessary aid coordination and management functions can be performed adequately. DACO should continue to be part of the government and its capacity strengthened to take the “drivers’ seat” in the overall aid coordination architecture in Sierra Leone.

Since the cessation of hostilities that culminated in the end of the conflict in 2002, DPs have largely preferred to create and utilize parallel structures unarguably due to weak capacities in most state institutions. To a large extent the establishment of parallel structures has created tensions in the civil service and undermined national ownership, domestic accountability and sustainable institution-building. Because Sierra Leone remains an aid dependent country, the power relation between the GoSL and its development partners, though improved in recent times, is expectedly unbalanced. DACO needs to collaboratively work with and encourage its development partners to put special emphasis on developing the capacities of state institutions and strengthening domestic accountability by supporting non state actors.

DACO is also cognizance of the fact that although there is some improvement in the management of donor funds, aid relationships between the GoSL and donors continue to be characterized by a significant lack of trust in the management and utilization of donor resources. Because of the limited confidence, donor partners channel high amount of aid through NGOs and the limited use of country systems, hence preference for parallel structures. DACO needs to reverse this trend if its relevance as the aid coordination agency is to be sustained. Development partners should be encouraged to continue to provide timely and detailed information on what they are doing. For instance, the establishment and utilization of the Development Assistance Database (DAD) as a useful tool to track foreign aid provided to the country should be improved and enhanced to enable users to access information with a click of a button. The timely and sufficiently disaggregated manner in which data is entered will support aid coordination and foster alignment between the government and its development partners.

In the short term, DACO needs to firmly institutionalize the data entry process, by linking it to the budget cycle and making data provision mandatory. Further, more proactive outreach to development partners is required through the proposed development partner desks, as well as proactive and client-oriented preparation of analytical products, such as sector, district and partner profiles by DACO.

In the long run, the gaps and overlaps created in the aid coordination and management process as the result of the merger between the former Ministry of Development and Economic Planning and the Ministry of Finance requires attention. In order to guarantee that the merger continues to positively result in unified budgetary process, and to contribute to the appropriate allocation of recurrent expenditures, and to align domestic and foreign resources to national development
priorities, there is need for MoFED to consolidate and overhaul its development division with DACO playing a leading role.\textsuperscript{15} It is unarguable that with a selective pay reform extended to DACO and its capacity fully developed, it can play a more proactive role in leading donor coordination and in the improvement of database for donor intervention in Sierra Leone.

\textbf{5.0 LESSONS LEARNED}

- There is need for the GoSL to strengthen Inter-Ministerial coordination to allow consistency and consensus building especially before DEPAC meetings. It is important and strategic for Ministers attending DEPAC to speak with unanimity rather than openly disagreeing on very critical issues bordering on national development. Pre-DEPAC meetings among Ministers will limit open disagreements that have characterized recent DEPAC meetings;
- DACO as a unit in the governance structure means well and its staff working very hard to meet the challenges of aid coordination and management in Sierra Leone. However, it is critical to not only increase staff capacity in terms of numbers but also to invest more in capacitating core staff for them to deliver on government’s aid coordination and management initiatives;
- There exit gaps in resource persons with institutional memory on aid coordination and management at UNDP. Frequent changes in personnel working on economic development issues especially at UNDP tend to negatively impact the effectiveness of DACO;
- There is need for a mechanism for partnership building between DPs and the GoSL with clear defining roles and expectations with regards to financial reporting and updating the DAD;
- Cooperation from focal persons from the various organizations has improved remarkably. However, DACO still finds it difficult to get data from some DPs;
- DACO is currently a unit operating within the MoFED. It is important for the GoSL and DPs to develop sustainable capacity building plan to involve other units within the MoFED with the view dealing with core governmental structures rather than relying on PIUs; and
- The country is experiencing fragmentation in responsibilities for the mobilization and administration of aid across agencies of government resulting in inefficiencies and reduced effectiveness in the overall system. There is need for better coordination and clarity of roles between government agencies (for instance, DACO, MCC, MFAIC, Office of the Chief of Staff etc) dealing with aid and inflow of donors resources. This will avoid duplicity of roles and enhance aid effectiveness and management.

\textsuperscript{15} See DACO report of 2011
6.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation concludes that DACO remains focused and active throughout the project circle and the project delivered many key outputs. Some of them are the successful preparation and launching of the PRSP III or the Agenda for Prosperity, the establishment of collective dialogue and coordination mechanisms in the form of DEPAC meetings and Sector/Pillar Working Groups, the creation of a monitoring framework to gather data from the community level, the establishment and functioning of the Development Assistance Database (DAD), the publication of several Development Assistance Reports, the signing of the MAF and the designing of the Aid Policy.

However, some of the key issues eminent in 2010 have not been properly addressed. They include the relative weak incentives for aid alignment including financial reporting among agencies, capacity weaknesses at DACO, the frequent changes in personnel at UNDP and focal persons among DPs causing a dearth in institutional memory, need to improve the quality and quantity of aid information, to name a few.

DPs and UNDP should have provided more technical assistance, in addition to the provision of funding, and should have put a stronger emphasis on strengthening capacities of permanent government institutions. Further, the GoSL should have provided strategic policy direction and aid coordination and management capacities and systems for DACO with the view to consolidating aid inflow into Sierra Leone.

The overall rating of the project is shown on table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Partially Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Strengthened Capacity for Aid Coordination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2: Increased Coordination at sector and district levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3: Improved quantity and quality of Aid information</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 4: Improved monitoring of Aid Accountability for Commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating for Output 1.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations to the GoSL

- It is recommended that the MoFED be designated the lead coordinating agency for all external assistance. In this regard, it is further recommended that the GoSL takes full responsibility and ownership of DACO in all of its form. That is, the government should take the full resource support and management of DACO, recruit and capacitate more core staff and institutionally strengthen DACOs internal processes, procedures and systems;
• The GoSL should put premium on pre-DEPAC meetings of Ministers to ensure consensus building around strategic aid coordination and management issues. It is key for the government to strengthen Inter-Ministerial coordination to limits clash. Government must be seen to be more proactive;
• It is recommended that the government embarks on implementing the civil service payroll with the view to enhancing the morale of civil servants across board. This will improve the level of performance and increase retention of capacitated staff;
• It is recommended DACO organizes quarterly workshops for all DAD focal persons with the view to have live exercise on the new features of the DAD;
• It is recommended that the government provide support to DACO to coordinate the implementation of the Agenda for Prosperity, the coordination of the New Deal and post-MDGs;
• It is important for the government to establish clear role differentiations between and among agencies dealing with aid inflows and external assistances to Sierra Leone. This will limit competition and duplicity of roles by government agencies.

Recommendations to the DPs

• It is important for DPs invest more on strengthening capacities of core government institutions rather than establishing and dealing with parallel structures;
• It is recommended that DPs provide support to the MoFED through a multi-donor support framework predicated on a comprehensive needs assessment, a joint capacity development strategy and a common funding mechanism;
• It is recommended that DPs focus more on long term institutional capacity development of core institutions that are sustainable rather than on short term results and procedural issues; and
• There is need for DPs to ensure the timely availability of data to be fed into the DAD.

Recommendation to UNDP

• It is recommended that UNDP ensures timely disbursement of funds to avoid delays in the implementation of projects;
• It is also recommended that UNDP provides technical assistance to DACO and other MDAs by training and capacitating more core staff to enhance performance;
• It is important for UNDP to review its position on the DWGs who have not been functional largely due to funding gaps;
• UNDP should endeavor to attract and encourage other non-traditional donors to come on board with the view to enhancing the aid effectiveness and management system in Sierra Leone; and
• UNDP should provide assistance to DACO to develop a communication strategy to facilitate greater dissemination of development assistance as well as the activities of the PRSP to the general public.
Annexure

Annex 1: Sample Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Evaluation Components</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Did the project objectives remain relevant throughout the implementation phase?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How far did the project design address the issues eminent in 2010?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- And how relevant are the project objectives to contemporary situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How appropriate are the project objectives and outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How many and which of the project outputs were delivered as planned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Were project objectives effective enough to contribute to desired outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What were the qualities of the outputs and how timely were they delivered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has adequate progress been made in the delivery of outputs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What aspects of the project have been most effective or least effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How can similar projects be strengthened in future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How did it contribute to the implementation of the PRSP 1, 11 and 111?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What mechanisms were put in place by the project for knowledge development and management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do the results justify the level of resource injection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do the outputs to date justify the inputs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Where the resources used as planned? If not, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How appropriate was the management structure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Was resource mobilization smooth and in tune with project requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What key achievements and challenges were faced during UNDP support to the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Could a different type of intervention lead to similar results at a lower cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extend was UNDP effective in creating synergies and interactions with donors and government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Which partners were involved in promoting aid effectiveness agenda in Sierra Leone?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent did the progress had catalytic effect on the national actors to engage in further aid effectiveness activities and donor support?

Impact

In your view, how has the project contributed to:

a. National capacity development  
b. Poverty reduction and  
c. Sustained inflow of donor resources

What were the achievements and challenges emanating from anticipated outputs?

What were the unintended effects of the project, if any?

Lessons Learnt

What key lessons were learned from the project?

How could the project been done better?

Recommendations

What are key recommendations for future similar projects with regards: resource mobilization strategies, partnership building and coordination, management structures, working methodologies and programming?

Annex 2: TOR

After the cessation of hostilities in 2002, the Government of Sierra Leone and Development Partners held a Consultative Group meeting in Paris where it was agreed that the aid landscape in Sierra Leone needs to be rationalized in order to ensure that that large influx of international partners is properly coordinated to ensure that duplication and wastage of resources is minimized and that some sectors and regions are not oversubscribed at the expense of others. This started the process of putting together an efficient and effective mechanism for aid coordination and a framework for improved aid coordination and management.

Consequently, in 2003 the Government with support from Development Partners established the Development Assistance Coordination Office (DACO) as the central hub for the new aid coordination mechanism under the authority of the Vice President. In 2006, UNDP, DFID and the European Commission (EC) jointly agreed to provide financial and technical support to the DACO under the UNDP project ‘Support to the Development Assistance Coordination Office’, with the aim of achieving the following objectives:

- Coordinate the activities of the Inter-Ministerial Committee (IMC) and the National Technical Committee (NTC) for steering the implementation of the Poverty Reduction
Strategy Paper (PRSP).

- Set up and coordinate a system for monitoring and evaluation of programmes identified in the PRSP.
- Support capacity building for the implementation of the PRSP.
- Coordinate and analyze development assistance into Sierra Leone and facilitate Government/Donor dialogue through the Development Partnership Committee (DEPAC), the CG and other appropriate structures or mechanisms.

Develop a communication strategy to facilitate greater dissemination of development assistance as well as the activities of the PRSP to the public.

Since its establishment, the DACO has made significant contributions to the development of the first, second and third generation Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP I, II and III[1]) and to the coordination of donor assistance, through introducing Development Assistance Database (DAD), producing annual donor assistance report, convening the regular donor coordination meetings. The DACO was also instrumental in the implementation of the Paris Declaration in Sierra Leone, and successfully completed the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey, which was presented at the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in September 2008.

In addition, UNDP in collaboration with DFID and EC commissioned a first round evaluation of DACO in 2009 with the primary objective of undertaking a final evaluation of the multi donor funded project “Support for the Development Assistance Coordination Office (DACO), which commenced in January 2006 and ended in December 2008. The second objective of the assignment was to examine current arrangements for aid coordination and management in Sierra Leone and to make proposals for their improvement. The key finding is that the project was overambitious, not well designed and not well managed. The evaluation also provided some lessons, notably (i) effective co-funding agreements require harmonization of project implementation procedures including financial reporting, among the agencies involved and (ii) a focus on short-term results tend to impede achievement of sustainable development results in the long term.

It is now three years since the previous evaluation and is therefore opportune to conduct a second round project evaluation in order to evaluate the achievements, document the challenges in the evolving aid management environment, codify lessons learnt and make specific recommendations for the future aid architecture.
Objectives

The objectives of this evaluation are:

To evaluate and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project with regards to achievement of its planned objectives and outputs as set in the project document and annual work plans since 2010 when the “Support to Aid Policy Implementation” commenced. This will also include the evaluation of expenditure against the planned and actual budget.

To assess the relevance and adequacy of the project in light of the changes that have taken place and the identified and emerging challenges.

To codify challenges in project implementation and make recommendations to address them, given the lessons learned.

To review the emerging and evolving aid management environment, and make recommendations on the best modalities to enhance the effectiveness of the aid management in Sierra Leone.

Assess whether lessons and recommendations of the evaluation in 2009 were taken on board in informing DACO operations. If not what are the challenges?

Recommend the programme framework for the future support to the rationalized aid coordination body.

Responsibilities

The evaluation will cover the programme period 2010 to 2013 and be focused on a number of key areas in line with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. Below are indicative questions for each criterion:

Relevance

The extent to which the project support to DACO and the DACO activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the country

- Did the project design properly address the issues eminent in 2010?
- Did the project objective remain relevant throughout the project implementation phase?
- Is the project still relevant to current situation?

Effectiveness:

The extent to which project activities attain its objectives
• How many and which of the projects outputs were delivered as planned?
• To what extent has the project contributed towards overall aid effectiveness of Sierra Leone?
• Where the funds utilized as planned?

**Efficiency:**
Measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.

• Was the project management structure appropriate to the objective and activities of the project?
• Were the resource mobilization processes smooth and in synch with the project requirement?
• Could a different type of intervention lead to similar results at a lower cost?

**Impact:**
The positive and negative changes produced by the DACO project and activities, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended

• To what extent has the project contributed towards the poverty reduction, national capacity development, and sustained inflow of the donor resources?
• What positive and negative effects are resulting from anticipated outputs?
• What are the unintended effects on the project, if any?

**Sustainability:**
The benefits of the DACO related activities that are likely to continue after the project fund has been exhausted

• Will the outputs delivered through the projects be sustained by national capacities, after the end of the project duration?
• Have the follow up support after the project duration been discussed and formalized?
• To what extent did the progress had catalytic effects on the national actors to engage in further aid effectiveness activities and donor support?

**Partnerships:**
The extent to which the project brings together the relevant stakeholders to achieve the project objectives

• Which partners did the project bring together to promote the aid effectiveness agenda in the country?
• How effective was UNDP’s interaction with the donors and the government?
• It is expected that the evaluation results will be used in future planning by the government of Sierra Leone and will also help donors effectively support Government
interventions in aid effectiveness and harmonization.

**Output and Deliverables:**

**Evaluation inception report:**

- Prepared by the evaluators before full fledge data collection. It should include proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.

**Preliminary findings report:**

- A presentation of findings to key stakeholders orally and in writing will be made prior to completing the in-country mission. The purpose of this session is to provide opportunity for initial validation and elaboration of the evaluator’s observations and analysis.
- Draft evaluation report – within two weeks the evaluator will submit a draft evaluation report to UNDP;
- Final evaluation report – within two weeks of receiving comments from stakeholders, the Evaluation Team will submit a final document.

**Corporate Competencies:**

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism.

**Functional Competencies of National Consultant:**

- Demonstrated knowledge of capacity development methods;
- Strong knowledge in key areas related to democratic governance such as political parties, the media, civil society, advocacy/education, human rights, women’s empowerment and legal sector;
- Prior experience in conducting development evaluation;
- Demonstrated knowledge of the democratization process in Sierra Leone;
- Knowledge in key areas related to democratic governance including political parties, the media, civil society, advocacy/education, human rights, women’s empowerment, legal sector, judiciary reform, peace and development preferred;
- Good knowledge of monitoring and evaluation methods.

**Qualifications**

**Education:**
At least a Masters’ Degree in a Social Science or other relevant area.

Experience:

- Minimum of 10 years of work experience;
- Familiarity with programme implementation in complex multi donor-funded programmes.

Language:

- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English.

Duration of the consultancy:

- The task is expected to take 21 working days to complete. It is expected that the International Consultant will spend 2 weeks in-country including field visits and the remaining time will be allocated for the production of evaluation deliverables. The detailed ToR will be shared upon commencement of the assignment.

Reporting Mechanism:

- The International Consultant is the Evaluation Team Leader. The Team Leader will report directly to the UNDP Country Director or any designated person acting in that capacity, who will provide guidance and ensure the monitoring of satisfactory completion of evaluation deliverables.

Payment Modalities:

Payment will be made in three installments upon satisfactory completion of the following deliverables:

- 1st installment: 20% upon signing the contract;
- 2nd Installment: 40% upon submission of the draft Evaluation Report;
- 3rd Installment: 40% upon submission of the final Evaluation Report.

Evaluation of Criteria and Weighting

The experts will be evaluated against a combination of technical and financial criteria. Maximum score is 100% out of a total score for technical criteria equals 70% and 30% for financial criteria.

The technical evaluation will include the following:

- Background and minimum educational qualification as defined above-10%;
- Practical previous experience relevant to the TOR - 30%;
• Substantial professional knowledge and experience in coordination and civil registration -50%;
• English language fluency -10%.

**Application Procedure**
Qualified and interested candidates are hereby encouraged to apply. The application should contain the following:

• Completed P11 form;
• Financial proposal (fees, tickets, daily subsistence allowance and other related expenses);
• Technical proposal (methodology of approach to the task).