

Evaluation of the Security Sector
Programme in Sierra Leone
May – July 2016

Final Report

July 2016

Contents

Abbreviations	0
1 Introduction	7
1.1 Evaluation purpose, objectives, approach and methodology.....	7
1.2 Scope and limitations.....	8
1.3 Report structure.....	9
2 Contextual background	9
2.1 Security Sector development.....	9
2.2 SSR Project background.....	12
3 Assessment of the SSR Project	13
3.1 Relevance.....	13
3.2 Project design, intervention logic and theory of change.....	16
3.3 SSR Project progress: key achievements and challenges.....	19
3.4 Outcomes, potential impact and sustainability.....	28
4 Project Management, Coordination and Synergies	30
4.1 Efficiency, financial disbursement and procurement.....	31
4.2 M&E and Learning.....	32
4.3 Coordination and synergies.....	33
5 UNDP cross cutting themes: Human Rights, HRBA and Gender Equality	35
6 Recommendations	38
ANNEXES	41
Annex 1: ToR.....	42
Annex 2: People Met.....	43
Annex 3: Disbursements of funds.....	44

Abbreviations

AfC	Agenda for Change (PRSP II)
AfP	Agenda for Prosperity (PRSP III)
ASJP	Access to Security and Justice Programme
AtoJ	Access to Justice
BC	British Council
CDIID	Complaints, Discipline & Internal Investigations Department
CPD	Country Programme Document
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
DfID	Department for International Development
EVD	Ebola Virus Disease
EU	European Union
GE/WE	Gender Equality/Women's Empowerment
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GoSL	Government of Sierra Leone
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
HRC	Human Rights Commission
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPCB	Independent Police Complaint Board
MIA	Ministry of Internal Affairs
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MRU	Manu River Union
ONS	Office of National Security
PBSO	Peace Building Support Office
ProDoc	Project Document
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategic Programme
PW	Prison Watch
RC	UN Resident Coordinator
SLCS	Sierra Leone Correctional Services
SPC	Standing Police Capacity
SSR	Security Sector Reform
TAM	UN Technical Assessment Mission
UNDAF	the United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNIPSIL	United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

UNPOL United Nations Police
UPR Universal Period Review

Executive Summary

In May 2016, UNDP commissioned an External Evaluation of the Security Sector Reform Project (hereafter the ‘SSR Project’) in Sierra Leone. The Evaluation was carried out between 30 May and July 2016, with a field mission to Freetown from 5 June till 12 June. The Evaluation is forward looking as it explores opportunities and challenges for UNDP and offers concrete recommendations on how to bridge shortfalls and respond more effectively and efficiently to evolving SSR / rule of law demands. The Evaluation assesses the Theory of Change (ToC), project design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and to some extent impact, in as far as this is possible as the interventions measured covers a period of a maximum of 2 years and six months (from January 2014 till June 2016), with some interventions still on-going.

The scope of the Evaluation is limited as it does not include field visits beyond Freetown and was carried out within a relatively short period. Further, it does not cover all human rights aspects and the Access to Justice (AtoJ) Project. However, during the inception period, it was agreed that the Evaluation explores whether a human rights based approach (HRBA) and gender equality (GE) was sufficiently reflected into the design and implementation of the project. The Evaluation was therefore closely coordinated with UNDP SSR and AtoJ team who recently commissioned an external evaluation of the Access to Justice Project. Together, the findings and recommendations of the two evaluations will inform the scoping and formulation of a new Rule of Law Project 2016-2019.

Overall, the Evaluation finds that the SSR Project has been *relevant* and able to achieve a number of its planned deliverables *effectively* at output level.

It has without doubt been a very difficult and close to impossible task for UNDP to fill in the gap and follow up of the UN missions support following the closure of UNIPSIL and the massive capacity development support provided by UNPOL as well as other development partners, such as the UK in particular through ISAT.

Although, the Project is informed by a good understanding of security sector reform challenges, needs and key dynamics of security sector reform, and an adaptability to a very changed context, the Evaluation, finds that the *ToC, ProDoc design and intervention logic* have largely been driven by the TAM report. A majority of partners expressed a strong ownership, justification and rationale for the suggested interventions. However, not all partners were fully involved in the scoping, formulation and needs assessment analysis.

UNDP’s *institutional building* to the security sector institutions in Sierra Leone proved particularly strong vis-à-vis its Technical Assistance (TA) support design. The *continuity* of

Standing Police Capacity (SPC) short-term and long-term inputs from APCOF provided invaluable technical assistance and established a very *close dialogue* in particular with the SLP and the IPCB, which was evident from the visits. Challenges are observed with regard to its preparation, the involvement of partners, and the rationale and justifications for the having selected so many partners and interventions. The result is that the project has been mainly activity based and some intervention areas have consequently become fragmented. A future programme should invest adequate time in selection of partners, focus on outcome and addressing the root causes of people's mistrust in SSR institutions as well as adequately measuring the theory of change. There is little evidence that points to improved governance or service delivery and 'transformative' and 'behavioural' change.

Amongst the *key achievements*, the project prevented the EVD outbreak in prisons (correction and holding centres) by rehabilitation of 2 EVD holding units at the correction centre in Freetown, and equipping the SLCS across the country with hygiene and sanitation material, it enhanced police oversight through the operationalization of the IPCB and development of all its internal systems. It initiated its investigations and complaints handling, and mainstreamed human resources recruitment and police oversight procedures within the SLP and brought security services closer to the people through community policing. It also strengthened security sector coordination and supported the EVD response led by ONS.

The Evaluation notes a number of key challenges around a changed context, a project design with many partners and activities and with regard to management and coordination and not least sustainability.

Just four months into the SSR Project, the project implementation was significantly *challenged* with the first Ebola case in Sierra Leone discovered. As a consequence, UNDP had to re-programme most interventions from September 2014 for a period of more than a year. A few activities continued and two new outputs were formulated to respond to the Ebola outbreak (Annex 3). The *impact* of UNDP's support to Sierra Leone Correctional Services (SLCS) through assistance of Prison Watch (PW) is clear as Ebola did not spread inside the prisons. The support moreover ensured that wrongly imprisoned prisoners were discharged through legal aid provided by PW's recruited legal practitioners.

Project management, coordination and ensuring synergies has been a challenge. This was mainly caused by the EVD crisis, restrictions in movement and a high staff turnover and difficulties to get international staff, technical assistance and support staff to fill vacant positions in a timely manner throughout the project implementation. There have thus been few resources to monitor progress against disbursements and evaluate learning and transformative changes at outcome level. With regard to coordination, strides were made to formalise and strengthen the coordination amongst security sector institutions and Development Partners, however, there is

a need to strengthen and re-activate these initiatives. There are obvious *synergies* between SSR, AtoJ, human rights and gender equality which could be further strengthened in a new Rule of Law Project.

Although, human rights and gender equality is at the centre of the SSR Project and part of many interventions, it is clear that *Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA) and Gender Equality (GE)* were not strategically focused to address for example gender transformative changes within security sector institutions and enhancing rights holders trust in security sector institutions.

Finally, but not least, *sustainability* remains perhaps the most critical challenge of all. The SSR Project needs to be further prioritised and adequately supported by the GoSL. All security sector institutions interviewed lack basic equipment and capacity to deliver quality services. There are critical constraints with regard to operational costs (e.g. transport, fuel, reliable electricity, internet, office equipment) and delivery of professional training. None of the newly established institutions are currently allowed to hire staff due to a civil service reform and generally government budget constraints although there are critical staffing constraints. To ensure long-term sustainability and follow up on the GoSL's commitment to enhance security sector institutions and the rule of law, it is critical that sustainability issues are raised at strategic level with the GoSL to find context-adaptive and pragmatic solutions for future programming.

Based on the above key achievements and challenges, the Evaluation provides the following overall recommendations:

1. **A need for a new holistic Rule of Law Project**, which will strengthen the synergies between Access to Justice (AtoJ) and security sector reform (SSR) and the delivery of justice and security services to the people including the most marginalised. Empowering right holders to demand for services and accountability from the duty bearers should be at the centre of a new project.
2. **A need for a Programmatic modality**. A new Rule of Law Programme should shift from a project and activity based approach toward a programmatic approach, with fewer partners to enhance focus on outcomes and M&E compliance.
3. **A need for a strategic focus on sustainability**. To ensure long-term sustainable and follow up on the GoSL's commitment to enhance security sector institutions and the rule of law, it is critical that sustainability issues are raised at the strategic level with the GoSL to find context-adaptive and pragmatic solutions for future programming.

4. A need to strengthen **Project Management and M&E Learning**. There is a critical need to enhance the M&E quality assurance. This includes streamlining the internal UNDP reporting procedures including to track physical progress against disbursement. A future Rule of Law Programme should include adequate financial support. Similarly, several Implementing Partners' M&E mechanisms are weak and it is critical that their M&E systems and compliance are strengthened if they should continue to be Implementing Partners in a new Rule of Law Programme.
5. **Coordination and coherence to be strengthened**. There is no formalised SSR coordination posing thus high risks of overlaps in donor areas of support. Close coordination and planning between GoSL and Development Partners, such as ISAT, DFID, UNODC, EU, Irish Aid, US Embassy (and its linkages to RoL and AtoJ) are much needed.
6. **Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA)/Gender Equality (GE)**: The UNDP (with technical assistance from OHCHR) should engage with the GoSL with regard to the operationalization of relevant UPR 2016 recommendations in the preparation of the next Rule of Law Programme. HRBA/GE should be integrated into the next Programme ToC, logframe and result framework, which should include HRBA / GE qualitative indicators. This will strengthen the focus of 'non-discrimination' and 'accountability' for the GoSL Implementing Partners as duty-bearers as well as legal aid and rights awareness / demand amongst the most marginalised communities.
7. **SLP**: Continued support is relevant, and much needed to enhance the rule of law and falls under UNDP's mandate. Future support should focus on fewer interventions/ departments and ensure coherence with ISAT and other donor support. Community policing, gender equality and oversight are particularly relevant vis-à-vis UNDP's comparative strengths. Future support should focus on ensuring 'accountability' and focusing on enhancing trust in the police. M&E and Learning in the SLP should be strengthened to ensure transformative and behavioural changes. Future training activities should apply a more systemic and tailored approach to training. Training needs assessment, screening/selection of participants by UNDP/SPC TA experts (to avoid nepotism), curriculum development and ToT approaches have to be entrenched to ensure sustainability and greater outreach. Aspects of value for money and performance (knowledge transfer and usage) have to be considered and there should be in-built follow up individual performance plans.

8. Oversight:

- a. IPCB: The Evaluation recommends that support to the IPCB be continued. UNDP's support is critical for continuity. To strengthen oversight and avoid duplication, future support could strengthen the overall oversight and referral mechanisms between IPCB and other oversight bodies (CDIID, ACC, HRC, Ombudsman Institution, Parliament Committees). This would enhance synergies with the AtoJ Project. The issue of sustainability vis-à-vis the GoSL commitment to support IPCB is critical and should be raised at strategic level by the RC and/or at SC level.

9. Prison and detention facilities:

- a. SLCS: Support to the SLCS is to be continued to respond to the critical needs evidenced in the UNDP capacity assessment and with the UPR 2016 recommendations. Future support should thus improve prison conditions, rehabilitation and the use of pre-trial detention. Continued capacity development/training of SLCS staff is relevant, yet it needs to be tailored carefully and approved by SPC TA and UNDP human rights experts (similar to SLP capacity development above). Such interventions will also strengthen synergies with the AtoJ Project.
- b. PW: The Evaluation recommends that support to PW be continued. PW is relevant partner with potential 'buy in' on legal advocacy around rehabilitation and provides legal aid to prisoners throughout the country. Future programmes could thus support SLCS around rehabilitation as well possible support around legal advocacy and legal aid. Further support could also be targeted on enhancing PWs M&E reporting capacity, which showed signs of weaknesses. Such support will enhance the synergies with the AtoJ Project.

10. Overall SSR Coordination and Security at borders:

- a. ONS: The Evaluation recommends that support to ONS be re-assessed in a future Rule of Law Project for the following reasons: Although both SSR coordination and integrated border management are important for the rule of law and vis-à-vis the Political Economy of Sierra Leone, the Evaluation finds that there may be other organisations who are better placed to support ONS in these thematic areas including ISAT and IOM. In addition, the EVD project supported interventions that have come to an end and are largely sustainable.

1 Introduction

This report presents the major findings and recommendations of the External Evaluation of the “Security Sector Reform (SSR) Project” from January 2014 till June 2016.

1.1 Evaluation purpose, objectives, approach and methodology

The **purpose** of the Evaluation is:

- To learn lessons and deepen the understanding of how the SSR was designed, set up, managed and delivered. The Evaluation will generate useful lessons especially on the design, management and quality of results generated by the project for improving the quality of similar and future initiatives;
- To account for various investments in terms of the intended and unintended results; the Evaluation will also provide essential information on results to donors and partners to account for all investments to SSR Project;
- To inform decisions on the way forward as well as the sustainability, scalability and replicability of the SRR intervention.

The **main objective** of this Evaluation is to assess UNDP’s contribution towards supporting and strengthening the security sector in Sierra Leone as well as to inform the design of the new Rule of Law Programme-2016-2019.

The **specific objectives** of the Evaluation include:

- Review the performance of the Project in achieving the outputs as per UNDP Country Programme and strategic plan;
- Assess the SSR relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the SSR Project design, governance, management, implementation, and emerging results and their sustainability;
- Identify and assess the strengths, weaknesses, constraints and opportunities of the SSR from design to results;
- Assess the factors that have influenced the achievement of SSR results and the potential for the scalability and replicability;
- Draw, on the basis of the objectives above, lessons and recommendations for sustaining the SSR project results, and providing guidance for future strategic direction of the SSR, and also for designing and implementing similar development initiatives (potentials for scalability).

The Evaluation was carried out by Nicolaj Sønderbye, Senior Expert on Rule of Law, Access to Justice and Human Rights. It was carried out between 30 May and July 2016, with a field mission to Freetown from 5 June till 12 June.

The methodology used for data-collection was as follows:

- Desk study;
- Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with key informants (UNDP, UN staff, Office of National Security (ONS), SLP (Sierra Leone Police), SLCS (Sierra Leone Correctional Services), Independent Police Complaint Board (IPCB), Prison Watch (PW), key SSR donors, end-beneficiaries and right holders;
- Triangulation meetings with key experts on SSR, Access to Justice (AtoJ), Rule of Law (RoL), Human Right and Gender Equality experts;
- A debriefing meeting was held with UNDP on 9 June to discuss overall observations and preliminary findings.

1.2 Scope and limitations

The Evaluation assesses the Theory of Change (ToC), project design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and to some extent impact as much as possible as the interventions measured covers a period of a maximum of 2 years and six months (from January 2014 till June 2016), with some interventions still on-going. The Evaluation focuses on key results, progress, challenges and needs for adjustments due to developments in the country context linked to the Ebola outbreak in 2014. See Terms of Reference (ToR) in Annex 1 for further description of the scope of work of the Evaluation.

The scope of the Evaluation is limited as it does not include field visits beyond Freetown and was carried out within a relatively short period. During the inception it was agreed that this Evaluation would focus *only* on the SSR Project and *not* cover all human rights aspects and the Access to Justice (AtoJ) Project. However, during the inception period, it was agreed that the consultant explores whether UNDP's commitment towards applying a human rights based approach (HRBA) and its principles, such as non-discrimination and equality, participation and inclusion, accountability and rule law as well as gender equality / women's empowerment (GE/WE) was sufficiently reflected into the design and operationalized in the SSR Project.

Although, the AtoJ Project was not part of the Evaluation, the consultant interviewed key UNDP staff and stakeholders including the UNDP governance team leader and its AtoJ team, UNDP gender specialist as well as key AtoJ informants and development partner organisations in Freetown. This was deemed necessary to assess the ToC and synergies between SSR, AtoJ, Human Rights, HRBA and GE/WE.

Throughout the mission, close consultations were held with the UNDP SSR team as well as the AtoJ team who acted as resource persons.

The consultant would like to express his thanks to UNDP and to everyone met during the assignment, for allocating their valuable time for and sharing their knowledge and experience with the Evaluation.

The Evaluation findings and recommendations are based on the persons consulted and data gathered prior to, during and after the field mission. The views reflect the position of the consultant and not necessarily UNDP or the GoSL (Government of Sierra Leone).

1.3 Report structure

The report is structured as follows:

Section 1 introduces the Evaluation background, purpose and objective, the criteria and key Evaluation issues addressed, the methodology and structure of the report.

Section 2 summarizes the relevant contextual background related to SSR developments in Sierra Leone and the SSR project.

Section 3 summarizes the key findings, results and challenges of the SSR project against the general Evaluation criteria.

Section 4 assesses the project management, coordination and synergies.

Section 5 assesses the SSR against HRBA and Gender Equality.

Section 6 finally presents the recommendations.

2 Contextual background

2.1 Security Sector development

Security Sector Reform (SSR) interventions in Sierra Leone have moved away from a *state-centric approach* (supporting RSLAF-SLP-ONS) from the end of the civil war in 2002, to a *holistic approach* (with a focus on police-justice-corrections) from 2005 till 2012 to the current *service delivery approach* (with a focus on community outreach) from 2012 till today¹.

Widespread human rights violations by police and military during the civil war (1991 – 2002) led to deep mistrust of security forces among the population and building a security

¹ Interviews with SPC Police Advisors

infrastructure that is accountable, credible and effective has been an essential component of Sierra Leone's post-conflict recovery.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) previously examined the causes and consequences of the civil war and found the failure to deliver security *'was largely a result of the failures in governances and institutional processes'*.²

After the conflict, the international community, largely comprising the UN and UK, commenced a major effort at Security Sector Reform (SSR) and huge strides have been made towards the demobilization of former combatants and the establishment of national security structures, which is considered a major success.³

Despite signs of marginal governance progress according to the Mo Ibrahim Governance Indicators 2015⁴, security and justice sector remains weak with significant challenges around corruption, service delivery out-reach and adherence to the rule of law. The justice and security sectors are highly centralized, with services dropping off outside Freetown. Most of the population continue to rely on customary or informal justice to resolve disputes.

When it comes to human rights, Sierra Leone has made progress with regard to putting in place a legal and policy framework. However, major challenges continue to exist when it comes to the actual implementation of human rights.⁵

Gender inequality and gender based violence (GBV) continues to be critical challenges in Sierra Leone⁶. To address gender inequality, cultural barriers and a general acceptance within communities with regard to GBV and domestic violence, tailored interventions is needed including further targeted sensitization of men.⁷

An Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC) perception survey in 2010 found 34.6% perceived the Sierra Leone Police (SLP) to be corrupt – the worst performing institution in the survey. The ACC places responsibility partly on the poor pay scales for incentivizing corruption. In

² Witness to Truth: Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Report, Volume 2.

³ Some 72,000 soldiers were demobilized and the size of the statutory army decreased from 17,000 in 2000 to 10,500 in 2006. Middlebrook, P. & Miller LLC, S., 2006, 'Sierra Leone Security Sector Expenditure Review', UK Department for International Development (UK-DFID)

⁴ Sierra Leone ranks scores 51 out of 100, ranking 25th out of 54 in Africa.

⁵ UPR for Sierra Leone of January 2016. Ratification of ICCPR (2014) and UNCAT (2014) and key informant interview with OHCHR Sierra Leone.

⁶ Interview with OHCHR and UNDP Gender Advisor.

⁷ Such interventions are being specifically targeted now by the UN GE/WE Working Group.

addition, the Fragility Assessment of 2012 as part of the New Deal⁸ found that both security and justice sectors in Sierra Leone were in the ‘transition’ phase. The findings of the updated Fragility Assessment in 2014 revealed that fragility indicators remained relatively weak for Sierra Leone⁹. While public confidence in security institutions seemed to have been “sustained” since the 2012 Assessment, people’s sense of justice appeared to have “slipped backwards” with growing concerns about political and regional divisions. Concerns were voiced around interference in the administration of justice, and the perception that police and judiciary are susceptible to political pressures. Finally, according to a recent Afrobarometer Survey a majority (59%) of respondents still perceive “most” or “all” police officials to be corrupt – the highest level of perceived corruption among public institutions.¹⁰

However, police oversight and internal discipline has been strengthened through support of the SSR Project to the CDIID and IPCB according to all key informants interviewed. As discussed under Section 3.4 the IPCB has been operationalized and cases are now reported to IPCB and investigated. IPBC meet with oversight agencies monthly and the GoSL shows will to prioritize independent civilian oversight of the police.

In addition, a recent external perception survey of a pilot community policing project in Kambia district¹¹ supported by the SSR Project indicates that ‘community policing’ has enhanced public awareness on the roles and responsibilities of the police in the targeted districts. Hence, prospects of *replicability* and *scalability* of similar community policing interventions to other districts seems to be highly relevant.

When it comes to prison services and correctional services, steps are moving in the right directions with the ratification of UNCAT and strides towards ratifying the OPCAT¹². Yet, there are serious violations of people’s rights during pre-trial detention with examples of people being detained for very long periods and thereafter discharged with no charges¹³, serious constraints with regard to access to justice, absence of rehabilitation services, over-crowded prisons (up to 600 per cent) and generally very poor health and sanitary conditions¹⁴. Yet, there are no indications of massive abuse by SLCS or prison guards and CSOs such as Prison Watch

⁸ The New Deal proposes five peacebuilding and statebuilding goals (PSGs) for conflict-affected countries: (1) legitimate politics, (2) security, (3) justice, (4) economic foundations, and (5) revenues and services. Each of the five is assessed as being at one of the following stages: crisis; rebuild and reform, transition; transformation and resilience.

⁹ A new Fragility Assessment is currently being finalised.

¹⁰ http://afrobarometer.org/sites/default/files/publications/Dispatches/ab_dispatchno103_corruption-trust-performance.pdf

¹¹ Kambia perception survey 2016.

¹² UPR Sierra Leone January 2016.

¹³ Interview with PW. See also Jefferson, A.M. and Gaborit, L.S. (2015) *Human Rights in Prisons: Comparing Institutional Encounters*, Basingstoke Palgrave MacMillan.

¹⁴ UNDP Capacity Assessment of the SLCS by Ross, G(2015).

are allowed access to prisons and provide counselling and legal aid to inmates¹⁵.

Overall, at the strategic level the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL) is committed to enhance the rule of law and to security sector reform through strengthening institutional capacity, transparency and accountability in its Agenda for Change (AfC) and strategic security sector reviews, please refer to Section 3.2 below. Yet, in reality this commitment is challenged as there are critical sustainability issues when it comes to GoSL funding to security sector and in the field of rule of law, which are discussed in the report below.

2.2 SSR Project background

The SSR Project is to a large degree a response to the recommendations made by the UN Technical Assessment Mission (TAM) in January 2013 and the closure of UNPOL (2012) and UNIPSIL (2014). The TAM report found that the security sector and border control management were key areas of potential risk if support were not maintained. Consequently, it recommended that UNDP incorporate SSR work areas into its programming.

The UNDP thus funded its first SSR Project in Sierra Leone largely funded by the Peace Building Fund (PBF) - 'Building Effective and Accountable Institutions for Increased Citizens Security' – with the two main outputs:

- i) Improved security sector governance, oversight and coordination and
- ii) Improved border security for enhanced citizen safety.

However, already four month into its implementation the EVD crisis commenced and UNDP was forced to undertake a comprehensive reprogramming in August-September 2014 to helping contain and respond to the outbreak. This was aligned with the GoSL strategy and it was agreed the activities would be reprogrammed to support the EVD response among security providers and in prisons and detention facilities as the situation would rightly be fatal if EVD would spread into the over congested detention facilities.

The Project was thus re-programmed with the following new outputs:

- iii) Improving capacities of security sector providers to effectively respond to EVD and
- iv) Support to prisons and detention facilities to minimize risk of an outbreak.

When EVD came under control in November 2015, the SSR Project went back to its original

¹⁵ Jefferson, A.M. and Gaborit, L.S. (2015) *Human Rights in Prisons: Comparing Institutional Encounters*, Basingstoke Palgrave MacMillan. See also Jefferson, A.M.; Feika, M and Jahallah, A (2014) *Prisons staff in Sierra Leone - Everyday Governance in African Prisons* in "The Prisons Service Journal".

outputs above. However, throughout the period, there have been two Project Documents (ProDoc) as several activities around institutional building continued under the original ProDoc throughout EVD crisis.

The UNDP SSR project implementing partners have been multiple and targeted both RSLAF, SLP, ONS, SLCS, SLP and IPCB.

The security sector faced significant challenges during the project implementation period. In May 2014 Sierra Leone discovered its first Ebola case. As detention facilities / prisons were found to be a high risk area for fast transmission if EVD entered (overcrowding and poor hygiene conditions) and due to the non-functioning of the Courts, a pilot project with Prison Watch was devised to ensure release of detainees on prolonged pre-trial detention or minor offenders.

3 Assessment of the SSR Project

The section assesses the relevance, project design, intervention logic, theory of change (ToC), effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the SSR Project.

3.1 Relevance

The SSR Project is to a large degree a response to the country context and recommendations made by the UN Technical Assessment Mission (TAM) in January 2013 and the result of the closure of UNPOL (2012) and UNIPSIL (2014). The TAM report found that the security sector and border control management were key areas of potential risk if support were not maintained. Consequently, it recommended that UNDP incorporate SSR work areas into its programming.

The UNDP thus funded its first SSR Project in Sierra Leone largely funded by the Peace Building Fund (PBF) - *Building Effective and Accountable Institutions for Increased Citizens Security* – with the two main outputs:

- i) Improved security sector governance, oversight and coordination and
- ii) Improved border security for enhanced citizen safety.

However, already four months into its implementation the EVD crisis commenced and UNDP was forced to undertake a comprehensive reprogramming in August-September 2014 to help contain and respond to the outbreak. This was aligned with the GoSL strategy and it was agreed the activities would be reprogrammed to support the EVD response among security providers and in prisons and detention facilities as the situation would rightly be fatal if EVD would spread into the over congested detention facilities.

The Project was thus re-programmed with the following new outputs:

- i) Improving capacities of security sector providers to effectively respond to EVD and
- ii) Support to prisons and detention facilities to minimize risk of an outbreak.

When EVD came under control in November 2015, the SSR Project went back to its original outputs above. However, throughout the period, there have been two Project Documents (ProDoc) as several activities around institutional building continued under the original ProDoc throughout EVD crisis.

The SSR ProDocs are aligned with the Project Outcome (PBF2-1): Support the implementation of peace agreements and political dialogue. The SSR Project's objectives are to enhance the coordination and service delivery of security institutions, improving border security and enhancing people's safety and responding to the EVD outbreak. This support has been relevant vis-à-vis the contextual background and Sierra Leone Political Economy in 2013 and 2014.

The overall government's Development Strategy (Poverty Reduction Strategic Programme (PRSP)), 'the Agenda for Change' (AfC, PRSP II, 2007-2012) as well as its current and now third Development Strategy 'The Agenda for Prosperity' (AfP, PRSP III, 2013-2018) have a specific commitment in the PRSP Pillar 7 - Governance and Public Sector Reform on "*delivery of quality, timely services in an accountable and transparent manner and improved Justice, Safety and Security Sector delivery systems*".

Moreover, the Second Security Sector Review for Sierra Leone (2012-2022)¹⁶ listed similar challenges and insufficient capacities in the security sector institutions being the number one perceived threats in Sierra Leone in 2012. Porous and insecure borders are also amongst the challenges included.

The SSR Project interventions are also relevant to the New Deal and the observations made in the Sierra Leone Fragility Assessment of 2013,¹⁷ which highlighted endemic corruption problems and weak capacity within security and justice institutions.

In addition, the SSR project is aligned to the UNDP's Strategic Plan 2014-2017, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and UNDP's Country Programme Document (CPD) for Sierra Leone 2015-2018 and outcome involving UNDP on Justice and

¹⁶ The latest GoSL SSR review / needs assessment prepared by Security Sector Review Secretariat, ONS.

¹⁷ <http://www.g7plus.org/sites/default/files/resources/Fragility-Assessment-SierraLeone.pdf>

security sector delivery systems improved in compliance with international human rights standards. The SSR ProDoc is consistent with the CPD. However, in this case the CPD was drafted after the SSR ProDoc was formulated.

The relevant CPD Outputs are:

- 4.1 Targeted state institutions and constitutional bodies are able to provide effective justice and security services in an accountable manner at national and local levels.
- 4.2 State institutions and CSOs including women’s organizations and networks are better enabled to provide justice services for women including on GBV, family, inheritance, land and property issues.
- 4.3 Security sector institutions are engaged to strengthen oversight and accountability mechanisms

However, when it comes to improved border security for enhanced citizen safety, this area was new to UNDP and other agencies, such as IOM may be better positioned to provide technical assistance around border security and integrated border management issues.

At the overall level, the above clearly illustrates the relevance of the SSR Project against the Political Economy. The Evaluation, however, notes considerable sustainability challenges with the GoSL funding of security sector reform and the rule of law. This questions the government commitment to fully implement the important findings of the Sierra Leone Security Sector Review Report from 2012, which was a priority of the GoSL as well as its commitment around SSR and rule of law in the AfP.

Other weaknesses are observed with regard to the scoping and preparation of the ProDoc and the extent to which the design reflected the GoSL partners’ strategic plans and was sufficiently owned by all the Implementing Partners as discussed in Section 3.3 below.¹⁸

In addition, the Evaluation observes risks of overlaps and duplications with other Development Partners programmes, for example with the Access to Security and Justice Programme (ASJP) and some of ISAT’s support to SLP, SLCS and IPCB.

With regard to cross-cutting issues, gender equality and human rights are included in the ProDoc the design and outputs. There have been a number of relevant activities implemented to address gender inequality and increased human rights awareness at both duty bearers (SLP in particular) and rights holders level. The ‘community policing’ interventions are found particularly relevant vis-à-vis bringing security services closer to the people and bridging the

¹⁸ In particular the Security Sector Review Report of 2012, which highlights the security sector institutions gaps and needs for 2012-2022.

dialogue between the SLP and the local communities. The Evaluation, however, finds that human rights based approach (HRBA) principles and gender equality were not adequately integrated into the ProDoc design, nor into Implementing Partners result frameworks, which could have been more right holders centred and addressing strategic transformative human rights changes (for further discussions, please see Section 3.4 and 5 below).

In sum, UNDPs support to building of security sector institutions and preventing Ebola to spread in corrections centres was relevant and pertinent. Project interventions were relevant vis-à-vis the contextual background; the lack of people's trust in the security sector institutions; perceived corruption and lack of police oversight; challenges vis-à-vis security sector coordination and ensuring safety and borders; lack of police oversight and the absence of effective rule of law and gender inequality. However, significant capacity gaps, financing and thus sustainability remain a critical challenge today for the security sector institutions. The Evaluation also notes some weaknesses with regard to the design of the original ProDoc. The scoping and formulation seems to have been driven largely by the TAM report findings. A closer dialogue with the GoSL (such as the ONS Security Sector Review Secretariat) and relevant Development Partners would have been relevant and likely have ensured more national and local ownership and coherences. Further, HRBA was not fully integrated into the ProDoc design, the result framework and into Implementing Partners result frameworks, and the SSR Project has not have a sufficient focus on addressing strategic transformative human rights changes.

Recommendation:

- UNDPs future security sector support should ensure a strong national and local ownership.
- It should also ensure that there is no duplication with other Development Partners support to SSR and SSR associated programmes (rule of law and governance programmes).
- Finally, future support should ensure that SSR and associated reforms (e.g. justice sector reform) are inclusive of women, marginalised communities and that the security sector is responsive to all communities. Right holders should be at the centre of future support addressing strategic transformative human rights changes and root causes of impunity and mistrust in SSR institutions.

3.2 Project design, intervention logic and theory of change

The scoping and formulation of the project took place in 2013. The preparation and formulation of the main SSR project document was largely driven by the findings of the TAM

report¹⁹. New activities and partners were identified following the EVD crisis as the programme was re-adapted due to a new context and emergency.

A majority of partners expressed a strong ownership, justification and rationale for the suggested interventions. However, during the mission it became clear that not all partners were fully involved in the scoping, formulation and needs assessment analysis. ONS, for example, stressed that their result framework and interventions did not fully reflect their needs and strategic visions as reflected in the Security Sector Review 2012-2022. This represents a weakness in the preparation phase and indicates that more time could have been invested in involving stakeholders to identify priorities using a participatory approach in order to ensure national ownership.

Furthermore, the SSR Project is characterised by numerous and fragmented project interventions and being too activity based. It also has two ProDocs, as the original ProDoc was re-programmed due to the EVD crisis. Since its implementation period there have been a high number of different Implementing Partners and (Sierra Leone Police (SLP), Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA), Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC), Human Rights Commission (HRC), Office of National Security (ONS), Sierra Leone Correctional Services (SLCS), Prisons Watch, APCOF (provided technical assistance to IPCB)). In addition as discussed below, the Evaluation observes weaknesses in the capacity of some Implementing Partners, for example SLP and PW, to monitor results. In principle, the Implementing Partners should meet the UN HACT assessment requirements and have a strong M&E mechanism. However, the UN HACT assessment will not capture the technical capacity of an Implementing Partner and there may be occasions where an Implementing Partner is technically very solid, like PW, but needs support to strengthen its M&E compliance framework.

This has hampered the *efficiency* and the overall *management* of the project. It has made it difficult for the project managers to monitor physical progress against disbursement of funds, document learning and transformative changes of so many activities and partners. In addition, the SSR Project suffered from a high turn-over of staff due to the EVD out-break, and for sometimes, it had no project manager.

Technical Assistance (TA) inputs from SPC and APCOF (funded under the project) is considered to be a key strength within the design and the intervention logic and this ensured *continuity, close dialogue and* the necessary building of trust in particular with the SLP and the IPCB. For further reference please refer to Section 4 below.

¹⁹ Interviews with GoSL key informants.

On gender mainstreaming in SSR, the Project Document (ProDoc) states that “*in order to further ensure inclusivity, gender issues will be of cross-cutting relevance and importance*” and the ProDoc integrates several gender activities and an output baseline indicator (“*reaching thirty per cent female police officers within the SLP*”). This in itself is however far too ambitious and will not be achievable. Hence a future programme should be more realistic in setting its benchmarks.

Although, the result framework and intervention logic includes support to ‘*community policing*’ and putting right holders at the centre of its interventions, HRBA and GE/WE is not sufficiently integrated into the theory of change (ToC), ProDoc design, outputs and indicators. For further reference to the HRBA/GE analysis please refer to Section 5 below.

Finally, the SSR Project *complementarity* to other development partners’ SSR support and SSR *donor coordination* is considered weak and was not given sufficient weight into the design of the project. However, at implementation level, UNDP and the SSR Project made significant steps to strengthen SSR coordination particular during 2014-2015 and set up a number of initiatives including overall police accountability. Please see Section 4 for further details.

The SSR Project’s underlying Theory of Change (ToC) is based on three main and inter-connected premises:

- Improved governance of the security sector will result in better service delivery to the populace;
- Improved service delivery will result in greater public confidence in security actors;
- and in turn, increased public trust can counter potential conflict vectors that have the power to undermine peaceful long-term development.

Although, the ToC assumptions are relevant, the ProDoc and implementation period suffers from little baseline studies, which has affected the M&E and learning. The SSR ProDoc is largely based on baseline studies that were conducted by other development partners and programmes, such as the ASJP. There have also been no follow up baselines to establish the level of progress or achievements. In addition, there is little evidence that points to improved governance or service delivery and ‘transformative’ change. However, an independent perception survey on the UNDP supported SLP ‘*community policing*’ and support to LPPBs in Kambia district may be able to bring some evidence on increased populace trust in the police. The Kambia project is still ongoing till the end of August 2016 after which a follow-up survey has been agreed to be conducted by ISAT. For now though there is no clear evidence to substantiate a change attributable to the UNDP intervention. A lesson learned exercise is in the pipeline. In view of the continued weak capacity and outreach of the SLP, similar community policing interventions could be *replicated and/or scaled up* in other rural districts.

In sum, the ToC is relevant however the SSR ProDoc design and intervention logic suffers from proper baselines, follow up baselines and from being too activity based involving too many Implementing Partners with limited capacity to deliver and report on achievements and disbursements. As discussed in Section four, there is a lack of synergies with UNDPs core support areas within AtoJ, human rights and GE/WE as well as risks of overlaps with other Development Partners' support due to weak SSR donor and Government coordination.

Recommendations:

- A holistic approach to addressing the Rule of Law: To maximise outcome and efficiency, UNDP should move away from a fragmented approach of individual standalone projects towards a more holistic Rule of Law Programme with clear goals, outcomes and baseline indicators and targets that are realistic.
- Selection of Implementing Partners: Implementing Partners should be carefully selected and justified against the UN HACT assessment requirements, the future Rule of Law Programme's ToC, their own strategies, mandate and capacity to fulfil the ToC, their M&E structure, reporting and financial capacity, and their technical competency to deliver on their respective mandates. When Partners' M&E frameworks and reporting are delayed and weak, these should be priorities. Similarly, UNDP should ensure M&E and learning, close dialogue with Implementing Partners and build in short-term consultancy services for mid-term reviews and when necessary for monitoring and Evaluations (for example on the application of HRBA, perception surveys /capacity assessments).

3.3 SSR Project progress: key achievements and challenges

This Section assesses the key achievements and challenges with regard to the main interventions and Implementing Partners vis-à-vis the following outputs:

- i) Improved security sector governance, oversight and coordination
- ii) Improved border security for enhanced citizen safety.

In 2014, a project was re-programmed to respond to the EVD crisis.

- iii) Improving capacities of security sector providers to effectively respond to EVD and
- iv) Support to prisons and detention facilities to minimize risk of an outbreak.

It includes specific assessments on *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact* where possible. Progress has been ascertained by assessing perception surveys, capacity assessments, external research material, annual and periodic progress reports, annual work

plans, result frameworks and strategies from UNDP and the Implementing Partners, focus group discussions and key informant interviews (UNDP, GoSL, CSO, development partners and key individual experts on SSR, Rule of Law, AtoJ, Human Rights, Gender Equality in and outside Sierra Leone) and meeting with end-beneficiaries in Sierra Leone.

In general, the monitoring of progress has been a challenge due to weakness in the design, lack of baselines (as above mentioned) and due to the Ebola crisis, which have had a considerable impact on the project deliverables. Many were cancelled or postponed and the programme had to be re-programmed. As mentioned above, this has had implications as there has been a significant turnover of staff and restrictions of movement during the EVD crisis. Moreover, the multi-partner and activity driven approach did not ease the monitoring of progress. In addition, the consultant notes that an Evaluation (or mid-term review) planned to take place in 2015 did not take place.

Institutional capacity development of the Sierra Leone Police (SLP)

The SLP employs 12,000 officers, headed by the Inspector General of Police (IGP), and is still regulated by the Police Act 1964 although a revision was planned and budgeted for in the ProDoc.²⁰ Prior to the UNDP SSR support, SLP has been supported primarily by the UK through DFID and the International Security Assistance Team (ISAT) and the UN missions (till 2014) and various justice and security support projects (for example ASJP). The SLP has prior to UNDP's support undergone a major modernization process including establishing civilian Local Policing Partnership Boards (LPPBs) in all districts, creation of new specialist departments: the Complaints, Discipline and Internal Investigations Department (CDIID); Corporate Services Department; Family Support Units (FSU); Legal and Justice Support; Human Rights Unit; Gender Unit; and the Transnational Organised Crime Unit (TOCU).

UNDP's support to the SLP has been *relevant* vis-à-vis the strategic plans of the SLP and its needs.²¹ There have been some risks of duplication of efforts with other Development Partners support, such as ISAT although the Evaluation notes that UNDP over time has prioritised to strengthen the coordination and also met with ISAT on an ad hoc basis to avoid duplication and strengthen cooperation. Community policing and gender awareness seems particularly relevant to SLP, UNDP's competences and complements ISAT's support. The UNDP's support to community policing commenced after the reprogramming of the ProDoc following the EVD crisis as there was a particular need to sensitize communities about the risks of EVD and a need for protection against EVD. The UNDP support has been complementary to ISAT support and has followed up on previous support from the UN mission. The support seems

²⁰ A study was conducted by the American Bar Association but the Act is still to be revised. See also Annex 3: overview of disbursement.

²¹ The Security Sector Review Report 2012 and the SLP Strategic Plan of 2015.

particularly relevant as it puts marginalised communities / rights holders at the centre of the support. In addition, the SLP and police oversight bodies have limited out-reach, capacities and resources outside Freetown.

UNDP's support to the SLP has been particularly *effective* due to a UNDP agreement with the Standing Police Capacity (SPC) Technical Assistance (TA) through Police Advisors. The continued SPC inputs (although there was a delay of the first SPC advisor during the Ebola crisis), has provided the necessary *continuity*, a close dialogue, and twinning arrangements between the SLP and the UNDP. The SPC inputs were instrumental for SLP in providing technical assistance. This was witnessed when the consultant met with the SLP as well as with other partners supported by the SPC.

The following lists some of the key achievements and key challenges:

- The support helped SLP to strengthen its human resources procedures and now put in place more transparent recruitment and retention procedures, which are in compliance with the Anti Corruption Commission (ACC) criteria. This is a key achievement.
- Community policing and out-reach. The project contributed to developing a model of 'community policing' in Kambia district for better grassroots engagement, involving training of police officers as trainers; training 170 front-line police officers; establishing Community Relations Officers (of which 50 per cent % are women) in three Chiefdoms in Kambia. Local Police Partnership Boards (LPPBs) play a critical role as the link between the SLP and the communities / right holders and is also very gender sensitive. Community policing and support to the LPPBs could be replicated and scaled up in the future. Close coordination with Development Partners such as ASJP and ISAT who also support LPPBs must be ensured to avoid duplication.
- The SSR project supported SLP's nationwide Assets Verification exercise, and developing software for SLP's first electronic assets database. This will potentially enhance accountability if implemented and used. Yet, weaknesses were observed with regard to the sustainability and actual use of the asset management database.
- A lot of the SSR support has been centred around training of SLP officers. For example, more than 250 CDIID officers were trained in complaints, investigation handling as well as provided refresher trainings on the Human Rights curriculum for police officers for the police academy. The British Council conducted a Communication / English training for hundreds of SLP officers in 2015. Although training has contributed to building police officers capacity, the Evaluation observes some weaknesses with regard to its

overall effectiveness and efficiency. There is little evidence with regard measuring 'transformative' and 'behavioural' change. Although the British Council training was informed by a thorough training needs assessment, weaknesses were observed with regard to the screening and selection of participants. Although the British Council was involved in the selection, the final selection and discretion was to a large degree left to the SLP management. A closer dialogue and inclusion with UNDP technical assistance (SPC and UNDPs Gender advisors) would strengthen oversight and avoid risks of nepotism. In addition, UNDP TA would be able to ensure oversight of the curriculum development, Training of Trainers (TOT) approaches and ensure sustainability and outreach beyond Freetown. Similar inclusion of the UNDP Gender Advisor would provide oversight on the selection of female candidates with the aim to get more SLP police officers into senior management positions. Aspects of value for money and performance (knowledge transfer and usage) are also areas, which could have been considered more carefully as the language training was comparatively much more expensive than other SSR Project interventions incl. technical assistance and capacity development and vis-à-vis the number of SLP officers trained. Finally, the Evaluation notes that most of the trainings did not build in a follow up performance plan for the participant.

- The SLP interventions also support the SLP Gender Directorate. When it comes to this support and gender equality the progress has been limited. SLP will not be able to meet the logframe baseline gender target (increase from 20 per cent to 30 per cent). Yet the Evaluation finds the baseline target to be far too ambitious. Although, procedures were put in place to increase the percentage of women into the SLP, the actual results were limited. This is mainly due to budget cuts and the inability of the SLP to hire new staff. The Evaluation however finds that the project strengthened the SLP Gender Directorate to better understand barriers to women entering police, and in the future will be able to target recruitment and gender awareness within the SLP. Gender equality barriers appears structural related and in the future it would be good to establish the reasons behind the barriers to recruitment and retaining female police officers in SLP, and targeting the role of men in addressing these barriers.
- UNDPs support has been complementary to other support by ISAT and GE support could be replicated and scaled up across the SLP supported interventions.
- M&E and Learning is an area of concern. Narrative progress reports and progress against disbursements were often delayed, lacks quality and is not centralised. It is critical that future support strenghtens the M&E and Learning mechanism of the SLP and that proper oversight on financial management is streamlined within the SLP.

- Finally, sustainability presents a key challenge. It is evident that the SLP lacks basic equipment and capacity to deliver quality services. The SLP raised critical constraints with regard to transport, fuel, reliable electricity, internet, office equipment and the fact that they were not allowed to hire staff although there are critical staffing constraints. Yet, Evaluation notes that the SSR Project during the EVD crisis helped with the repairs of 30 SLP vehicles in order to enhance the SLP outreach as well as met SLP's requests with regard to laptops, desktops and printers. There appears to be a lack of clarity as to the current workforce, job profiling, capacity and out-reach and therefore future interventions could include a capacity needs assessment and profiling of SLP workforce.

In sum, the SSR project has contributed to enhanced institutional capacity of the SLP through equipment and hardware and putting in place human resource procedures and focusing on capacity building and building the 'soft skills' of SLP officers around investigation, oversight, human rights awareness, gender awareness and community policing. Key challenges remain around sustainability and ensuring the GoSL commitment to sustain the SLP as a key institution to secure safety and rule of law in Sierra Leone. The project interventions have been many and activity driven. Areas such as community policing and gender awareness seem relevant to scale up and complementary to what other development partners fund. The SLP M&E and Learning mechanism and it is critical that reporting and accountability measures are strengthened.

Recommendations:

- Future support should focus on fewer interventions/ SLP departments and ensure coordination with donor support to avoid duplication and waste of resources. Community policing, gender equality and oversight are particular relevant to the SLP needs and strategic visions and fits well with UNDP's comparative strengths and complementarity to other development partners support.
- M&E and Learning in the SLP should be strengthened to ensure accountability. Consideration should be made to mainstream the SLP reporting through having only one M&E entity instead of various departments reporting.
- Capacity development and future training should ultimately aim at enhancing citizens' trust in the police through HRBA analysis and strengthened dialogue between duty bearers and right holders. There should be a specific focus on measuring 'transformative' and 'behavioural' change. Value for money and performance

(knowledge transfer and usage) should be considered more carefully and individual performance plans / targets should for participant should be in-built in future trainings.

- With regard sustainability there is a lack of clarity as to the current workforce, job profiling and capacity and therefore future interventions could include a capacity needs assessment and profiling of the SLP workforce.

Improved border security for enhanced citizen safety; SSR institutional coordination and response to the EVD crisis: support to Office of the National Security (ONS) and the MRU organisation

Overall, the Evaluation finds that the selection of ONS as a partner was *relevant* vis-à-vis the ToC, the CPD and ProDoc outputs and the Political Economy Analysis and TAM assessment.

ONS is the key coordinating body for the security sector, as well as it had a leading role in the coordination of the EVD response.

Yet, weaknesses are observed with regard to the design of the selected interventions. More specifically, ONS expressed that their strategic visions and needs as reflected in the Security Sector Review 2012-2022 were not sufficiently consulted during the design and this was a major concern to them.

While a border security policy has been drafted, the results have been very limited with regard to the output of *improved border security for enhanced citizen safety*. The main reasons for this are due to the re-programming of the ProDoc to respond to the *EVD*.

In terms of *effectiveness*, across the board, key informants stressed that the SSR project contributed to an enhanced coordination of security sector institutions. This has been led by ONS as well ONS led the SSR institutions coordinated response during the EVD crisis. Given the curfews, restrictions of movements and enhanced visibility of police and military offers during the EVD crisis, it was somewhat positive that no significant conflicts were triggered during the EVD crisis.

Some of the key achievement and challenges include:

- ONS supported interventions ensured more responsiveness to communities through human rights sensitisation, and outreach in areas through a community based approach. ONS, for example, developed a training manual to ensure protection and respect for human rights in quarantines and checkpoints during the EVD crisis together with the

Human Rights Commission (HRC). As a result 2,000 security personnel were trained on checkpoint procedures, human rights in applying emergency measures.

- ONS also ensured that SLP police officers and RSLAF military officers were deployed to border areas with necessary equipment.
- Community volunteers sensitised border communities on EVD and provided a link to security providers. Some of this support was provided through the MRU organisation.

In addition, the Project also provided support in contributing to the development of the Internal Security Strategy and was invited by ONS to sit during coordination meetings and with ISAT/ASJP.

With regard to *sustainability*, this is less of an issue with ONS compared to the other institutions supported. ONS has a strong capacity and a strong M&E system in place. Moreover, the EVD crisis is over and early warning procedures are now put in place in the event of a new outbreak.

Although security sector coordination and border security and border security (integrated border management) are critical areas to support, the Evaluation finds that, there are other development agencies, such as IOM and ISAT who may be better placed to support ONS and security sector institutions around these themes. There is a role that UNDP could play in engaging with the ONS but as part of the overall role that ONS plays in coordination, similar to the role the SSR Project played in contributing to the development of the Internal Security Strategy.

Recommendations:

The Evaluation recommends that support to ONS be re-assessed in a future Rule of Law Project for the following reasons: Although both SSR coordination and integrated border management are important for the rule of law and vis-à-vis the Political Economy of Sierra Leone, the Evaluation finds that there may be other organisations who are better placed to support ONS in these thematic areas including ISAT and IOM. In addition, the EVD project supported interventions that have come to an end are largely sustainable.

Independent Police Complaint Board (IPCB)

The IPCB was established by regulation in 2013 just prior to the commencement of the SSR Project. Its mandate is *relevant* for the SSR project as it is to provide oversight to rights holders vis-à-vis suspected abuse of power by the police. IPCB is thus performing a critical role as watchdog and oversight body. UNDP's support is found *timely, relevant and informed* by research conducted by African Police Civilian Oversight Forum (APCOF). The consultant finds the designed interventions and support fully owned by IPCB. Although, the EVD crisis represented a significant challenge for the UNDP supported Technical Assistance (TA)

provided by APCOF as this had to be provided remotely from South Africa, it in fact also forced the IPCB staff to take full ownership of the design and implementation of the project interventions. With regard to *effectiveness* the UNDP support and TA provided by APCOF was delivered effectively throughout the EVD crisis. The IPCB premises have been constructed and almost completed. More importantly, standing operating procedures (SOPs), policy frameworks and training of staff have been delivered and put in place. The Evaluation notes that there are still challenges with regard to the coordination between oversight bodies and the coordination system (MoUs), which should provide the scope of work/ roles and responsibilities for each of the oversight bodies. The MoUs should have been signed and completed in 2015. In addition, as recommended by APCOF, there is a critical need to follow up with technical assistance and training in the next phase.

Although the IPCB is at its infancy, there are some small indications of ‘transformative change’ made with an increase of cases of abuse being reported and investigated. By March 2016, 11 cases of police abuse had been handled by the IPCB. Yet, there are risks of overlaps that the same cases are reported to the CDIID, HRC, the Ombudsman or other oversight bodies.

Financing and staffing constraints present a significant weakness with currently only one investigator and five staff due to the GoSL suspension of recruitments for financial reasons as well as cleaning the pay roll. This represents a key challenge as UNDP and its SPC advisors will only be able to provide technical assistance and mentoring to the IPCB once IPCB staff has been recruited. Thus, it is critical that the GoSL live up to its commitment of enhancing ‘oversight and accountability’ and *sustain* IPCB with adequate staffing.

Out-reach represents another challenge as the IPCB is only present in Freetown with very limited resources. Although the IPCB is in the process operationalizing the cooperation with other oversight mechanisms, there are risks of potential overlaps with regard to the case adjudication and mandates and it would add value to mainstream referral procedures between oversight bodies.

Recommendation:

The Evaluation recommends that technical assistance to the IPBC be continued. There is a need for follow up on technical capacity development and to further enhance the operationalization of the IPCB’s dual mandate in investigating police oversight and as an independent watchdog preventing police abuse and enhancing citizen’s trust in the SLP. To strengthen oversight and avoid duplication future support could strengthen the overall oversight and referral mechanisms between IPCB and other oversight bodies namely CDIID, HRC, Ombudsman etc. This would enhance synergies with the AtoJ Project. The issue of sustainability vis-à-vis the GoSL commitments to support IPCB is critical and should be raised at strategic level with the GoSL and by the RC.

Sierra Leone Correctional Services (SLCS)

The intervention was *relevant* and the design reflects local ownership as UNDP held consultative meetings with the SLCS at the outset to identify needs and areas of critical support to prevent EVD breakdown within detention and pre-trial detention centres. The rehabilitation of 2 EVD holding units at the correction centre in Freetown, and equipping the SLCS with hygiene and sanitation materials across the country were *effectively* delivered and likely had a significant *impact* on the outcome as EVD was not spread inside detention facilities. The support was complementary to other support provided to SLCS by Dfid and ISAT. However, as evidenced from focus groups discussions with the SLCS, interviews with key experts, site visits carried out to the ‘holding units’ and prisons and interviews with in-mates, pre-trial detention and prison facilities remain over-crowded and in very poor conditions with little to no correction facilities. This does not live up to the corrections reforms.²²

Sustainability remains a key weakness. The achievements of SLCS/PW results have opened a new dialogue with the GoSL of the potential to broaden the support to improve prison-conditions, rehabilitation and reducing the use of pre-trial detention. Continued support to SLCS to improve the capacity of SLCS and the prisons conditions around rehabilitation / correctional services which are close to absent seems highly relevant and critical²³. SSR development partners interviewed recognise this gap and development partners, such as the US and the EU seem willing to support the area of rehabilitation of prisoners.

Recommendation:

The Evaluation recommends that support to the SLCS be continued to respond to the critical needs evidenced in the UNDP capacity assessment and with the UPR 2016 recommendations. Future support could be targeted to support the SLCS institution from moving from Prison – to Correctional Facilities to effectively combat recidivism and improve prison conditions and rehabilitation and legal procedures with regard to pre-trial detention. Continued capacity development/training of SLCS staff is relevant yet it needs to be tailored carefully and approved by SPC TA and UNDP human rights experts (similar to SLP capacity development above). Such interventions will also strengthen synergies with the AtoJ Project.

Prison Watch (PW)

²² PW, APCOF, Dignity and research conducted by TIMAP for Justice and the Open Society. This is also further evidenced by an UNDP Capacity Assessment of the SLCS (2015) by Ross, G.

²³ See UNDP Capacity Assessment of SLCS (2015).

The support to PW was highly *relevant* vis-à-vis the EVD context and informed by evidence based research conducted in 2013 around the needs for i) persons/in-mates in pre-trial detention, and ii) the socio-economic consequences for their families.²⁴ As a partner PW is a particularly relevant organisation because of its outreach to all pre-trial detention and detention facilities throughout the whole of Sierra Leone. In addition, they have established quite a collaborative relationship with the GoSL, which is clearly evidenced by the fact that it is the only CSO who is part of the Correctional Council and given daily /weekly access to counselling / legal advise to in-mates²⁵. The SSR funding to PW has not only been *relevant* in its support to SLCS during the EVD crisis it has also been *effective* as PW were able to assist with the screening of caseloads during the EVD crisis, assist the SLCS putting in place an effective case management system and provide legal representations to in-mates fast-tracking cases. With regard to *sustainability*, the support has come to end. PW is mainly funded by Dignity and UNDPs funding has been complementary.

Recommendation:

The Evaluation recommends that support to PW be continued. PW is a relevant partner with potential 'buy in' on legal advocacy around rehabilitation and provides legal aid to prisoners throughout Sierra Leone. Future support could thus support SLCS around rehabilitation as well possible support around legal advocacy and legal aid. Further support could also be targeted on enhancing PW's M&E reporting capacity, which showed signs of weakness. Such support will enhance the synergies with the AtoJ Project.

3.4 Outcomes, potential impact and sustainability

Overall, it is too early to assess the wider *impact* of SSR support with the objective to enhance security service delivery, oversight, and bring safety and security closer to the people. This is highly dependent on the future patterns of the *sustainability* of the interventions and thus GoSL financing to institutions such as ONS, SLP, IPCB, and SLCS that in recent years have been declining despite a commitment made in the AfP (PRSP III). The decline in the GoSL budget cuts has affected ONS, SLP, IPCB and SLCS making them fragile and incapacitated to deliver on their respective mandates.

As above mentioned the SSR ProDoc design and intervention logic suffers from proper baselines, follow up baselines and from being too activity based involving too many Implementing Partners with limited capacity to deliver and report on achievements and disbursements. As above to maximise outcome and efficiency, UNDP should move away from

²⁴ Co-funded 2013 Study by UNDP, TIMAP and Prisons Watch in 2013.

²⁵ See also Andrew Jefferson in *Introducing Human Rights in Prisons*, 2015, a comparative research which include PW.

a fragmented approach of individual standalone projects towards a more holistic Rule of Law Project with clear goals, outcomes and baseline indicators and targets that are realistic.

Although the security sector coordination improved through the SSR Project and through e.g. the support to ONS, the SSR coordination remains weak and still very ad hoc with no SSR working group and little coordination between the GoSL and the development partners. It is critical that UNDP collaborates with GoSL to take on a more active part in formalising the SSR coordination mechanisms and explores close coordination with ISAT, DFID, UNODC and other relevant Development Partners. It may also be explored that the Governance and Accountability Working Group that however comprises of Development Partners alone could engage with the GoSL and play a role in coordinating SSR. Currently, there is also no discussion on the details related to programming within this Working Group.

Yet, the *impact* of the support to the SLCS and PW in preventing the Ebola outbreak in the detention facilities can be directly attributed to the UNDP support.

When it comes to the output of *improving border security for citizen safety*, the border areas remain highly vulnerable today. The EVD crisis highlighted the need for sustained support in this area and the UNDP's CPD commits to working in the Mano River Union (MRU) through the MRU organisation and supporting better border management. This work has been largely suspended since EVD. Although the UNDP SSR Project delivered tangible results supporting ONS, SLP and the MRU organisation in the prevention of further EVD outbreak, sensitisation of communities at the borders, and successfully implemented 'community policing' projects in the Kambia border districts, the border security continue to remain vulnerable. Although, there is a need to sustain this area, other organisations, such as the UNODC and IOM are mandated to support these areas of work.

According to a 2010 baseline perception study by the Anti-Corruption Commission, 35 per cent of the population perceived the SLP to be corrupt²⁶. There was no baseline when the SSR Project commenced. The result framework baseline indicator estimated a decrease of 10 per cent. It is unlikely that this baseline indicator will be met. Yet, a perception study is planned to take place in the fall of 2016 by ISAT. However, in as much as the populace may still have mistrust in the SLP according to several key informants interviewed, the population in Kambia has developed some level of trust in community policing, which through targeted community and rights based interventions.

Similar, at the commencement of the project, 20 per cent of the SLP officers were women. The baseline indicator according to the result framework was to increase the women work force by

²⁶ Sierra Leone ACC.

10 per cent. This target has not been met although HR structural changes were made to support recruitment of female officers. There are several reasons as to why this target was not being met. First of all, a 10 per cent increase was far too ambitious and unrealistic. 20 per cent is already high and SLP should in the future rather focus on putting female police officers in strategic management positions. Secondly, all recruitment was suspended from 2014 due to EVD, which made it impossible for the SLP to enrol enough female officers to meet this target.

- The *sustainability*²⁷ of the SSR support differs significantly across the Implementing Partners. The most critical issue is the SLP and IPCB's continuous reliance on UNDP funding for its core operations. Future support to SLP and IPCB needs further emphasis on building sustainable financing strategies for SLP and IPCB. The issue of sustainability is a challenge across government institutions. Sustainability is discussed throughout the report and in Section 3.4 with regard to the organisations supported.

Recommendation:

- To ensure long-term sustainable and follow up on the GoSLs commitment to enhance security sector institutions and the rule of law, it is critical that sustainability issues are raised at the strategic level with the GoSL to find context-adaptive and pragmatic solutions for future programming.
- As there is lack of clarity as to the SLP workforce, job profiling and capacity, future interventions could include a capacity needs assessment and profiling of workforce.

4 Project Management, Coordination and Synergies

The overall management responsibilities of the project support rest with UNDP and a Steering Committee of the SSR Project. UNDP's SSR Project Manager oversees the strategic management of the SSR Project, which includes overseeing achievement of outputs, coordination and synergies with the CPD and the AtoJ Project.

However, as there has been a high turn-over of Project Managers since its commencement, the strategic management of the Project is currently done by the Governance Team Leader with the day-to-day project management by a Project Coordinator who is de facto responsible for the project management activities. The SSR and the AtoJ teams meet frequently in governance meetings to discuss wider rule of law business.

²⁷ This has also been raised by UNDP itself in its Assessment of Development Results (ADR) report.

Core responsibility of the Project Manager (currently Project Coordinator) is to maintain oversight of the activities under the two outputs and the progress against disbursements.

The Evaluation notes weaknesses in the internal oversight procedures. In particular it has been difficult for Project Managers to utilize ATLAS (an internal UNDP system) and Project Managers have had to rely on very limited financial support. Moreover, there have been high staff turnover and the Project has continued to deploy staff on short-term contracts, and SPC Police Advisors whose contracts do not exceed 6 months except on special cases. In addition, there have often been delays from the Implementing Partners to report on disbursements (financial reports) due to weak M&E capacities.

4.1 Efficiency, financial disbursement and procurement

Overall, with regard to the *efficiency*, the Evaluation observes challenges around the Implementing Partners service delivery capacity, geographical out-reach and with regard to the rationale supporting Implementing Partners is efficient enough to improve the security sector institutions and border management response to deliver the envisaged changes.

The SSR project included both a hardware/infrastructure capacity development approach (for example SLP computers, motor cycles, SLCS holding centres, IPCB office premises) and a focus on “soft skills” capacity development. Considerable training has taken place (e.g. training to SLP CDIID, SLCS, and IPCB).

Some weaknesses were observed with regard to the knowledge usage and sharing within the SLP and SLCS. Although there has been a lot of focus on human rights sensitization and gender awareness through training there is no documented evidence of ‘transformative changes’ with regard to the SLP and SLCS officers addressing human rights violations or gender inequalities. Stronger staff performance Evaluations and obligations after training and individual performance review systems could be enacted and build into future training design for it to be more *efficient* and transformative.

Through interviews with the GoSL and development partners, such as DFID and ISAT, the Evaluation notes that there is a risk of duplication of support with regard to the support to the SLP, IPCB and SLCS and there is a need to enhance the SSR coordination meetings with donors supporting the same institutions. The issue of decentralization of SSR structures is of paramount concern to the GoSL and UNDP as most of these structures are HQ (Freetown) based. The issue of duplication can be addressed more effectively and efficiently if support is channelled in a coordinated manner and geographically mapped out.

The Evaluation notes that a number of planned interventions were either cancelled or postponed due to the re-programming of the SSR Project, which was necessary to respond to the EVD crisis. An overview table of the project progress against disbursements is included in Annex 3. Thus, implementation in 2014 was slower than planned with many activities not completed and carried into 2015 and resulted in no-costs extension sought from Peace Building Support Office (PBSO) and the Government of Japan. Going through the progress reports submitted, the Evaluation though finds that there is a need for better communication and more detailed documented justification as to why some targets were delayed, postponed or not met (please refer to Annex 3).

A closer internal UNDP and Implementing Partner dialogue on the physical progress against disbursements as well as on procurement should be envisaged and used more effectively in the future. Throughout the project implementation it has been challenging for SSR Project Managers/Coordinators to monitor the efficiency and disbursements as explained above in this Section.

For the future, it would be critical to invest in adequate administration / finance support and ensure that regular meetings take place between the Project Manager, Finance and Procurement staff.

In addition, the Evaluation found weaknesses in Implementing Partners financial management and reporting procedures (for example SLP and PW) and capacity (SLP) making it difficult for UNDP's finance staffs reporting. Support to Implementing Partners M&E and financial reporting mechanisms is critical to ensure compliance and learning.

4.2 M&E and Learning

As above mentioned, the ProDoc and implementation period suffers from little baseline studies and no follow up baselines to establish the level of progress or achievements. This is a key weakness. However, the Evaluation notes that one of the biggest challenges in the country is the absence of baseline information and understands that the PMSU is currently working with a team of consultants to create realistic baselines that might in future guide respective projects in setting realistic targets.

Systems and procedures for M&E have remained relatively static during the project period in spite of several changes in project context. UNDP has made use of consultancy services (e.g. Capacity Assessment SLCS, Kambia community policing survey) for M&E and programme reporting. A mid-term review / Evaluation was planned to take place in 2015 but was cancelled.

The Ebola crisis did not allow for regular field monitoring. The SSR Project Managers and Coordinator have had limited exposure to the field. Output based findings were uploaded, however more outcome based and strategic findings were not sufficiently fed into M&E.

One of the key strengths of the SSR Project, which secured the monitoring was the Technical Assistance (TA) inputs provided by SPC Police Advisors and APCOF long-distance advisors. Both arrangements clearly facilitated a *close dialogue* and building of trust between UNDP and the targeted institutions (in particular SLP and IPCB). It also ensured a *continuity during the EVD crisis where it was difficult to attract staff*. In addition the SPC arrangement is very cost-effective and allow UN agencies (UNDP and DPKO) to maintain a partnership across agencies/ mission. The main challenge with the SPC arrangement is that UNDP in principle only is able to keep the SPC advisors for up to six months, with the exception of one SPC advisor staying for ten months. The challenge of this is that SPC staff normally leave at the time when they have acquired substantial knowledge of SSR issues in Sierra Leone and a better understanding of the project and challenges. It also resulted in some periods in the course of 2015 where there were gaps in the SPC technical assistance.

More regular field monitoring visits by UNDP SSR team and the Team Leader and jointly with UNDP technical experts wherever relevant (AtoJ, Gender Equality, HRBA) to strengthen the synergies across UNDP's AtoJ, gender and human rights work.

Recommendations:

- There is a critical need to enhance the M&E quality assurance. This includes streamlining the internal UNDP reporting procedures including to track physical progress against disbursement. A future programme should include adequate financial support.
- Similarly, several Implementing Partners M&E mechanisms are weak and it is critical that their M&E systems and financial reporting are strengthened.
- It is recommended SPC advisors stay for up to at least one year. In addition to being cost effective (efficient) this would enhance the effectiveness and likely the impact of the institutional support.

4.3 Coordination and synergies

Across the board, it was clear that the coordination between SSR institutions are not formalised and there is a need for a much closer dialogue and coordination.

However, although there is a no formal security sector reform working group or mechanism in place today, UNDP and the SSR Project initially made significant steps to strengthen SSR coordination particular during 2014-2015 and set up a number of initiatives including overall police accountability. Under the UNDP auspices, a coordination mechanism was established under the MIA's leadership which comprised ASJP, ISAT, ONS, SLP, MIA, MRU & the Justice Coordination Office. Coordination meetings were held regularly up till September 2015. Thereafter, the meetings became irregular, and they no longer take place.

In addition UNDP and ASJP also set up a coordination mechanism to allow police accountability institutions to meet regularly. Efforts were made to ensure the mechanism was sustained but unfortunately there were some concerns vis-à-vis limited information sharing which seem to have disrupted the mechanism.

With regard to coordination with ONS, UNDP were invited to sit in at coordination meetings on the security sector including development of internal security strategy with ISAT/ASJP.

UNDP also meet regularly with ISAT & ASJP to avoid duplications of efforts. The relationship between ISAT and UNDP has not been formalized but been on a case-by-case basis. UNDP Community Policing have for example been coordinated with ISAT and benefitted from ISAT's support. Similarly, the SSR Project support to IPCB benefitted from ISAT with regard to the development of MoUs on roles and responsibilities for other oversight bodies (HRC, CDIID, IPCB, Ombudsman etc.) involved in handling police complaints.

In sum, efforts have been made to strengthen SSR coordination but some of these initiatives would need to be re-activated. In addition, there is no overall SSR coordination mechanism in place today, which ensures that the GoSL has a clear overview of what the Development Partners are funding. There is therefore a risk of duplication of efforts. In addition, it was clear from the interviews with the Development Partners that risks of overlaps for example exist between the SSR Project, ASJP and ISAT supported interventions. A new Rule of Law Project could look into how to strengthen the coordination and perhaps draw inspiration to what exist with regard to the access to justice where the donor contributions are known to the GoSL.

All Implementing Partners stressed the importance and complementarity of the UNDP support to the security sector being critical. UNDP has been instrumental and a key donor to the SLP since 2014. Although there are different modalities with regard to supporting the SSR sector, Development Partners agree that there are gaps throughout the sector and that UNDP's support has been complementary.

The Evaluation finds that there is a need for a more holistic and systemic approach strengthening the rule of law. What UNDP's SSR Project may refer to as SSR interventions, such as its support to IPCB, SLCS or its human rights and gender awareness activities may be referred to as rule of law and/or governance support by other Development Partners.

As discussed throughout the Evaluation there are clear *synergies* between the SSR and AtoJ Projects as well as vis-à-vis Human Rights, HRBA and Gender Equality (see Section 5 below). Efforts are made at the UNDP governance team to share and understand lessons/synergies across the SSR and AtoJ Projects.

Examples of synergies include support to SLP as this is often the first entry point for rights holders to claim their rights. To address the root causes of human rights violations, gender inequality and impunity it is thus crucial that the SLP is sensitized on human rights and gender equality and that transformative change within the SLP is measured in the future. Other obvious synergies include support to 'oversight bodies', such as support to IPCB (and to other oversight bodies, such as ACC, HRC, the Ombudsman Institution, CDIID, Parliament committees and the Judiciary) and support to the SLCS (for example to rehabilitation and legal advocacy through PW and/or other partners), legal aid, ADR, mediation, counselling, access to justice, customer care and sensitisation of LPPBs and marginalised communities.

Several key informants stressed the necessity to enhance focus on 'accountability', 'outreach', 'community policing' and a rights-holders' centred approach to better address the root causes of people's mistrust in the SLP and in security sector institutions.

Recommendations:

- There is a need to strengthen and re-activate the SSR coordination mechanisms and formalise the several initiatives initiated by UNDP.
- The design of a future Rule of Law Project should address *synergies* between SSR, AtoJ, human rights and gender equality. This will also minimise fragmentation of projects and duplication of resources.

5 UNDP cross cutting themes: Human Rights, HRBA and Gender Equality

This section focuses on UNDP's cross cutting themes and to what extent HRBA, gender equality and the rights of the most marginalised groups and communities have been specifically addressed in the SSR Project and incorporated into the Implementing Partners' activities.

Assessing the ToC and ProDoc background, Human Rights and Gender Equality are at the centre of the SSR Project with the focus on promotion of rule of law, enhancing citizen's protection and safety, trust in the security sector institutions.

The human rights and gender equality context shows progress at the legal and policy level but also that impunity and human rights violations continue in practice. Moreover, there are critical concerns with regard to gender inequality and gender-based violence in practice.²⁸ As above mentioned while public confidence in security institutions seemed to have been "sustained" since the 2012 Assessment, people's sense of justice appeared to have "slipped backwards" with growing concerns about political and regional divisions.

With regard to the ProDoc's although there are references to human rights and gender equality, a gender marker and a gender equality baseline indicator, the design has not integrated a HRBA or HRBA principles in a systematic manner. The Evaluation also notes that the ProDoc's or the M&E documentation do not make systematic reference to the UPR recommendations for 2011.

When it comes to the outcome level, the Evaluation is not able to document strategic human rights 'transformative changes'. There are however some signs of increased police oversight and accountability through the operationalization of IPCB and enhanced trust in the SLP through community policing interventions.

At the output level, the interventions have integrated HRBA principles, such as accountability, participation, non-discrimination and inclusion through its focus on 'oversight and accountability' of security sector institutions, 'community policing' and 'gender equality'. Several of these examples are included and discussed in Section 3.4.

In general, there have been a focus on capacity development and awareness raising in human rights and gender equality. During the EVD crisis, the project for example assisted the ONS together with the Human Rights Commission (HRC) to train and strengthen SLP police officers and RSLAF military forces on human rights compliance. When it comes to gender equality issues as mentioned above future SLP gender equality interventions ought to better establish the reasons behind the barriers to recruitment and retaining female police officers in SLP, and the role of men in addressing these barriers.

When assessing the Implementing Partners strategic visions vis-à-vis human rights and HRBA principles some Implementing Partners seems to be very prone vis-à-vis HRBA, such as PW and IPCB. Most of the other Implementing Partners and government agencies seems to have

²⁸ UPR 2016 Report on Sierra Leone, January 2016. This was also stressed by several key informants including the OHCHR.

been put in place a number of policy frameworks, which reflect human rights standards and gender equality.

The SSR Project has clearly contributed with this through the outputs as discussed in Section 3.4. Some of this are also attributed to the support by the previous UN mission (UNIPSIL and UNPOL) and bilateral Development Partners prior to the UNDP SSR project, for example the SLP curricula on community policing.²⁹

Based on the M&E documentation reviewed, the Evaluation finds that there is a need to enhance the skills and knowledge within the UNDP on how to implement future SSR interventions through a HRBA lens. This can be facilitated by assistance of the OHCHR and/or through consultancy services.

In summary, while progress has been made at the policy level and at results level, and there is a willingness from the GoSL to enhance protection and promotion of human rights and gender equality, major challenges related to impunity, human rights violations and gender inequality continue in practice. The targeted Implementing Partners focus on human rights, gender equality awareness and increasing accountability and transparency through establishing and strengthening oversight mechanisms. However, there is a need to embed HRBA and human rights analysis in future programming and document human rights transformative changes and enhanced citizens trust in security sector institutions.

Recommendations:

- The UNDP should engage with the GoSL (and with technical support from the OHCHR) with regard to the operationalization of the UPR 2016 recommendations and use this as reference document for the next programme formulation with realistic goals.
- HRBA/GE should be integrated into the next programme ToC, result frameworks, which should include HRBA / GE qualitative indicators. This will strengthen the focus of ‘non-discrimination’ and ‘accountability’ for the GoSL Implementing Partners as duty-bearers as well as legal aid and rights awareness / demand amongst the most marginalised communities.
- Gender equality issues are structurally related. Future SLP gender targeted interventions should establish the reasons behind the barriers to recruitment and retaining female police officers in SLP, and the role of men in addressing these barriers.

²⁹ SLP Community Policing Curricula.

6 Recommendations

This section presents the key consolidated recommendations. Throughout the Evaluation there are more operational recommendations.

1. **A need for a new holistic Rule of Law Programme**, which will strengthen the synergies between AtoJ and SSR security sector reform and the delivery of justice and security services to the people including the most marginalised. Empowering right holders to demand for services and accountability from the duty bearers should be at the centre of a new project.
2. **A need for a Programmatic modality**. A new Rule of Law Project should shift from a project and activity based approach toward a programmatic approach, with less partners to enhance focus on outcomes and M&E compliance.
3. **A need for a strategic focus on sustainability**. To ensure long-term sustainable and follow up on the GoSLs commitment to enhance security sector institutions and the rule of law, it is critical that sustainability issues are raised at the strategic level with the GoSL to find context-adaptive and pragmatic solutions for future programming.
4. A need to strengthen **Project Management and M&E Learning**. There is a critical need to enhance the M&E quality assurance. This includes streamlining the internal UNDP reporting procedures including to track physical progress against disbursement. A future Rule of Law Programme should include adequate financial support. Similarly, several Implementing Partners M&E mechanisms are weak and it is critical that their M&E systems and compliance are strengthened if they should continue to be Implementing Partner in a new Rule of Law Project.
5. **Coordination and coherence to be strengthened**. There is no formalised SSR coordination posing thus high risks of overlaps in donor areas of support. Close coordination and planning between GoSL and Development Partners, such as ISAT, DFID, UNODC, EU, Irish Aid, US Embassy (and its linkages to RoL and AtoJ) are much needed.
6. **Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA)/Gender Equality (GE)**: The UNDP (with technical assistance from OHCHR) should engage with the GoSL with regard to the operationalization of relevant UPR 2016 recommendations in the preparation of the next Rule of Law Programme. HRBA/GE should be integrated into the next Project ToC, logframe and result framework, which should include HRBA / GE qualitative indicators. This will strengthen the focus of ‘non-discrimination’ and ‘accountability’ for

the GoSL Implementing Partners as duty-bearers as well as legal aid and rights awareness / demand amongst the most marginalised communities.

7. **SLP:** Continued support is relevant, and much needed to enhance the rule of law and falls under UNDPs mandate. Future support should focus on fewer interventions/ departments and ensure coherence with ISAT and other donor support. Community policing, gender equality and oversight are particularly relevant vis-à-vis UNDPs comparative strengths. Future support should focus on ensuring ‘accountability’ and focusing on enhancing trust in the police. M&E and Learning in the SLP should be strengthened to ensure transformative and behavioural changes. Future training activities should apply a more systemic and tailored approach to training. Training needs assessment, screening/selection of participants by UNDP/SPC TA experts (to avoid nepotism), curriculum development and ToT approaches have to be entrenched to ensure sustainability and greater outreach. Aspects of value for money and performance (knowledge transfer and usage) have to be considered and there should be in-built follow up individual performance plans.

8. Oversight:

- a. IPCB: The Evaluation recommends that support to the IPCB be continued. UNDPs support is critical for continuity. To strengthen oversight and avoid duplication, future support could strengthen the overall oversight and referral mechanisms between IPCB and other oversight bodies (CDIID, ACC, HRC, Ombudsman Institution, Parliament Committees). This would enhance synergies with the AtoJ Project. The issue of sustainability vis-à-vis the GoSL commitments to support IPCB is critical and should be raised at strategic level by the RC and/or at SC level.

9. Prison and detention facilities:

- a. SLCS: Support to the SLCS is to be continued to respond to the critical needs evidenced in the UNDP capacity assessment and with the UPR 2016 recommendations. Future support should thus improve prison conditions, rehabilitation and the use of pre-trial detention. Continued capacity development/training of SLCS staff is relevant, yet it needs to be tailored carefully and approved by SPC TA and UNDP human rights experts (similar to SLP capacity development above). Such interventions will also strengthen synergies with the AtoJ Project.

- b. PW: The Evaluation recommends that support to PW be continued. PW is relevant partner with potential ‘buy in’ on legal advocacy around rehabilitation and provides legal aid to prisoners throughout the country. Future programmes could thus support SLCS around rehabilitation as well possible support around legal advocacy and legal aid. Further support could also be targeted on enhancing PWs M&E reporting capacity, which showed signs of weaknesses. Such support will enhance the synergies with the AtoJ Project.

10. Overall SSR Coordination and Security at borders:

- a. ONS: The Evaluation recommends that support to ONS be re-assessed in a future Rule of Law Programme for the following reasons: Although both SSR coordination and integrated border management are important for the rule of law and vis-à-vis the Political Economy of Sierra Leone, the Evaluation finds that there may be other organisations who are better placed to support ONS in these thematic areas including ISAT and IOM. In addition, the EVD project supported interventions that have come to an end and are largely sustainable.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: ToR

Annex 2: People Met

Annex 3: Disbursements of funds
Overview of budget and spending up to end of the year (USD million)

