Evaluation of three project funded through the Immediate Response Facility (IRF) of the Peacebuilding Fund for Somalia

Final Evaluation Report
31 October 2018

Nuha A. Abdelgadir
Evaluation Consultant

Content

Acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
FGS	Federal Government of Somalia
FMS	Federal Member States
IRF	Immediate Response Facility
JP	Joint Programme
JRMS	Joint Risk Management Strategy
MA	Monitoring Agent
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MPTF	UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund
NDP	National Development Plan
NPS	New Partnership for Somalia
PBF	United Nations Peacebuilding Fund
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PPP	Peacebuilding Priority Plan
PRF	Peacebuilding Recovery Facility
RCO	UN Resident Coordinator Office
RMG	Risk Management Group
RUNO	Recipient UN Organisation
SDRF	Somali Development and Reconstruction Facility
SFF	Special Financing Facility
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCT	UN Country Team
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNSOM	United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia
World Bank	WB

Executive Summary

This report represents the final evaluation of **three projects** that were funded through the Immediate Response Facility (IRF) of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) for Somalia.

The first project is the **Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery through Federal Government Systems.** The project was designed to enable the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) to deliver tangible services to its citizen to improve the legitimacy of the government. The project was also meant to test the use of the National Systems and build the government capacity to manage funds effectively.

The second project is the **Risk Management Support** project which was funded to support the implementation of the Joint Risk Management Strategy (JRMS). The main project objective is to enable the Somali Development and Reconstruction Facility (SDRF) Trust Fund provides an effective contribution to Somalia Peacebuilding and State-building priorities.

The third project is the **Coordination Support for the Implementation of Peacebuilding Priority Plan and Measures to Pilot Studies of Public Response to Peace- and State Building Efforts in Somalia**. The project has two distinct components. The first component is intended to provide technical capacity on designing, implementation, monitoring and reporting to enable achieving the Peacebuilding Priority Plan objectives. The second component, implemented by the UN Global Pulse, focuses on using Big Data technology to measure Somalia public perception of the ongoing peacebuilding and state-building processes.

The **purpose** of the evaluation is accountability and learning. The primary users of the evaluation are the UN Country Team (UNCT) in Somalia and the PBF who will use the findings to inform the design of future programmes and projects.

The **methodology** used is predominantly a qualitative assessment mainly documents review and Key Informant Interviews with selected stakeholders of the three projects.

Findings

Relevance
Overall the three projects are relevant: the projects are in line with the Somalia development priorities, aligned to the country context and address the needs of the beneficiaries including the benefiting government institutions and UN agencies. However, the big data component has some weakness in the design which has undermined its relevance; any future projects need to address such weaknesses.

Efficiency
Efficiency has been relatively good for the three projects. For the Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery, cost efficiency has been positively influenced by the fact that the Ministry of Finance (MoF) has an established Project Implantation Unit (PIU) working on implementing other donors' projects concurrently. Implementing using the government systems has created a strong sense of national ownership and developed the government capacity as well. The weakness of the Pilot Project has been the delays of project activities beyond the initial project duration. The delays resulted from the time spent coordinating activities and setting work arrangements at the project initial implementation stage which has not been factored during the planning. The prolonged elections period and the selection of the Cabinet of Ministers have further delayed the project.
All the three projects were extended beyond the IRF duration threshold of 18 months.

Effectiveness
The three projects showed good progress towards their overall objectives. There is evidence that the PBF has been catalytic and enabled the UN and the government to get donors funding. However, though some outputs were achieved, not all outputs were fully realised.

The Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery implemented some small-scale infrastructure projects that support service delivery, in five member states. The projects have been delivered using the government systems providing an opportunity for testing the national system and building the capacity of the FGS to manage funds. However, local communities' satisfaction with the constructed infrastructure projects; a key component of the project theory of change; was not tracked or measured.
For the Risk Management Support Project, achieving the objectives of the JRMS depend on how the Risk Management Group (RMG) succeeds in its efforts on revising the JRMS strategy and adopting a revised approach.

Sustainability
The projects have varying levels of sustainability. Each project faces different sustainability challenges.

The Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery has two fundamental elements of sustainability: a strong sense of national ownership and has invested in developing the capacity of the government staff. However, the individual level capacity (government staff) may face sustainability challenges if donors/international partners' funding ceases.

The big data component achievements are unlikely to be sustainable, at least within the Somalia programmes, mainly because of the weakness in the project design.

Impact
The assessment of the projects' impact was not possible: the projects last for less than three years and peacebuilding results emerge at a scale that is larger than the project duration. It is also difficult to assess the impact of the projects in isolation of the overall peacebuilding interventions. Assessment of the **potential impact** is limited by data availability (no data available beyond the output level results).

However, it is worth noting that some of the people interviewed have reported an observed impact for the solar streetlights in Bandiiradle. The streetlights have improved the security, extended the working hours in the market and increased the district revenues. The consultant believes this point needs to be reported even if it cannot be substantiated.

Lessons learned
Based on the analysis of findings obtained through the discussion with the stakeholders and from the desk review, the evaluation drew four key lessons from the three projects implementation:

Lesson 1: Establishing systems and supporting new institutions is a lengthy process and takes time to achieve. Projects' designers need to consider these points in estimating how long it takes to build capacity, what level of inputs are required and for how long.

Lesson 2: In Somalia context, there are always some conditions and requirements to be set at the initiation phase for successful projects' delivery

and implementation. These requirements need to be examined carefully at the inception and factored in the plans of the project.

Lesson 3: Initiatives without linkages to agencies frameworks and projects face high failure risk and weak ownership regardless of how innovative the initiative is and how valuable its objectives are. It is therefore critical for the success of a new initiative; its design accounts for the local context and its implementation framework are linked to the programmatic frameworks following rigour programme discussion at the technical level to secure ownership.

Lesson 4: The context of Somalia includes a wide range of risks, and the government systems are not yet mature, a strong UN oversight and programme support to projects implemented by the government proved to be successful in building government capacities, mitigating risks and strengthening the partnership with the government.

Recommendations

In future the UN programmes, may consider the following seven recommendations:

To the UNCT

Recommendation 1: Advocate for the use of the National Window. Future projects that will use the government systems should continue to integrate capacity development within the implementation framework focusing on institutional capacity at the FGS and the Federal Member States (FMS) as well. The National Window Guidelines should clarify the roles of FGS level vis-à-vis FMS as needed so that roles and expectation are clear and capacity/ testing of the systems is extended to the member states.

Recommendation 2: Consider funding a realistic and affordable oversight mechanism for the National Window stream projects: It should encompass financial oversight as well as programmatic oversight and support. The cost of the oversight role could be based on cost-sharing across the UN projects and should be factored during the project planning.

Recommendation 3: Future infrastructure projects should be planned within the context of a programme area (not as standalone) and vetted more carefully prioritising projects that have higher potentials to contribute to specific UN outcomes.

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that current collaborative risk management within the framework of the JRMS continues and further strengthened building on the work done and the lessons learned so far. The RCO is uniquely qualified to coordinate and lead this cooperation because of its position and role within the UN and with other development actors. Coordination with other similar initiatives is also necessary for implementing joint risk monitoring activities to reduce the high monitoring cost in Somalia.

To the PBF

Recommendation 5: Strengthen the capacity for developing M&E frameworks, indicators selection and outcome monitoring. These set of skills place the foundation for good reports and support mobilising resources from other donors and as such are essential skills for serving the catalytic objectives of the PBF projects.

Recommendation 6: Fund initiatives to collect outcome level data for the portfolio to enable systematic outcome assessment, improve programme management and enhance results reporting.

Recommendation 7: The Coordinator role should shift towards a more strategic role at the programme level with the ability to engage early to overcome challenges, build synergies and share lessons learned.

Introduction

Country Overview and Context

Over the last six years, Somalia has made significant progress in the field of politics following more than two decades of conflict. The country has undergone a real transformation, progressed in the state formation with the establishment of the Federal Member States (FMS) and the peaceful transition of power in 2017. The Somalia National Development Plan 2017-2019, the country first National Development Plan (NDP) in 30 years, articulates the country priorities for national recovery and development. Somalia's international partners have committed to aligning behind Somalia's NDP. The international community plays a critical role in supporting the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) and the FMS in the stabilisation efforts, implementing development priorities to enable the decentralisation processes. The support is crucial for the state and district authorities to establish their presence, improve the capacity and effectiveness of their institutions and to enable them to provide tangible improvements to the Somalis lives.

Following the London Somalia Conference in May 2017, Somalia and the international community endorsed the New Partnership for Somalia (NPS) as a framework for mutual accountability and accelerated progress. The New Partnership for Somalia sets out how Somalia and the international community will work together to meet Somalia's most pressing political, security and economic needs and aspirations, as set out in the National Development Plan. The NPS, informed by an independent review of the Somalia Compact in 2016, defined eight thematic areas and associated high-level goals that the Somali Government and international community commit to working together to achieve. The eight thematic areas are political settlement, security, rule of law and human rights, rights of women and girls, youth empowerment, financial and economic management, growth, economic recovery and resilience and inclusion and regulation. The NPS retained the critical elements of the Somalia Compact, reframing them based on the lessons learned. The NPS carried over six partnership principles[1] from the Compact and aligned these principles to key joint enabling actions necessary for the realisation of the NDP. The High Level Partnership Forum and the Somali Development and Reconstruction Facility

---

[1] The NPS engagement principles are; a) Development is Somali-owned and Somali led and aid is aligned with government priorities b)Aid operations are designed and delivered in partnership with government institutions, c) Aid is provided in line with the government budget cycle and channelled through preferred instruments of the government, d) Aid supports institutional capacity development; e).Aid is provided in a coordinated, flexible transparent and predictable manner and f). Aid is provided in a conflict sensitive manner and g. Aid programmes addressing humanitarian and development needs must be complimentary Frameworks.

(SDRF), the key drivers of the Somali Compact, were retained as the principal bodies for NPS and NDP implementation. The SDRF bring together several funds windows (the UN, the World Bank (WB) and the African Development Bank (AfDB)) under common governance arrangements.

Evaluation Subject

Peacebuilding Fund Interventions in Somalia

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) addresses immediate needs in countries emerging from the conflict at a time when sufficient resources are not available from other funding mechanisms. The fund supports interventions of direct and immediate relevance to the peacebuilding process by addressing critical funding gaps. The PBF provides quick, flexible and risk-tolerant financing to UN efforts to supporting solutions aimed at preventing the lapse and relapse into conflict. The PBF programmes feature innovation and catalytic traits through Kick-start new peacebuilding initiatives that will eventfully get funded by other donors or accelerate an existing blocked peacebuilding effort.

The PBF allocates fund through two funding facilities, the Immediate Response Facility (IRF) and the Peacebuilding Recovery Facility (PRF). The IRF is project-based financing (projects up to 18 months duration) designed to jumpstart peacebuilding and recovery needs where quick actions are required for immediate peacebuilding and recovery needs. The PRF is a programme-based financing mechanism provides up to three years of support to a structured peacebuilding process and priorities driven by national actors based on a joint analysis of needs with the partners.

The Somalia Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) was jointly elaborated by the Government of Somalia and the United Nations in collaboration with international partners. The plan was approved by the Peacebuilding Support Office endorsing the PBF contribution to peace and stability in Somalia. The plan prioritised programmatic solution under the following two outcomes:

1. Government structures and institutions at federal, regional, district and community level are strengthened, more accountable and transparent and better able to listen and respond to the various needs of populations in newly recovered areas of South and Central Somalia.

2. Communities in South and Central Somalia generate the demand for and benefit from, local governance, security, justice, social and economic solutions.

The Projects under the Scope of the Evaluation

The three projects that are the focus of this evaluation are funded through the IRF of the PBF for Somalia. From the PBF perspective, the three projects are intended as fast, flexible financing for addressing critical and urgent peacebuilding needs in Somalia. The projects are intended to be catalytic meaning eventfully funded by other donors or integrated within the UN existing structures. The three projects are designed to support the PBF Priority Area 4 that focus on re-establishing essential administrative services (namely 4.2 and 4.3).

The next section provides a brief summary of each project.

Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery through Federal Government Systems

The project was designed to channel funds through the national window to be used to implement small-scale infrastructure projects. The main objectives of the project are: a) to enable the Federal Government of Somalia, considered as the Recipient UN Organization (RNOU) for the project, to independently deliver tangible services to its citizens and develop its capacity to conduct community consultations and b) Testing the use of national systems and build the capacity of the FGS to effectively manage funds and to pave the way for other donors to use government systems. The project design included UNDP as the second RUNO responsible for the oversight function by contracting and administering an Independent Monitoring Agent (MA).

The project results structure is as below:

Outcome 1: Somali citizens in the target locations perceive their Regional Authorities and the Federal Government of Somalia as being more legitimate thanks to the improvement of infrastructures in their communities. The following are the outputs under outcome:

- The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) of the Ministry of Finance (MoF) successfully managed the rehabilitation / construction of two[2] small-scale infrastructures in two Member State / Interim Regional Administration.

---

[2] The project document indicates two project and propriety plan talked about three projects

- The Project Implementation Unit developed a successful communication campaign to promote the work of the FGS/IRAs in rehabilitating infrastructures
- PIU and IRA civil servants use a participatory monitoring tool to measure the satisfaction of citizens with the rehabilitated infrastructures.

Outcome 2: National systems strengthened with the Ministry of Finance's PIU established as a sound project management model able to deliver tangible deliverables thereby improving its credibility with the donors. The outputs under outcome 2 are:

- The PIU's project cycle management and financial management systems are strengthened through tailored training and on the job coaching.

The project theory of change is that the delivery of small infrastructure projects by the government has dual benefits:

1. Channelling the fund and managing the project will enable testing the government systems. It will improve the government fund management capacity as well as its capacity to plan, manage and implement projects and will encourage donors to use the government systems.
2. The infrastructure projects will increase citizens' trust of the government. The process of the design and construction the projects will create good collaboration between FGS and FMS and with the local communities.

Risk Management Support project
The objective of the Risk Management Support project, as stated in the project document, is to enable the SDRF trust fund provides an effective contribution to Somalia peacebuilding and state-building priorities due to better mitigation in the design and implementation of support initiatives. The project was designed to deliver the following outputs:

- Risk Management Strategy implemented.
- Technical assistant to Government counterparts.
- All the UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Joint Programmes (JPs) apply do-no-harm/conflict sensitivity principles at formulation and implementation stages.

UNDP is the RUNO and the PBF primarily used to fund the position of MPTF Risk Manager to enable the UN work jointly with the WB and AfDB, donors and Government of the implementation of the RM Strategy for SDRF funds.

Coordination Support for the Implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan project
The project has two components. The first component is intended to provide technical capacity on designing, implementation, monitoring and reporting to enable achieving the Peacebuilding Priority Plan objectives. It was also intended to help transfer conflict analysis and peacebuilding programming knowledge to the national counterparts. UNDP is the RUNO of the project and the fund allocated is the budget of the Peacebuilding Coordinator role needed to extend the technical capacities at the Integrated Office of DSRSG/HC/RC. The second component, implemented by the UN Global Pulse, focuses on using big data technology to gauge Somalia public perception of the ongoing peacebuilding and state-building process without exposing the UN personnel to security risks. The key stakeholders of the big data component are United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia (UNSOM), United Nations Department of Political Affairs (DPA), UNDP Somalia, UNDP Uganda, UN Resident Coordinator Office (RCO) Somalia.

The project results were framed around the following two outcomes:

Outcome 1: The Peacebuilding Priority Plan will provide an effective contribution to Somalia's peacebuilding and state-building priorities due to effective coordination support in the design and implementation of the PRF projects. The following are the outputs under outcome 1:

- PPP Relevant stakeholder buy-in and proper needs assessment among potential users
- Project outcomes achieved as agreed in the project plan and memoranda of understanding
- Scale up of current to provide more analysis

Outcome 2: Support efforts to remotely monitor Somali public perceptions and behaviours relevant to the ongoing peace- and state-building processes. The project document stated the following as the outputs under outcome 2:

- PRF project proposals developed
- Technical assistance provided
- PPP implementation coordinated

Evaluation Purpose and Scope

The purpose of the evaluation (as stated in the ToR) is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the projects. According to the evaluation ToR, the evaluation will also assess the potential impact of the activities of the project on beneficiaries and the sustainability of results including capacity building results. The evaluation is expected to identify lessons learned and make recommendations that projects partners and stakeholders might use to improve the design and implementation of other related projects.

The scope of the evaluation is the programmatic assessment covering the outputs and outcomes of the three projects from the inception of each project to the evaluation time. The scope covers assessment of the interventions undertaken by the RUNOs and the FGS within the scope of the three projects. The evaluation scope covers assessment of OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability.

Evaluation Methodology

The methodology was agreed with the RCO as the commissioners of the evaluation, in the inception report which can be found in Annex 2. The evaluation employed a qualitative analysis covering desk review, semi-structured interviews, and observations. The inception reports also include detail of the methods used for each evaluation criteria.

The consultant acknowledges that there are some unique elements of peacebuilding interventions needs to be considered in doing an evaluation. The evaluator recognized the uniqueness of peacebuilding interventions while applying the evaluation discipline practices, process and criteria.

The data collection and analysis were based on the evaluation matrix presented in the inception report. The matrix was aligned with the OECD-DAC criteria, and the consultant used the OECD-DAC definitions of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact and tailored the criteria where peacebuilding nature necessitates adjustments. Almost the same questions, data collection tools and analysis used for the three projects to ensure that consistency in the application of the methodology.

Evaluation Limitations

Evaluations, as well as other programme interventions in Somalia context, are highly constrained by the prevailing conditions in the country, namely security and its implications on work arrangements in Somalia. The UN

security regulations limit where and when the consultant can travel and where stakeholders can be consulted. Availability of key stakeholders for interviews is also a challenge in Somalia. There was movement restriction in Mogadishu during the in-country mission, which limited the consultant ability to meet and conduct interviews with government stakeholders. The only government staff interviewed are the PIU staff who came to the UN compound. Additionally, the consultant was not able to undertake the site visit for the Pilot Project site in Kismayo, as was initially planned, due to UN security restrictions.

A particular limitation of this evaluation was the fact that the evaluation is conducted with only one consultant and planned for a maximum of 30 days including only 10 days field trip[3] (5 in Nairobi[4], 5 in Mogadishu). The time is inadequate for evaluating three projects in a complex context such as Somalia.

The evaluations limitations were partially mitigated through the following:

- The consultant focused the evaluation scope by being selective about the issues to be assessed prioritising subjects that most likely present potentials for learning.
- Skype calls were used to interview some of the projects' stakeholders instead of face-to-face interviews.
- While the planned site visit to one of the Pilot Project sites was not accomplished, interviewing some UN staff from another project (UNDP RoL) who are not engaged in the project who have visited the site provided reasonably reliable information.

Evaluation Findings

This section presents the evaluation findings based on the analysis of the data and the information obtained from the documents reviewed and interviews with projects' stakeholders. The findings are presented for each project separately. The DAC evaluation criteria are used as the framework to discuss the evaluation findings.

This section provides a brief description of how each criterion examined in this evaluation.

---

[3] The filed mission took place between 22-30 September 2018

[4] The Nairobi mission was shortened due to the unavailability of stakeholders during the mission and Skype interviews were used.

Relevance is concerned with assessing whether projects are in line with local needs and priorities and are in line with the policies and priorities of the recipients and the donor. For this evaluation, the relevance criterion assesses the extent to which the project addresses the Somalia priorities, is aligned to the peacebuilding and State-building priorities, adapted to the context and is in line with the PBF policies.

Efficiency within the context of peacebuilding interventions intends to assess if the project used the most efficient option considering the context and the project's objectives. It also assesses how well the project used the opportunities to synergise and build complementarities when possible.

Effectiveness measures the extent to which the project or activity achieved its objectives, or whether this can be expected to happen given the outputs delivered. Under the effectiveness criterion, the evaluation also assessed if the project has been **catalytic**, i.e. triggered resources from other donors for the project or similar project.

The evaluation considered **innovation** as a broad term meaning any attempt to offer a new programme solution or approach that is more effective, efficient and sustainable than the previous/ current solutions. Hence innovation is assessed within the framework of efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability.

Sustainability is concerned with assessing whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue after the project cycle.

Impact looks for the positive and negative changes produced by the interventions, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery through Federal Government Systems

Relevance
The project is relevant to the Somalia national priorities and features strong ownership by the government. The project is in full alignment with the Somalia Compact/ NPS, SDRF and the Peacebuilding Priority Plan. Specifically, the project is aligned to PB Focus Area: 4.2 which is concerned with the extension of state authority/ local administration. The output 2 of the project was designed to build the capacity of the PIU of the MoF, is aligned with the Peacebuilding Priority Plan outcome 1:"Government structures and institutions at Federal, regional, district and community level

are strengthened, more accountable and transparent and better able to listen and respond to the various needs of populations in newly recovered areas of Somalia". Additionally, the project infrastructure activities target the recovered areas and as such are aligned to outcome 2 of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan and subsequently aligned to the NDP's priorities.

On a strong positive note, the project uses the government systems and procedures and as such is fully in line with the principles of the New Deal for Engagement in the Fragile States that have been reaffirmed in the NPS. The project put into action the international community commitments to NPS principles. The NPS confirmed the international community commitments to channel aid through the government preferred instruments and to use aid to support the institutional capacity development.

Efficiency
Within the scope of the evaluation, the following points related to the efficiency of the project are noted.

The project channelled fund through the National Window. The Federal Government of Somalia was the recipient entity and the PIU at the Ministry of Finance tasked with the implementation. The project implemented using the government systems following the PIU work schedules. The project was running concurrently with the WB Special Financing Facility (SFF) for the Local development project. The WB supports the core staffing structure of the PIU during the implementation period of the project.

The use of the National Window proofed to efficient, and there are many advantages of implementing using the government systems (using the PIU at the MoF as implementation unit). In particular, it has been possible to implement the project using the government PIU[5] that was established as a permanent structure and is used to implement other projects (mainly WB projects).

The fact that the MoF had a functioning PIU substantially enhanced the efficiency especially getting the activities implemented at relatively lower cost. The project generated savings from the lower implementation costs which had been used to implement additional infrastructure projects that are in line with the project objectives. The additional projects funded with the savings include installation of solar streetlights in Bandiradley, providing

---

[5]The PIU established with the Norwegian funds and with the starting up of the UN and the WB projects, the WB has been funding the PIU (SFF-LD Somalia Financial Facility for Local Development)

equipment for the two constructed facilities in Kismayo and North Galkacyo and installation of solar panels in the newly built district administration block in North Galkacyo.

The use of the National Window enabled better coordination with other projects funded by other partners (WB), improved not only the efficiency but also reduced possibilities of duplication of efforts. The national window allowed implementing projects in the most risky recently recovered areas. This would have been extremely difficult to be implemented by the UN taking into consideration the UN security restrictions.

The use of the National Window played a pivotal role in strengthening the government capacity (learning by doing) and in increasing government ownership.

The most significant inefficiencies noted is that the project activities did not conclude within the initial timeframe set by the PBF. According to the people interviewed from the UN and the government site, the delays are brought about by the slowdown start of the project. The UN, WB and FGS took long time to coordinate the intervention and to set an integrated approach for all the projects implemented by the government. These activities were not factored at the planning phase. The prolonged elections period and the selection of the Cabinet of Ministers have further delayed the project activities. The project progress reports showed that until the end of the first quarter of 2017 the delivery was mainly the cost of training, designing infrastructure projects and consultations and none of the infrastructure work was started on the ground.

The project design included using the service of an Independent Monitoring Agent, to be administered by UNDP, for the oversight of the project activities. UNDP was not able to find a qualified company at a reasonable cost. The lowest price received from a qualified company was above $700,000.

The evaluation concludes that the use of the national window has not been less efficient in comparison with other models and has almost certainly been more effective than some. Overall, the advantages of implementing through the National Window outweighed the disadvantages.

Effectiveness
The project through the National Window mechanism delivered some small-scale infrastructure projects that support service delivery, selected through

government and community consultations, in five member states. The project targeted the weakest administration in the South and Central Somalia where government provision of basic services is essential for the legitimacy of the state.

A critical aspect of the effectiveness of the project is that services have been delivered by the government providing an opportunity for testing the national system and building the capacity of the FGS to manage funds. The project also offered an opportunity for collaboration between the Federal and Member States' authorities. The following infrastructure projects were completed following the standards: the construction and equipping of a Regional Court in Kismayo, Jubbaland State; Solar Streetlights in three streets in Banadir District Administration, Mogadishu; Administration Office with attached Courtroom and Solar Streetlights in Bandiiradley, Galmudug State and Construction of and providing equipment to the District Administration office, Puntland State.

Based on the reports produced by the project and interviews with the PIU team and UN/WB staff, it appears that PIU has acquired the substantial capacity for overall management of projects. A UN staff interviewed by the consultant, who is a Certified Project Manager, has stated that the PIU currently has the capacity to manage mid-size procurements. The staff also noted that the PIU is highly efficient on processing payments.

UNDP/RCO worked very closely with the PIU during the project implementation. Through training and on the job mentoring the PIU staff gained capacity in a) public procurement, bid evaluation and contractual management, b) financial management and reporting c) risk management and audit d) monitoring of projects, e) ethics and integrity in public procurement and management of public contracts. UNDP contracted engineer worked closely with the PIU in critical technical areas where the latter needed support. The PIU also delivered relatively well on improving government visibility promoting the government infrastructure projects through communication and public campaigns. The gender results are limited to the little participation of female in the construction work and the efforts of the PIU to promote women participation in project selection and to encourage female candidates to apply to projects' positions.

Notwithstanding the above successes and achievements, the expected project outputs were not fully achieved. Among some of the factors that contributed to this, is the fact that progress is not tracked for all planned objectives. For example, local communities' satisfaction with the constructed

infrastructure; a key component of the project theory of change; was not tracked or measured.

The consultant noted that the results in the progress reports do not always measure the intended change. This observation may indicate a problem with the selection of indicators without consideration of how the data will be collected, selecting indicators that are not sensitive to change or using indicators that are not appropriate to the result (the direct causal link between the indicator and the results).

The project did relatively well regarding process monitoring (input and activity reporting: monitoring of the construction work, reporting training activities), and little reflection on the output level results. The weakness on results level reporting is due to the quality of the results framework and monitoring challenge highlighted in the previous paragraph.

Last but not the least, although the pilot projects have been selected through community consultations to strengthen the community trust of the government; it was quite interesting to note that construction and providing equipment for administration offices were among the few priorities that were funded. The consultant does not wish to imply that these are not important or does not reflect community priorities. However, such projects may likely be interpreted as elite/politicians pushing for their preferences. The reality is that in a country in conflict or post-conflict there are vast needs and there will always be competing priorities. It is important to be careful not to select projects that in a way could be interpreted politically as favouring segment of the population. One approach to avoid selecting what can be perceived as "a political choice" would be limiting the work on standalone infrastructure projects. Work on infrastructure and equipment provision projects should be done within the framework of thematic programmes or projects (RoL, Stabilisation, Local governance). According to the UN RCO, new infrastructure activities have been considered within the framework of the thematic projects and will continue to be implemented through the national window. In the consultant view, integrating infrastructure activities within the thematic programmes ensures better vetting of the community priorities and contributes to better impact as well.

Catalytic Effect
The evaluation finds some evidence that the project has been catalytic.

An important point to note is that the pilot project targeted the newly recovered area representing high insecure and risky locations. These

infrastructure projects would probably not get funded through bilateral donors' agreements due to the high risk. Additionally, the pilot project has encouraged other donors to use the government systems. Currently, there are other projects signed agreements with donors including funds to be implemented through the National Window.

The following table includes funding from donors that are / will be channelled through the National Window subsequent to the implementation of "the Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery through Federal Government Systems".

Project	Amount	Donor	Year
Rule of Law – Construction of Baidoa Prison	$1,102,277(after deducting 1% Administrative Agent fee)	Government of Sweden	2017
Rule of Law – Rehabilitation of Supreme Court, Construction of Galkayo -National Somali University compound rehabilitation	Euro $3,292,300 (approximately $4m) FGS – $3,463,443 UNDP - $536,557	Government of Italy	2018
Rule of Law Construction of prison in Kismayo Construction of Bosaso court house	$2,389,860 programmable amount (hybrid implementation with funds passing from MPTF to UNOPS to Government treasury) FGS - $1,692,554 UNOPS - $687,306	EU	2018

Sustainability

The Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery has two fundamental elements of sustainability. The project has generated a strong sense of national ownership (as discussed under relevance and efficiency) and worked on developing the government capacity. However, the evaluation is not able to conclude if the PIU staff capacity will be sustained without donor funding. According to the RCO, the WB will stop funding the PIU and the cost of staff has been allocated as part of the UN new projects that will be implemented through the National Window.

It is widely known that Somalia government faces great challenges on paying government salaries[6]. It is important for projects that work on

---

[6] In 2018 salaries of civil servants were not paid regularly and at times civil servants did not receive salary payments for successive months. The WB used to support salaries of 47 government department.

government capacity development to carefully consider how to sustain the capacity development efforts. The challenges facing the sustainability of government capacity development efforts are not specific to one project and should be addressed across the programme as early as possible.

For the sustainability of the created infrastructure, according to the PIU team; it has been agreed during the design of the projects that the maintenance of the infrastructure is the responsibility of the local authorities. The PIU team mentioned that some of the projects have local arrangements to cover the operation and maintenance.

Overall, it is difficult to come to a solid conclusion on sustainability in the current context.

Impact
The assessment of the project's impact is challenged by the following:

Firstly, the project lasted for less than three years and meaningful peacebuilding results emerge at a scale that is larger than the duration of the project.

Secondly, if the consultant considers assessing the potential impact, there is no data available beyond the output level results. It is also difficult to assess the impact of the project in isolation of the overall peacebuilding interventions and the overall context in the project targeted areas.

However, it is worth noting that some of the people interviewed have reported an observed impact for the solar streetlights in Bandiiradley. The streetlights have improved the security, extended the working hours in the market and increased the district revenues. The consultant believes this point needs to be reported even if it cannot be substantiated.

Risk Management Support project

Relevance
The Risk Management Project was developed to extend the capacity of the UNCT on risk management to implement the SDRF Joint Risk Management Strategy (JRMS). The project was intended to strengthen the strategic and operational collaboration between the UN, the WB, AfDB, donors and the government to enable achieving strategic objectives of the programmes within the risk context in Somalia. The project also was meant to complement the procedures and methods of the programmes funded under

the Peacebuilding Priority Plan. The Risk Management Group (RMG) was established as a platform to discuss and share information. Collaboration on risk analysis, dialogue, sharing of information and communication between organisations is not only an efficient approach but also enhance programme effectiveness. The RMG by bringing the various partners facilitates addressing multiple risks where each partner brings some degree of specialisation needed for addressing risks and all partners accept to share the residual risks. As such, collaborative risk management is highly relevant given the complexity of the project/ programme in Somalia. The RCO is uniquely qualified to coordinate and lead this cooperation because of its position and role within the UN.

The project has a strong component supporting the Pilot Project to Strengthen Service delivery. The project performed oversight role for the Pilot Project to substitute the function of the MA as UNDP did not manage to contract the MA due to the high cost. The engagement with the Pilot Project is relevant given the objective of the Pilot Project (testing the government systems) and the high risk in Somalia. However, the approach to oversight does yet come at the cost of slowing down Pilot Project implementation (especially at the initial stages of the implementation) as the risk management project followed a close accompaniment approach.

Efficiency
Collective risks management effort is, no doubt, a more efficient approach especially in the Somalia context given the high complexity and uncertainty. The dialogue and information share are necessary as multiple donors and agencies are involved in various projects in different geographical locations and with different partners. Collaboration on risk management expands the share of technical skills and reduces reinventing the wheel by the different programmes. However, people interviewed including key members of the RMG mentioned that the dedication of the members from the donors has declined compared to the strong commitment at the inception. The government, a key stakeholder for the project, has very limited involvement in the RMG.

In terms of the approach to risk analysis, most of the analysis documents were produced with limited collaboration mostly involving the MPTF Risk Manager and the WB/UN Coordinator. The interviews revealed that the members recognise the importance of collaborative risk management. However, translating that into commitment is a challenge as the government, donors and organisations human resources capacity are stretched among the competing priorities in Somalia complex context.

The RMG started to consider an alternative approach to improve collaboration and produce in-depth analysis of selected subjects to feed the programmes decision making machinery. In April 2018, the RMG started working on the analysis of Gender-Based Violence risk involving the Swedish Embassy (lead), UN and the WB.

In the consultant view, moving towards a web-based dashboard that can be accessed by all the members via an internet connection may be an efficient way for the regular/ routine updates.

The evaluation assessed the level of coordination between the project and the relevant stakeholders and projects as another indicator for the project efficiency.

The JRMS is built on complementarities with project level risks. Additionally, the JRMS framework has enabled closer collaboration (at least between the UN and the WB) especially on training and capacity development efforts. According to government officials and UN staff interviewed, the project used an integrated approach to technical capacity where issues related to risks are included as part of other training programmes which seems to be a more efficient approach.

Regarding collaboration with other relevant initiatives, the National Funding Stream Manual developed by the project in 2016, is based on the UN common principles under the Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT). The manual used and referred to the HACT principles extensively. According to the MPTF Risk Manager, the project has made use of HACT in providing inputs when developing risk management and engagement plans.
In the consultant view, seeking collaboration with the HACT members on implementation of joint assurance and monitoring activities (contracting Independent Monitoring Agent, coordination on spot checks etc.) should have been attempted as an efficient way for monitoring the pilot project activities.

Effectiveness
The project and the JRMS collaborative approach underpin the effectiveness of the project. The joint reviews, analysis and share of risk-related information have contributed to shifting the focus of risks management from fiduciary/compliance and risk avoidance towards broader programme quality assurance and mitigation. This represents great achievements that the UN and the partners need to build upon in the future.

The following results represent the achievements of the collaboration on risk management:

1. Risks Dashboard updates and information sharing;
2. Thematic Risks on the Impact of the Drought in Somalia over the SDRF;
3. Cross MPTF Funded JPs Risk Analysis;
4. The Use of Country Systems Road Map for Somalia;
5. SDRF Operational Manual
6. Operational Manual for the National Window.

As discussed under the relevance section, the project has a strong component of capacity support to the national window, especially in supporting the MoF implementing the pilot projects. All the PIU staff interviewed reported satisfaction with the support provided by the project including training, on the job coaching and mentoring and quality assurance of the PIU work. The partnership between UN and the MoF and other government institutions has also been strengthened as a result of the engagement.

The challenges facing the implementation of the JRMS are ensuring the continuous commitment to the collaborative work on risk management and producing more in-depth analysis that informs the programme decision making. The people interviewed by the consultant reported limited government participation; varying levels of dedication and technical experience of the members (change of staff representing the organisations) are among the challenges facing the group.

While the project delivered good results, strategic opportunity for developing a holistic risks management in Somalia was not fully utilised. A comprehensive risk assessment requires a wide range of technical skills and expertise. Therefore a meaningful collaboration among the partners is essential to achieving the JRMS objectives. Limited involvement of the government, the change of staff representing the participating agencies and competing priorities in Somalia complex context had an impact on achieving the objective of the JRMS.

In conclusion, achieving the objectives of the JRMS depend on how the RMG succeeds in its efforts on revising the JRMS strategy and its approach to be able to produce an in-depth analysis to inform programme decision-making.

Sustainability

The sustainability of the Joint Risk Management Strategy achievements depends on findings ways to bring collaboration on risk management to the partners' top priorities and producing in-depth risk analysis.

Coordination Support for the Implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan project

Relevance

Similar to the risk management, the project is meant to increase the capacity of the UNCT to operate in the challenging environment of Somalia. The project provided an additional resource to enable the UN capacity that is particularly challenging to fund yet needed. The PBF Coordinator role is instrumental in achieving the outcomes of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan given the programme size, the number of UN agencies and the challenging conditions in Somalia.

Under the Big Data component, the project was intended to support the UN efforts to monitor Somali public perceptions on various issues related to the ongoing peace and state-building processes. The project has attempted, through the application of big data, to overcome data collection challenges mainly security and access challenges. The project used technology to extract and analyse data from social media and radio stations to generate information that is important for peacebuilding. The consultant acknowledges the significant role of citizens' perception of the peacebuilding process to peace and the UN and the partners' work in Somalia. However, the reality that there is limited use of social media and the coverage of radio stations partly undermined the relevance of the project. The project reports stated that project targeted eight radio stations that have reasonable quality in Mogadishu. There is no information on the estimated audiences of the radio station, their geographical distribution and the level of participation across the districts.

Additionally, the project has no links to any results frameworks of a peacebuilding and development programmes in the country, this major weakness of the project design, led the project to be mostly isolated and further undermined its relevance. Some stakeholders interviewed do not see the component on big data generates information that provides added value to the UN and the partners in Somalia. At this moment, a key stakeholder to the Big Data component does not recognise any achievements of the component that is relevant to them.

Efficiency

The distinct coordination role apart from the programming capacity is necessary given the size of the programme and the number of agencies involved. Programme coordination is essential especially considering the innovation and catalytic nature that necessitates across projects synergies and learning. Catalytic and innovative initiatives seek direction and benefit from learning and knowledge sharing. For these reasons, programmes wishing to be catalytic and to promote innovation should leverage collaboration and learning.

However, some of the UN staff interviewed perceive the PBF the current funding procedures and oversight mechanisms as an inefficient, imposing an unnecessary burden by introducing additional layers. In their views, as the PBF programmes and projects are within the frameworks of UN programmes, the PBF should use the existing governance mechanisms. Additionally, the programmatic approach (Joint Programmes) despite its benefits triggered some challenges. Some agencies reported were not able to get the remaining 20% of fund despite delivering the 80% of their fund as required by the fund policy.

The Big Data Component
The following points are noted regarding the efficiency of the project:

Efficiency assesses if there is a duplication of efforts. UN staff interviewed by the consultant stated that the social media analysis (Facebook) generated by the Big Data component does not provide added value to the UNSOM social media monitoring; neither on the scale or the content.

The project while considered designed based on consultations; the documentation and follow-up required for such a project environment were not adequate. According to a UN staff who was tasked to develop an internal brief about the project, seeking the involvement of government was mentioned in meeting's minutes and no evidence of any actions being taken – at least from minutes.

On the cost side, the evaluation did not manage to assess the cost efficiency of the project. Cost-effectiveness requires cost-benefit analysis as well as the assessment of the cost invested in producing toolkits (the technical outputs of the project) compared to similar toolkits.

Effectiveness

The project delivered on the commitment to review project proposals and reports before it gets to the PBF. Moreover, according to UN staff interviewed the BPF enabled the agencies to enter new locations and test new approaches. For some UN staff effectiveness in the Somalia context means ensuring that the programmatic approach is followed: when you go to a place to implement a new initiative or you enter a new location you are sure that the other necessary programmatic components are there. This method has been achieved to some extent in implementing and coordinating the Peacebuilding Priority Plan.

Catalytic Effect

The staff interviewed by the consultant (from three JPs) mentioned that they have promises from donors to help them expand and replicate their work.

Some of the UN employees interviewed believe that the project should have played a stronger role acting as a link between different PBF projects by analysing the various projects, sharing information on gaps, complementarities and generating lessons learned across the projects.

In the consultant view, the project needs to work on strengthening joint outcome level monitoring to improve results reporting as an important enabler for achieving the projects' objectives and the overall PPP gaols. Results oriented reports are strongly linked to the ability to mobilise resources from other donors and as such are necessary for serving the catalytic objectives of the projects.

The PBF Coordinator role should shift towards a more strategic programmatic role with the ability to engage to overcoming challenges, build synergies to facilitate the achievement of the overall programme objective; without introducing additional burden to the projects.

The Big Data Component

The project achievements include the following: Radio and Facebook analysis toolkit and the relevant documentation. However, a key project stakeholder interviewed by the consultant doesn't see achievements for the project beyond delivering technology outputs in the form of social media analysis toolkit and radio analysis toolkit (not reaching the aim of the project).

The major weakness of the project design which has affected its effectiveness is that the project has no link to in-country initiatives and frameworks. The component was designed without links to a specific UN

peacebuilding project or programme. It seems that the component has been driven by necessity outside the country. Integration and linkages to a specific programme (i.e. using the big data component to collect data on specific indicators) should have been considered as a way to enhance the ownership of the project. Key informants from the UN are unaware about the project, and other insisted in distancing themselves from the project even though their entities are listed as implementing partners in the project document. A key project stakeholder stated that he concluded that the project did not bring an added value to his unit work and the unit stopped working with the project. The challenges facing the big data pointed to a serious gap in the coordination role. These problems should have been immediate red flagged to the steering committee and to the PBF to be timely addressed to enable the project achieves its objective.

Sustainability

As discussed under relevance and effectiveness, the Big Data component of the project is not linked to in-country programme, UN frameworks or project and lacks ownership by the UN agencies in the country. The lack of integration with the UN programmes and projects had weakened knowledge about the project and resulted in weak institutional memory. As such, the project achievements are unlikely to be sustainable at least within the Somalia programmes.

Impact

The assessment of the impact of the project is challenged by the following:

Given the project objectives, it is not possible to assess the impact of the project in isolation from the impact of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan. As discussed, under the sustainability of the Pilot Project, meaningful peacebuilding results emerge at a scale that is larger than the project duration.

General Points

For both the Coordination Support and Support to Risk Management projects project delivery and timeline are not discussed as the main cost of the two projects is the staffing cost.

All the three projects were extended beyond the IRF duration threshold of 18 months.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

Lesson Learned
L1: Establishing systems and supporting new institutions is a lengthy process and takes time to achieve. Projects' designers need to consider these points in estimating how long it takes to build capacity, what level of inputs are required and for how long.

L2: In Somalia context, there are always some conditions and requirements to be set at the initiation phase for successful project delivery and implementation. These requirements need to be examined carefully at the inception and factored in the plans of the project.

L3: Initiatives without linkages to agencies frameworks and projects face high failure risk and weak ownership regardless of how innovative the initiative is and how valuable its objectives are. It is therefore critical for the success of a new initiative; its design accounts for the local context and its implementation framework are linked to the programmatic frameworks following rigour programme discussion at the technical level to secure ownership.

L4: The context of Somalia includes a wide range of risks, and the government systems are not yet mature, a strong UN oversight and programme support to projects implemented by the government proved to be successful in building government capacities, mitigating risks and strengthening the partnership with the government.

Recommendations

To the UNCT
R1. Advocate for the use of the National Window. Future projects that will use the government systems should continue to integrate capacity development within the implementation framework focusing on institutional capacity at the FGS and the FMS as well. The National Window Guidelines should clarify the roles of FGS level vis-à-vis FMS as needed so that roles and expectation are clear and capacity/ testing of the systems is extended to the member states.

R2. Consider funding a realistic and affordable oversight mechanism for the National Window stream projects: It should encompass financial oversight as well as programmatic oversight and support. The cost of the oversight role

could be based on cost-sharing across the UN projects and should be factored during the project planning.

R3. Future infrastructure projects should be planned within the context of a programme area (not as standalone) and vetted more carefully prioritising projects that have higher potentials to contribute to specific UN outcomes.

R4. It is recommended that current collaborative risk management within the framework of the JRMS continues and further strengthened building on the work done and the lessons learned so far. The RCO is uniquely qualified to coordinate and lead this cooperation because of its position and role within the UN and with other development actors. Coordination with other similar initiatives is also necessary for implementing joint risk monitoring activities to reduce the high monitoring cost in Somalia.

To the PBF
R5. Strengthen the capacity for developing M&E frameworks, indicators selection and outcome monitoring. These skills place the foundation for good reports and supports mobilising resources from other donors and as such are necessary for serving the catalytic objectives of the projects.

R6. Fund initiatives to collect outcome level data for the portfolio to enable systematic outcome assessment and improve programme management and enhance results reporting.

R7. The Coordinator role should shift towards a more strategic role at the programme level with the ability to engage early to overcome challenges, build synergies and share lessons learned.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for evaluation

TORs Project
Evaluation of 3 MPTF

Annex 2: The Consultant Inception Report

Inception Report[7]

Evaluation of Three Projects Funded through the Peace Building Fund for Somalia

Introduction

The evaluation is commissioned by the Head of the Integrated Office (HIO) of DSRSG/HC/RC Somalia and is concerned with the evaluation of three projects funded through the Immediate Response Facility (IRF) of the Peace Building Fund for Somali. The projects are:

1. Risk Management Support for UN Multi Partner Trust Fund (UMPTF) and Somalia Development and Reconstruction Facility (SRDF).
2. Coordination Support for the Implementation of Peacebuilding Priority Plan and Measures to Pilot Studies of Public Response to Peace- and State building Efforts in Somalia
3. Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery through Federal Government Systems in Federal Member States and Interim Regional Administrations.

This inception report outlines the evaluation framework, the methodology and the evaluation work plan the evaluation consultant will follow for the evaluation.

Background and Context

Somalia has made significant progress in the field of politics, has undergone a real transformation and has progressed in state formation resulted in the establishment of the Federal Member States. However, the road ahead remains fragile and uncertain. The country has established a comprehensive aid architecture bridging peace, security, justice and development priorities. Some of the most contentious issues that remain outstanding are those dealing with fiscal federalism, power and revenue sharing.

The international community plays a critical role in supporting the Federal Government of Somalia in the stabilization efforts, implementing development priorities to enable the decentralization processes. The support is crucial for the state and district authorities to

---

[7] Evaluation Consultant: Nuha Abdelgadir

establish their presence, improve the capacity and effectiveness of their institutions and to enable them to provide tangible improvements to the Somalis lives.

The Somali compact between Somalia and the international community made commitments for the reconstruction of Somalia, based on the New Deal Principles for Fragile States. The Somalia compact identified a set of key priorities for the reconstruction of Somalia under five Peacebuilding and State building Priorities (PSG).

As part of the Somali Compact, the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) and development partners established the Somalia Development and Reconstruction Facility (SDRF) as a centerpiece of the New Deal partnership to enhance the delivery of effective assistance to all Somalis. The SDRF bring together several funds ("windows") (the UN, the World Bank and the African Development Bank and the Special Financing Facility) under common governance arrangements.

Evaluation Subject

The three projects that are the focus of the evaluation are funded through the Immediate Response Facility (IRF) of the Peace Building Fund for Somali. The three projects are designed to support the **PBF Priority Area 4 that focus on re-establishing essential administrative services (namely 4.2 and 4.3).**

The objective of the **Risk Management Support project** is to enable the SDRF trust fund provides an effective contribution to Somalia peacebuilding and state building priorities due to better mitigation in the design and implementation of support initiatives.

The **Coordination Support for the Implementation of the Peacebuilding** Priority Plan project intended to deliver/ contribute to two outcomes namely 1) The Peacebuilding Priority Plan will provide an effective contribution to Somalia's peacebuilding and state building priorities due to effective coordination support in the design and implementation of the PRF projects. 2) Support efforts to remotely monitor Somali public perceptions and behaviours relevant to the ongoing peace- and state building processes.

The ultimate Outcomes of **the Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery Through Federal Government Systems** are 1) Somali citizens in the target locations perceive their Regional Authorities and the Federal Government of Somalia as being more legitimate thanks to the improvement of infrastructures in their communities. 2) National systems strengthened with the Ministry of Finance's PIU established as a sound project management model able to deliver tangible deliverables thereby improving its credibility with the donors.

The **project information and the programmatic scope for the** three projects (as reflected in the project documents and the amendments are as in Table 1:

Table 1: Projects Information and the Programmatic Scope

Project	RUNO	Timeframe From	To	Budget	Results Framework| Outcomes/ Outputs
1.Risk Management Support for UMPTF and SRDF	UNDP	15.07. 2015	30.06.2018	586,974	**Outcome 1:** The SDRF trust fund provides an effective contribution to Somalia peacebuilding and state-building priorities due to better mitigation in the design and implementation of support initiatives. **Outputs:** **Output 1:** Risk Management (RM) strategy implemented. *Indicators:* 1.1 : Risk analysis and RMG convened according to strategy (see risk management strategy) **Output 2:** Technical assistant to Government counterparts. *Indicators:* 2.1 Number of trainings on risk management (related to trust fund strategy) 2.2 Proportion of recommendations to offset emergent risks implemented. **Output3:** All MPTF JPs apply do-no-harm/conflict sensitivity principles at formulation and implementation stages. *Indicators:* 3.1 % of projects implemented through Trust Fund that proactively manage potential risks to gender equality, and women's empowerment a) of Trust Fund resources allocated to gender specific activities/interventions % of projects implemented through Trust Fund that routinely formally monitor stakeholder vulnerability/concerns Aligned to PB Focus Area: 4.3 Governance of peacebuilding resources (including JSC/PBF Secretariats).
2.Coordination Support for the Implementation of Peacebuilding Priority Plan and Measures to Pilot Studies of Public Response to Peace- and State building Efforts in Somalia	UNDP	01.06.2017	30.06.2018	952,889	**Outcome 1:** The Peacebuilding Priority Plan will provide an effective contribution to Somalia's peacebuilding and state building priorities due to effective coordination support in the design and implementation of the PRF projects. **Output 1:** PRF project proposals developed *Indicators:* Quality PRF project proposals developed, Target 3 **Output 2:** Technical assistance provided

Project	RUNO	Timeframe From To		Budget	Results Framework| Outcomes/ Outputs
					Output 3: PPP implementation coordinated
					Outcome 2: Support efforts to remotely monitor Somali public perceptions and behaviours relevant to the ongoing peace- and state building processes.
					Output 1: PPP Relevant stakeholder buy-in and proper needs assessment among potential users.
					Output 2: Project outcomes achieved as agreed in project plan and memoranda of understanding
					Output 3: Scale up of current to provide more analysis
					Aligned to PB Focus Area: 4.3 Governance of peacebuilding resources (including JSC/PBF Secretariats)
3. Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery Through Federal Government Systems in Federal Member States and Interim Regional Administrations.	FGS/ UNDP	17.02.2016	30.06.2018	FGS 1,902,500 UNDP 159,581 2,062,0835	**Outcome 1**: Somali citizens in the target locations perceive their Regional Authorities and the Federal Government of Somalia as being more legitimate thanks to the improvement of infrastructures in their communities. **Output 1.1:** The Project Implementation Unit of the Ministry of Finance successfully managed the rehabilitation / construction of two small scale infrastructures in two Member State / Interim Regional Administration (IRA??). **Output 1.2:** The Project Implementation Unit developed a successful communication campaign to promote the work of the FGS/IRAs in rehabilitating infrastructures **Output 1.3:** PIU and IRA civil servants use participatory monitoring tool to measure the satisfaction of citizens with the rehabilitated infrastructures. **Outcome 2:** National systems strengthened with the Ministry of Finance's PIU established as a sound project management model able to deliver tangible deliverables thereby improving its credibility with the donors. **Output 2.1:** The PIU's project cycle management and financial management systems are strengthened through tailored trainings and on the job coaching Aligned to PB Focus Area: 4.2 Extension of state authority/ local administration

Purpose & Scope of the Evaluation

The *purpose* of this evaluation (as stated in the ToR) is to is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Projects. It will also assess the potential impact of the Projects activities on beneficiaries and sustainability of results including capacity building. It will further identify lessons learned and make recommendations that Project partners and stakeholders might use to improve the design and implementation of other related projects.

The *scope* of the evaluation is programme components covering all the outputs and outcomes of the three projects from the inception of each respective project to the evaluation time. The scope covers assessment of all interventions undertaken by the RUNOs and the federal government at the federal and regional levels. This is a vast scope (in fact three evaluations) for an evaluation that is further constrained by the evaluation time and the evaluation resources (only one consultant for 30 working days).

The evaluation methodology and questions have been carefully developed considering the constraints but still, meet the evaluation purpose.

Methodology

Considering the time, resources constraints and the scope of the evaluation, the methodology is predominantly a qualitative assessment. The evaluation will use a mixed-method approach for data-collection including the following:

- ✓ Desk review of relevant documents: Review of projects documents, amendments, progress reports, work plans (AWP), and any relevant documents and publications. The desk study will be conducted prior to the field mission so that interviews can build on existing knowledge and to maximize the benefits from the field mission.
- ✓ Key Informant Interviews with selected stakeholders of the three projects. The project stakeholders include UNDP, HIO, OBF joint Secretariat, PBSO RMU, UNOPS, UN, WB and AfDB, donors (Swedish SIDA, EU, DFID and Italy) and FGS staff and government officials at the member states). The consultant will use purposive sampling – i.e, the selection for key informant interviews will be based on availability of stakeholder, evaluation time-frame and the consultant/ evaluation manager judgment on the stakeholder interest to contribute to the evaluation and answering the questions.
- ✓ Field visits: Unstructured individual interviews and direct observation will be used. The evaluation consultant will discuss with the evaluation manager to select the sites to be visited.

The consultant will pay attention to **triangulation** and will compare information collected by different methods used for the evaluation.

Data Analysis

The consultant will start by analysing information from the desk review to draw initial findings, organize data into themes and extract information linked to the evaluation questions outlined in the inception report. During fieldwork, the consultant will review information gathered it to identify and clarify themes to be compiled with findings of the desk review. As the fieldwork progresses, a review will be undertaken to assess whether the data gathered will be sufficient to answer the key questions.

The evaluation will look at how each project was planned, what activities were carried out, what outputs were delivered, how processes were managed and what monitoring systems were put in place. The consultant will ensure that the evaluation findings are complete and the different perspectives are considered and analyzed.

The findings will be generated for each project separately and recommendations will be sorted and addressed to the respective entities.

Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation will be conducted against the evaluation criteria as guided by the Development Assistance Committee's Criteria for Evaluation of Development Assistance. The ToR identified the **Relevance, Effectiveness**, **Efficiency**, **Sustainability** and **Impact** criteria as a framework for the evaluation. The ToR also required assessment of how cross-cutting issues namely, gender and human rights been given sufficient attention and if they been integrated into the project in an adequate manner.

Detailed evaluation questions against each of the criteria, methods and sources of data are provided in Table 2: Evaluation Matrix.

The Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Specific sub questions[8]	Data Sources/ Collection methods/tools	Indicators/ Success standards	Methods for data analysis
<u>Relevance:</u> **General Questions** To what extent do the intended outputs address national priorities, adapted to the Somalia context and to what extent are they aligned to Peacebuilding and State building Priorities?	• Were the objectives reflecting the real needs and priorities of the implementing partners as well as of the intended beneficiaries (institutions/ people? • Did the projects contribute to fulfilment of PSGs and the national priority plan? and how? • How relevant the systems set by the project to the MPTF national funding stream governance? • How has the project implementation adapted to the Somalia context? • What innovative or high-risk activities implemented and how risks were mitigated? • In which ways have **gender**	Desk review and Key Informants Interviews Observations	The extent to which the projects are aligned with PBP and PSGs. The extent to which the implementation/ methods adapted to the needs /context.	Qualitative analysis and output mapping /comparison against Theory of Change (TOC).

---

[8] The questions will be further tailored specifically to each project during the KIIs.

Evaluation Criteria	Specific sub questions[8]	Data Sources/ Collection methods/tools	Indicators/ Success standards	Methods for data analysis
	and **human rights** as cross-cutting issues been considered?			
Effectiveness: **General Questions** Have the projects successfully delivered on the results as identified in the project documents?	• To what extent the expected results have been achieved?[9] • How have corresponding results at the output level delivered by the projects affected the outcome, and in what ways have they not been effective? What are the challenges to achieving the outcomes? • What is the most significant change resulted from the interventions? • Are there any additional achievements of the projects (beyond the results in the project documents)? • How well **cross cutting** objectives have been incorporated? What are the **gender achievements**? • What are the lessons learned from the engagement in the three projects (specially in coordination and risk management)? **Innovation/ Catalytic Effect:** • To what extent were the choice and	KIIs with projects' managers, RUNO management and desk study (review of progress reports)	The results indicators as in the projects. The consultant measure of success (alternative indicators that have data). .	Qualitative / quantitative analysis Assessing contributions of the outputs to the outcome and testing validity of assumptions. .

---

[9] The questions will be further tailored specifically to each project during the KIIs.

Evaluation Criteria	Specific sub questions[8]	Data Sources/ Collection methods/tools	Indicators/ Success standards	Methods for data analysis
	the design of interventions considering the Somalia context and circumstances? -What *innovative* approach (planning, implementation and monitoring) were used? -What seems to be working and not working? -How is the larger system (SDRF, Government or MPTF) and environment *responding to the innovation and how flexible the systems to adapting to change*s? - Were there *any risks or issues associated with the innovative* approaches and how were they mitigated/ addressed? • -What other *mechanisms or strategies used for promoting catalytic effects*? Is there evidence that projects approach **produced better results**?			
Efficiency: **General Question** Assess the efficiency of implementation methods and if the resources/ funds efficiently used?	• Were the projects Implemented within deadline and cost estimates? • Have the implementation arrangements enabled timely delivery of activities and achievement of ? What are the challenges to achieving the outputs?	KIIs with projects' managers, RUNO management and review of the financial reports	Performance against the annual workplans. Progress on activities No overlap with interventions delivered by other organizations	Qualitative analysis and quantitative data comparison wherever available.

Evaluation Criteria	Specific sub questions[8]	Data Sources/ Collection methods/tools	Indicators/ Success standards	Methods for data analysis
	• Have the oversight and control mechanisms enabled meeting requirements? • Was there duplication of efforts among the interventions or overlap with interventions delivered by other organizations? Were the interventions coordinated with other similar projects if exist • Were there alternative implementation arrangements that would have been better for delivering value for money?			
Sustainability: **General Question** Has the projects been designed /implemented in a manner to ensure that results achieved will be sustainable in the longer term?	• How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders/ benefiting communities? • How likely the benefits to continue after donor funding ceases? What systems and tools created by the project? How likely the system will continue after the projects? • Do the projects have an exit strategy? What will happen at the end of the project? What could be done to strengthen sustainability? **Innovation/ Catalytic:** • Are there any catalytic effects of the projects? Were the projects	KIIs and review of reports.		Qualitative / quantitative analysis

Evaluation Criteria	Specific sub questions[8]	Data Sources/ Collection methods/tools	Indicators/ Success standards	Methods for data analysis
	able to **leverage additional financin**g from other sources? Is there any evidence for or potentials for projects' **scaling-up,** expansion of activities or the use of the projects 'methods by others? -Can the innovation methods be adapted to other projects/ programs (**can they be replicated.** has innovation methods **created/ supported catalytic effect**)?			
Impact: What are the <u>potentials</u> for long-term impacts of the intervention?	• Did the project effectively develop adequate institutional capacities? • To what extent the project implementation integrated and embedded in national systems?	KIIs and review of reports.		
Cross-Cutting: How have the projects incorporated gender equality, rights based approach and human rights priorities in planning and implementation?	• To what extent and in what ways has UNDP addressed Gender issues in the project? • What gender results have been achieved?			

Evaluation Time-frame

Phase I: Inception Phase

This phase encompassed **a rapid desk review** of projects documents and progress reports and aimed to clarify scope and focus. It concluded with the development of the inception report and evaluation plan.

- ✓ Inception report   by 10 August.

Phase II: Fieldwork & Data Collection

This comprises a comprehensive document analysis and interviews in Nairobi, Mogadishu and select districts. Because of the short time in-country, the comprehensive desk review and the interviews of the managers of the projects will be conducted from home before the field mission so to maximize the benefits from the field mission building on knowledge gained before the field trips.

- ✓ Comprehensive desk review and Skype calls   11- 26 August
- ✓ Field visit
  a- Nairobi -Somalia   27-31 August / 01-05 September

Phase III: Analysis & Report Writing

Upon the conclusion of fieldwork, the consultants will finalize the analysis of the data and report writing which will be completed home-based.

- ✓ Submission of the first draft of evaluation report   by 11 September
- ✓ Comments and feedback on draft (by HIO and partners)   by 20 September
- ✓ **Submission of the final report**   by 27 September

Evaluation Report Format

The final report will cover findings; judgments made following the evaluation criteria and questions based on the analysis of qualitative and quantitative. The following is the proposed format for the report:

- Title Pages
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive summary
- Introduction: Purpose and Methodology of the Evaluation and Description of the interventions (three projects)
- Findings of the Evaluation per project
- Assessment Against OECD/DAC Criteria
- Recommendations and Lessons learned
- Annexes: TOR, Inception Report data collection tools - field visits report, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

41

Annex 3: List of Key Informants

Federal Government

Name	Title	Organisation
Ali Haji Aden	SFF-LD Coordinator	Ministry of Finance
Amir Sirad	M&E Officer	Ministry of Finance
Eng Abdinur Farah	Project Engineer	Ministry of Finance
Fatima Ahmed	Procurement Officer	Ministry of Finance

UN Agencies/ Funds in Somalia

Name	Title	Organisation
Peter de Clercq	DSRSG/HC/RC	UNSOM
Franco Sanchez	Head of Integrated Office of DSRSG/RR/RC	RCO
Merita Jargo	MPTF Risk Manager	RCO
Peter Nordstrom	Peacebuilding Fund Coordinator	RCO
Fatuma Kuno Muhumed	Programme Analyst-Youth	UNFPA
Peter Opio	Programme Officer: Somalia Refugees Cross Border Peacebuilding Pilot Project	UNHCR
Valerio Bosco	Head of the Integrated Analysis Team	UNSOM
Marilynne Marshall	Risk Officer	RMU/ RCO
Ruth Pfleiderer		RoL/UNDP
Doel Mukerjee	Head of RoL Programme	UNDP
Yasir JAMAL	Civil Engineer, QA Specialist	Integrated Office of DSRSG/HC/RC
Abdullahi Hudow OSMAN,	Project Officer, Support to Stabilization	UNDP

UN Peacebuilding Fund

Name	Title	Organisation
Marcus Lenzen	Peacebuilding Policy and Programme Advisor	Peacebuilding Support Office
Patrice Chiwota		
Ayham Al Maleh		Policy Branch, PBF
Marc Jacquand		
Chanil Jung	Programme Analyst	UN Global Pulse Lab

Other

Name	Title	Organisation
Christina Dahlman		Swedish Embassy
Sarah Cramer,	WB/UN Coordinator	World Bank

Annex 4: List of Documents Reviewed

General

- ✓ A New Partnership for Somalia for Peace, Stability and Prosperity: A Framework for Mutual Accountability and Accelerated Progress.
- ✓ United Nations Somali, Integrated Strategic Framework 2014-2016
- ✓ United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office, Peacebuilding Priority Plan for Somalia (2016).
- ✓ Somalia UN MPTF Project to Enable Safe, Coordinated, Transparent and Gender Sensitive Delivery of International Assistance through Somalia in Support of all PSG Priorities and Milestones -Progress Reports for 2016 & 2017.

The Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery through Federal Government Systems

- ✓ PBF-IRF-_SOM PRODOC: The Pilot Project to Strengthen Service Delivery through Federal Government Systems.
- ✓ Project No cost extension.
- ✓ Quarterly and Annual Progress reports (2016, 2017 & 2018).
- ✓ Report No. 5 (2018) -ECHOTECH Construction Supervision: Engineering Consultancy Services For The Development of Preliminary and Detailed Engineering Designs & Supervision of Civil Works for The Ministry Of Finance - Federal Government Of Somalia.
- ✓ PIU projects' weekly monitoring reports.
- ✓ UNSOM Monitoring Mission Report National Window Projects (2018).
- ✓ SFF-LD Work Plan.v1 for October 2017 - March 2019.
- ✓ PIU construction projects' launch notes for 1) Kismayo Regional Court project and 2) Phase II projects.

The Risk Management Support Project

- ✓ PBF-IRF_SOM PRODOC: The Risk Management Support for the UN MPTF Somalia and Somalia SDRF
- ✓ Project extension
- ✓ Progress reports   (2016 & 2017) Risk Management Support for the UNMPTF and SDRF

- ✓ Joint Risk Management Strategy for the SDRF funds draft (2015).
- ✓ Revised Joint Risk Management Strategy for the SDRF funds (2018)
- ✓ JRMS for SDRF Funds: Strategic Way Forward (PPT 2018)
- ✓ Update on the Joint Risk Management Strategy Draft – 28 September 2016,
- ✓ Risk Monitoring Plan Dashboard - risk update (November 2017 Meeting)
- ✓ UN MPTF for Somalia Monthly Donor Briefing Nairobi – June 2016
- ✓ MPTF Funded Projects Risk Analysis (ND)
- ✓ Drought Risks RMG revV2
- ✓ National Funding Stream: Manual (2016)
- ✓ Use of Country Systems: Roadmap for Somalia (April 2017)

The Coordination Support for the Implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan project

- ✓ PBF-IRF-_SOM MPTF_PRODOC: Coordination Support for the Implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan and Measures to Pilot Studies of Public Response to Peace- and State building Efforts in Somalia.
- ✓ Project No cost extension.
- ✓ Annual Report (2017) for Coordination Support for the Implementation of the Peacebuilding Priority.
- ✓ Pre-secretariat & Global Pulse, first Bi-Annual report (2016).
- ✓ Big Data Project Half Yearly Progress updates January – June 2016
- ✓ Project Completion Report (2018): Exploring the use of Big Data in Peacebuilding, UN Global Pulse.
- ✓ Progress Report (2018): Youth Political Empowerment:
   Enabling Somali young women and men to meaningfully engage in governance, peacebuilding and reconciliation efforts.
- ✓ Project updates (2018): Kenya - Somalia Refugees Cross Border Peacebuilding Pilot Project for Voluntary Return, Co-existence and Sustainable Reintegration for Baidoa Returnees.