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## GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFTC</td>
<td>Commonwealth Fund for Technical Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>Economic Affairs Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRU</td>
<td>Economic Policy and Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACO</td>
<td>Development Assistance Coordinating Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECSEC</td>
<td>Decentralisation Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPAC</td>
<td>Development Partnership Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRU</td>
<td>Economic Policy and Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBA Act</td>
<td>Government Budgeting and Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSL</td>
<td>Government of Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRCB</td>
<td>Institutional Reform and Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japanese International Corporation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGFD</td>
<td>Local Government Finance Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFFS</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEF</td>
<td>Medium Term Expenditure Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoDEP</td>
<td>Ministry of Development and Economic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCSA</td>
<td>National Commission for Social Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAO</td>
<td>National Authorizing Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Economic Partnership for African Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADCO</td>
<td>Peace and Development Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASCO</td>
<td>Poverty Alleviation Strategy Coordination Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIUs</td>
<td>Project Implementation Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSL</td>
<td>Statistics Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Treasury Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBB</td>
<td>Treasury Bearer Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAMZ</td>
<td>West African Monetary Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The question of the role played by the Ministry of Development and Economic Planning in achieving the overall policy and strategic objectives of government has dominated the debate for over the past two decades. Previous attempts to close it or to merge it with the Ministry of Finance seem to highlight the seriousness of the issue to past administrations. Not surprisingly we the (authors) find ourselves exercised by the continuing debate which is even more vexed at this juncture in Sierra Leone’s history. Planning is a crucial and an absolutely essential central function of government. The authors have therefore considered and taken to account these important aspects during the analysis and subsequent formulation of recommendations for change.

The Ministry of Development and Economic Planning is at a threshold of its history. Over the years it has suffered from high attrition to mostly donor-funded Project Implementation Units, the creation of rival institutions, lack of donor attention etc., all of which have contributed to its low performance. As a consequence its power and influence have waned. So many laws have also been enacted as part of the broader post-war reforms by government, and this has also considerably reduced MoDEP’s functions which have resulted in MoDEP taking on some other functions which do not directly relate to its broader mandate.

In this report we have attempted to look at MoDEP under the lens of its original mandate, how new legislations have affected this mandate, its current functions whether they are core or non-core, staffing, human resources and wider issues as well as looking at its capacity to communicate with stakeholders. As a result, we have flagged far-reaching recommendations which will seriously affect the future role of MoDEP.

In this regard, we have redefined MoDEP’s role to solely focus on policy development and planning as a small compact body sitting at the heart of government. Focusing in this way will effectively lead to the relinquishment of responsibility for functions such as Aid Coordination and NGO registration. Which we have recommended would be taken by a new Aid Coordination and Debt Management Unit (ACDM) within in the Ministry of Finance in line with the Government Budgeting and Accountability Act 2005. This also means that the Development Assistant Coordination Office (DACO) will cease to exist in its present form. The twin functions of Aid Coordination and temporary PRS secretariat will be taken over by the new ACDM and the proposed Strategic Planning and Policy Development body sitting closer to the centre of government. This refocusing will also see MoDEP passing on most of its non-core functions to relevant ministries or institutions inevitably leading to right-sizing of its manpower budget.

These issues and potential changes have led us to identify several options. We have offered three options to refocus and rationalise the role of MoDEP based on internationally accepted practices, followed by supporting arguments which we consider provide the best benefit to GoSL’s machinery of government. The three options include a) a possible merger of functions and structure into the Ministry of
Finance, b) to streamline and strengthen the current institution, or c) to set up a new body with a more strategic role nearer the heart of government. The last and preferred option creates a unit/institution responsible for translating presidential vision and co-ordinating strategic policy, national goals and intent into policies and programmes right across government and down to the local councils. The recommendations we have made for the review of the Ministry of Development and Economic Planning, Ministry of Finance and the likely outcomes of the ongoing horizontal review across all government ministries will we hope ensure that planning and policy remain a key aspect of central mandates whilst ensuring necessary fiscal and operational matters are placed elsewhere.
Summary of Recommendations

1. **We therefore recommend** that the laws defining the development planning apparatus should be updated after the Government decides on the exact form and structure which the apparatus should take. (Para 7.2 and 8.2)

2. **We consider** that (this work) ‘formulating national policies, priorities, and strategic plans for development (e.g. poverty reduction strategies) and gaining collective political support for implementation’ should be undertaken within a centralised policy development and strategic planning apparatus. (Para 8.6)

3. In the future **we recommend** that the PRS Secretariat will facilitate the working groups and collate incoming data – work which requires a small core of expert planners with one to monitor each of the working groups. (Para 8.7)

4. We recommend that 2 permanent well-qualified analysts, with occasional support from specialists in areas such as civil engineering or agriculture assigned by co-option into an advisory group capacity, should undertake evaluation of large cross-sectoral projects. (Para 8.8)

5. It is recommended that this work (participating in the budget process to ensure cross-sectoral coordination and Local Councils’ plans compatibility) could be incorporated into the duties of policy planning officers. (Para 8.9)

6. It is recommended to develop a ‘think tank’ for Government to provide specialist inputs to policy development including the use of external independent research (Para 8.10)

7. Ministries do not yet have formal planning units, and it may be necessary to strengthen the law in this area - so **we recommend** that this matter is examined. It is envisaged that the central task of overseeing the planning machinery will require a small team of expert strategic planners. (Para 8.11)

8. **We recommend** the creation of a Technical Co-operations Unit within the new policy development and economic planning structure to interface with Governments, Regional and International agencies and current and new initiatives on technical co-operation. (Para 8.13)

9. **We recommend** that action is taken to implement the GBA Act to defragment the functions of coordinating and managing aid across 4 main institutions into one entity the Aid Co-ordination and Debt Management Unit (Para 8.16)

10. **We recommend** that the aid work of the PDMU and EAD of MoF is merged into the new Aid Co-ordination and Debt Management Division, together with the work of DACO, and the aid coordination activities of MoDEP and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Para 8.16)
11. To strengthen the policy development and strategic planning capacity to fully take on PRS work, **we recommend** that focused technical assistance, mentoring and training is provided. (Para 8.17)

12. **We recommend** that EPRU current functions in the MOF be revised to focus more on formulating and analysing socio-economic policies, issuing guidelines for managing the economy as well as designing and carrying out studies and research (Para 8.18)

13. **We recommend** the setting up of a new Policy Development and Strategic Planning Secretariat under the auspices of the Office of the president to incorporate the work of the PRS Secretariat and EPRU (Para 8.24)

14. **We recommend** that regular internal meetings are held in order to foster an inclusive management style. (Para 8.29).

15. **We also recommend** that a senior manager is assigned specific responsibility for ensuring that records are maintained in good order, and that the team who are leading the records management improvement programme should be invited to present their suggestions for setting up an upgraded records system. (Para 8.29)

16. **We recommend** staff capacity should be enhanced by further training in MTEF and financial planning, thereby enabling effective participation in the work of the budget committee. (Para 8.30)

17. **We recommend** that the organisation should have an internal audit unit that will monitor use of motor vehicles, issue of fuel etc. and see that proper procedures are followed in accounting for assets and financial operations. (Para 8.31)

18. **We recommend** that there should be a well organised communications strategy including scheduled meetings for sustaining and broadening the network of stakeholders and the use of a wide range of media, and that the budget should reflect adequate provision. (Para 8.32)

19. Following decisions on the recommendations in our report and subsequent restructuring it will be necessary to access the equipment and software requirements of the new organisation from the Essential Equipment Fund (Para 8.33)

20. **We recommend** that a change management team is set up to implement the approved findings of this report. (Para 8.34)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 In 2002 GOSL and DFID agreed to commission management and functional reviews of key Ministries as part of the first phase of the Governance Reform Programme. The first group of Ministries consisted of Education, Health, Agriculture, and Local Government, and when these were completed in 2003 it was decided to extend this first phase to include reviews of two other Ministries in key sectors - Defence and Trade. These were completed by mid 2004, and then in October 2004 the initial review of Local Government was updated following the Local Government Act of 2004 which transformed the functions of the Ministry, and decentralised and restructured the whole system of public administration.

1.2 The second phase of the Governance Reform Programme was launched in 2005, and GOSL and DFID have commissioned the consulting firm, Public Administration International, in partnership with CoEn (Ghana), and in conjunction with local Sierra Leonean consultants, to undertake reviews of all the other Ministries, starting in May 2005.

1.3 This review of MoDEP was conducted in October and November 2005 by a team of Sierra Leonean consultants, supported by an international consultant who worked on earlier reviews under the reform project. The review immediately follows the one conducted in the Ministry of Finance (MoF) because it was recognised that the functions of the two Ministries are inter-related and that the recent reforms in the MoF may impact on MoDEP’s current and future functions.

1.4 The second phase of the Governance Reform Programme also includes a complementary, and parallel, DFID funded project to strengthen human resources management and records management throughout the Civil Service, and two local records management consultants joined the review team to examine the current status of the registries/records systems in MoDEP. Their findings are part of this report.

2.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE

2.1 The full text of the Terms of Reference is in Appendix H, but in essence it is to examine and make recommendations on the following key aspects of the Ministry:

- The statutory framework in which MoDEP operates
- MoDEP’s functions and their inter-relationship with other relevant Agencies
- Organisation structures
- HRM, staffing, and training
- Internal budgeting, and accounting
- Management processes, procurement procedures and records systems
- Communications and relationships with stakeholders
- Priority equipment needs
- Institutional arrangements for managing change
3.0 APPROACH TO STUDY

3.1 The Development Secretary was briefed about the review three weeks before it began so that she could prepare the Ministry’s staff, locate a room for the consultancy team, and set up a contact group to liaise with the consultants. It was agreed that the main method of collecting data would be through comprehensive structured interviews with senior and middle level staff. A questionnaire was designed to assist this process and it was circulated in advance in order to enable the consultants to prepare for the individual interviews. The names of the people interviewed are listed at Appendix A.

3.2 During the review we travelled to the field to hold detailed discussions with the Ministry’s officials in all 3 Regions of the country, as well as with local councillors, members of the Development Planning Committees in the Councils, Chief Administrators, local Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs), Peace and Development Corp (PADCO) volunteers, Decentralisation Secretariat (DECSEC) coaches, and other stakeholders in 6 Districts, and 10 Local Councils.

3.3 Interviews were also held with officials from Central Management Agencies – the Ministry of Finance (Budget Bureau, Economic Policy and Research Unit (EPRU), and Local Government Finance Department), the Ministry of Local Government and its DECSEC, as well as with UNDP, World Bank, DFID, EU, Civil Society, and relevant NGOs – see Appendix A for a complete list.

3.4 In addition to interviews and many informal discussions we also examined relevant Acts, documents and reports – including of course the draft management and functional review report on the Ministry of Finance. A complete list of documents is in Appendix B.

3.5 Various interviews and meetings included discussions to seek agreement and ownership of new ideas, and to reduce resistance to change. We noted that many people to whom we spoke felt that change was overdue.

4.0 RESPONSIBILITY

4.1 Although the production of this report has been supported by DFID under British aid arrangements, the British Government bears no responsibility for, and is not in any way committed to, the views and recommendations expressed therein

5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

5.1 We are most grateful for the interest and support provided by the Honourable Minister, Deputy Minister, and Development Secretary during the review. Our thanks are also due to the many officials in the Ministry who gave generously of their time, especially to the liaison officer, Desmonde Forde, who made our task so much easier with his guidance around the Ministry.
5.2 During our field work we were indebted to the Chairmen and members of the Development Planning Committees of the Local Councils for the time they spent on briefing us on local planning matters. We are also most grateful to the other key stakeholders who assisted us with our work when we were in the field.

5.3 The general assistance we received on Civil Service matters from Mr E B O Coker, Coordinator of Public Service Reform, was much appreciated and we wish to record our sincere thanks to him.

5.3 We are also very grateful to Charlotte Duncan, DFID’s Senior Governance Adviser in Freetown, and the Project Team Leader, Stephen Catchpole, for their helpful comments and support during the assignment.

6.0 BACKGROUND

6.1 Sierra Leone is, despite its abundant natural resources, classified as one of the least developed countries in the world, according to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Index (HDI). All indicators relating to the well being of the population of the country indicate that poverty is indeed pervasive.

6.2 The devastating civil war experience throughout the 1990s, three decades of economic downfall, economic mismanagement typified by lack of clearly defined development strategies with feasible objectives and effective mechanisms of implementation have all contributed to this state of affairs. Development plans were not fully executed and there was lack of commitment and capacity for efficient use of resources and sustainability of programmes.

6.3 Following the attainment of peace in 2001, the government is now faced with the challenge of maintaining stability, creating conditions for sustainable development and rebuilding social capital in an environment where the economy is still weak and access to quality services and infrastructure very poor. However, in line with its broad legal mandate of directing economic development and planning, and mobilizing aid resources, MODEP have thus contributed to the formulation and implementation of key national policies and programmes to enhance economic growth and reduce poverty.

6.4 It (MODEP) has a history of being merged and divorced with MoF over the years. It operates 3 offices at regional level support and guide district planning and development. The global shift from centralized planning to local participatory planning; emphasis on strengthening public financial management rather than strategic planning and development; weak professional capacity; fragmentation and duplication of certain functions within government, low staff moral and administrative bureaucracies have all undermined the ministry’s capacity to effectively and efficiently discharge its responsibilities.
7.0 OVERVIEW OF PRESENT ARRANGEMENTS

Statutory Framework

7.1 MoDEP was established in 1968 in response to a vacuum in development planning activities during the post-colonial era. The new Ministry was given the broad legal mandate to take the lead on development and economic planning across all sectors, Regions, and Districts. A National Planning Council was also set up in 1972 with the President as chairperson and a comprehensive National Plan was produced for the period 1974 to 1979. This was expected to be complemented by posting planning officers to the Regions and Districts to help facilitate Regional and District Plans but due to resource constraints, and the dissolution of the Local Councils, officers were only posted to the Regions. In the 1980’s however, following the global decline in top-down centralised national planning and a lack of Government direction, MoDEP discontinued its national five year planning framework.

7.2 During the post-war period 2002 to 2005 there have been major new laws and related financial and administrative reforms that have:

- devolved GOSL’s development planning apparatus to sector Ministries and to Local Councils – thus giving a major boost and expansion to development planning throughout the country
- clarified the respective responsibilities of MoDEP and the Ministry of Finance in the areas of economic planning, preparation of the national budget, and aid coordination and management

7.3 These new laws and reforms have fundamentally changed MoDEP’s original responsibilities for development planning and economic planning, and we highlight below key areas where these changes are taking effect.

Laws Devolving Development Planning

7.4 Firstly, the Local Government Act 2004 has devolved development planning across the country to the 19 Local Councils and their Ward Committees. Although MoDEP sent out initial guidelines to help Development Planning Committees of the Councils to start preparing their plans for 2006, a number of other institutions are also involved resulting in some replication and/or overlap. These are:

- Local Government, Decentralisation Secretariat, provides some general assistance to the Development Planning Committees through the assignment of one consultant/coach to each Council.
- PADCO volunteers sponsored by National Commission for Social Action (NaCSA) are also rendering general assistance to Councils in planning.
7.5 Secondly, the Act also stipulates that the development plans of the Councils should not be incompatible with national development goals, i.e. the PRS. Hence the Councils’ plans are expected to be examined jointly by MoDEP and Local Government Finance Department (LGFD) to ensure harmonisation with national goals. The annual budgets of the Councils are then examined by LGFD and this process triggers the flow of development funds to the Council. LGFD is only responsible for designing fiscal decentralisation strategy whereas MoDEP should be providing technical support to crosscheck and harmonise plans but lacks capacity to do so. The sector Ministries also retain an interest in the local plans and would seek to influence Councils if overlapping facilities were planned at contiguous sites. We noted that the Act allows for a transition period for implementing decentralisation from 2005 to 2008 and that during this time it is expected that the Councils will become progressively more self-reliant, and more sophisticated with their development planning.

7.6 Thirdly, the sector Ministries are now required by the Government Budgeting and Accountability Act 2005 (GBA Act) to produce strategic development plans and arrive at their annual budgets based on these plans, subject to the requirements of the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and the Poverty Reduction Strategy (S.20).

**Laws Clarifying Roles of MoDEP and Ministry of Finance**

7.7 Firstly, the GBA Act clarifies in Section 3 that MoF is responsible for formulating macro-fiscal policy and for implementing the medium term expenditure framework on which the annual budget is based. This means that the EPRU at MoF is required to conduct economic planning exercises to forecast the various macro-economic scenarios. There is no need for MoDEP to replicate this work done by the EPRU on economic planning and macro-economic analysis.

7.8 Secondly, the GBA Act requires that the recurrent and development budgets are merged at the sector and national level into a single format incorporating external funds (S.23 and S.24). It is envisaged that integrated budget proposals from the Ministries/Agencies, covering both recurrent costs and development costs, will go direct to the Ministry of Finance (rather than to MoDEP) so that the ‘development’ budget components can be worked on by the same staff who work on the ‘recurrent’ items – thus facilitating full integration at the working level.

7.9 Thirdly, we noted that the GBA Act states that the vote controller in a Ministry or Agency should ensure that sound methods are used to evaluate projects under their supervision (S. 46). The intention of this new law is to improve accountability by ensuring that vote controllers are given explicit responsibility for project costs and benefits, as well as for possible cost overruns in their sector. The implication is that there will be a need for MoDEP to now focus on strategic outcome evaluations of large cross-sectoral projects rather than seeking to evaluate all development projects in all sectors.

7.10 Fourthly, as from 2005 the budget cycle now starts with policy hearings for groups of Ministries with related cross-cutting functional responsibilities (such as
Social Services, Governance, Security etc) and at these hearings the Ministries present their current policies and plans. The MoF organises these policy hearings jointly with MoDEP and the latter’s role is to

- prepare carefully by studying the policy papers submitted by Ministries
- add value to the discussions by helping to identify overlaps or gaps in these policies/plans, thus improving sector coordination before the detailed budgets are finalised

The budget reforms therefore envisage a much closer working arrangement between the functions of MoDEP and MoF for coordinating the plans and budgets of the Ministries at the time of the annual budget hearings.

7.11 Fifthly, the National Statistics Act of 2003, which created Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) as a semi-autonomous agency under MoDEP has removed from the Ministry the executive responsibility for compiling the national statistics - including economic statistics used in the macro-economic analysis now undertaken by the Economic Policy and Research Unit (EPRU) at the Ministry of Finance to guide the medium term expenditure framework and annual budget process.

7.12 Sixthly, the GBA Act states in Section 3 that Aid Coordination and Management is the responsibility of MoF, and that MoF should have a division for handling this work. It is envisaged that this division would be able to facilitate the formulation of policy on donors’ aid, mobilise external resources, and advise GOSL and donors on the marginal value of aid between different sectors, programmes, and projects. The division would also be required to work closely with the Budget Bureau so that external funds can be readily aligned with GOSL funds in order to facilitate holistic decisions on the sector allocations, in line with the MTEF and the PRS. The national budget is expected to capture most of the donor funds in 2006, and all of these funds by 2007. Meanwhile it is expected that MoDEP, DACO, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would integrate their aid coordination activities into the new Aid Co-ordination and Management Division at MoF.

7.13 In undertaking the review we have taken these new laws and reforms into account in seeking to identify how best to strengthen the strategic policy and economic development planning apparatus.

Functions

7.14 After devolving detailed development planning functions to the sector Ministries and Local Councils, MoDEP’s original planning functions are greatly reduced in scale and complexity. But at the centre of Government there still remains the vital role of giving strategic direction to policy and economic development planning and undertaking functions which are cross-sectoral and not performed by individual Ministries, or other implementing agencies. This role includes the following residual functions, but we noted that for various reasons MoDEP is not at present performing all of them:
Facilitating the formulation of national policies, priorities, and strategic plans for development (e.g. poverty reduction strategies) and gaining collective political support for implementation.

Setting benchmarks for nationwide economic and social development and monitoring and evaluating progress in meeting the benchmarks. An example of this is measuring poverty levels – a key cross-sectoral task.

Evaluating large cross-sectoral development projects (e.g. electricity supply).

Participating at the beginning of the annual budget cycle to assist with:
   a) cross-sectoral coordination at the policy hearings for Ministries
   b) harmonising Local Councils’ development plans with national development goals

Acting as a think-tank for Government on cross-sectoral development management issues, (e.g. how much should be spent on social sector development as opposed to building the infrastructure for the productive sector and what should be the size and cost of Government etc?), dialoguing with the outside world, and feeding Government with new development ideas.

Overseeing the effectiveness of the development planning machinery in the Ministries and Local Councils – but not micro-managing individual development plans.

Although these functions are consistent with the original rationale for creating MoDEP as the institutional foci for planning, MoDEP’s capacity to execute these functions and manage the approach to a co-ordinated policy and planning mechanism has also been severely eroded in recent years by factors such as:

- the loss of well-qualified professional staff to donor-funded PIUs (Project Implementation Units), international organisations, and private businesses
- constraints on its budgets
- the creation of new organisations with parallel functions - such as the Poverty Alleviation Strategy Coordinating Office (PASCO), the Development Assistance Coordination Office (DACO), and NaCSA
- lack of job satisfaction at MoDEP

For example, we noted that lack of capacity was the reason given for MoDEP not being assigned the implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) published in March 2005. Although MoDEP took a lead on producing the interim PRS in 2002, the task of producing the final PRS went to PASCO which was originally under MoDEP’s control but was subsequently moved away from the Ministry. The implementation of the PRS, the key national economic and social development strategy, is now temporarily assigned to DACO, which also is responsible for coordinating most of the financial donor aid flowing into the country. A further temporary arrangement includes a Technical Working Group (co-chaired by the Financial Secretary and Development Secretary) to support DACO.
In addition to its core policy functions we noted that MoDEP has accumulated over the years a range of functions which are development-related but which can be normally considered as non-core functions because they are not strictly part of the GOSL’s development planning apparatus. These include the following:

- Residual elements of managing donor relations such as the coordination of technical assistance from UNDP and Commonwealth Fund For Technical Co-operation (CFTC), and oversight of the National Authorising Office for EU projects. But the management of donor/creditor relations is currently fragmented, and components of the work are also handled by DACO (under the auspices of the Office of the Vice-President), the Economic Affairs Department at the Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Coordination of NGOs at the national level (i.e. registering and approving them, and feeding data on their funding flows into the national budget).
- Managing relations with international African and other institutions such as West African Monetary Zone, the Mano River Union, the African Union (AU), and the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and responding to international initiatives such as NEPAD (New Economic Partnership for African Development).
- Collaboration with the Budget Bureau at MoF in preparing the Development Budget (but this is in the transitional stage of being fully integrated with recurrent expenditure as part of the ongoing budget reforms – leading in due course to the transfer of all MoDEP’s capital budgeting work to MoF, as described in para 7.2 above).
- Management of the Youyi Building.

In addition to the functions described above, MoDEP also has the usual internal administrative support functions of HRM, Training, Budgeting, Accounting, Procurement, and Records Management.

To summarise it is possible to group MoDEP’s functions into three main categories:

- The core policy formulation and evaluation function which is the central part of GOSL’s apparatus for strategic social and economic development planning.
- The non-core development-related functions which are not strictly part of the Government’s apparatus for this strategic planning.
- The internal administrative support functions.

Structure

The structure of MODEP is relatively compact compared to other Ministries, and is headed by a Development Secretary who oversees an Administrative Division, and a professional Division officially known as the Central Planning Unit. The Ministry also provides policy oversight function for both the National Authorizing Office (which serves as the counterpart office to the EU) and Statistics Sierra Leone.
The Central Planning Unit is headed by a Director supported by a Deputy Director, and is subdivided into various sections, including 3 Regional Offices. The Administrative Division is headed by a Deputy Development Secretary, and includes units for handling HRM, Accounting, procurement, and Records Management, as well as Aid Coordination functions. It also has responsibility for the following units:

- **Mano River Union Coordination:** this unit serves as a focal point for MRU matters headed by a Deputy Secretary. It liaises with the Mano River Union Secretariat in Freetown.

- **NGO Coordination:** with funding from the UNDP the unit is staffed by a Contract Officer (as the Head), two senior administrative officers, one planning officer and three support staff. Its current functions include: to scrutinize NGO activities, verify and register NGOs, monitor donor inflows through NGOs, and grant duty waivers to NGOs in collaboration with the Ministry of Finance and National Revenue Authority.

- **Commonwealth & UNDP Coordination:** this unit is headed by a Deputy Development Secretary. It coordinates sourcing of technical assistance programmes and development projects from the UNDP and the Commonwealth. The current Commonwealth Fund for Technical Corporation includes a scholarship training programme, support to small and medium scale enterprises, and requests for international technical staff for key national institutions such as the Anti-Corruption Commission, the Sierra Leone Police, the National Electoral Commission, and other MDAs.

- **ECOWAS Unit:** this unit is responsible for coordinating ECOWAS activities in Sierra Leone under the direction of a Deputy Development Secretary. It serves as a liaison point between NGOs, line ministries (e.g. Foreign Affairs, Trade and Industry), Chamber of Commerce, Civil Society, Bank of Sierra Leone and ECOWAS. It organises sensitisation workshops to ensure that national policies are in line with ECOWAS protocols and programmes and facilitates the implementation of ECOWAS policies and programmes.

The Central Planning Unit comprises eight technical units which are described below:

- **Development Finance and Financial Planning:** this unit is headed by a Deputy Director of Planning and is responsible for providing technical support to ministries in the assessment of sectoral development needs and development of appropriate projects for inclusion in the public investment programme. It is also responsible for liaising with the World Bank on project implementation issues including donor and Government counterpart funding.
• **Social Development & Strategic Planning**: this unit aims to prioritize critical poverty sectors for inclusion in the development estimates and national budget; develop measurable indicators for development projects; collaborate with local government in establishing development planning committees in local councils; provide technical back-up to regional planning offices in formulating development plans, policies and strategies; compile and analyse data on regional development activities; train line ministries in strategic planning methodology.

• **Macro Economics**: this unit is responsible for updating the national and sectoral development strategies and policies; preparing the macro-economic framework for inclusion in the public expenditure programme; analyzing macro-economic statistics and practical problems of inflation, debt management, taxation, income inequality and structural adjustment; collaborating with Statistics Sierra Leone.

• **Population**: this unit is responsible for the integration of population issues and concerns into national and sectoral development policies, plans, programmes and strategies; it is the focal point for HIV/AIDS UNFPA-MoDEP matters, and provides technical backstopping for population issues to line, ministries and NGOs.

• **Social Services**: this unit is responsible for liaising with relevant line ministries (Education, Health, Gender and Children’s Affairs, Labour, Youth and Sports) and NGOs in order to co-ordinate activity on social development issues. It is also the focal point for all UNICEF assisted programmes.

• **Industry and Mining**: this unit monitors and evaluates the small and medium scale pilot demonstration industrial development projects; prepares and compiles data on all the industrial development projects and conducts analytical studies on such projects and programmes; conducts feasibility studies on industrial development projects; evaluates and states the position of MoDEP on such industrial development projects; collaborates with other MDAs in drafting mining policies.

• **Food Security and Micro Finance**: this unit coordinates the programming and provision of food security related infrastructures by sectoral ministries, departments and agencies; gives early warning on the national food security situation; monitors and evaluates multi-sectoral food security intervention; coordinates micro-finance operations in the country, as well as multi-lateral investment and technical corporation between the Government of the Republic of China and the GoSL.

• **Monitoring and Evaluation**: this unit is staffed by a Senior Planning Officer responsible for monitoring and assessing project outputs and outcomes, and facilitating data collection and collation.
Human Resource Management (HRM), Staffing, and Training

7.23 Although the Ministry has a relatively small number of staff compared to larger ministries like Agriculture and Health, it is not an exempt from the current HRM weaknesses that continue to mar the performance of the entire civil service in Sierra Leone. However, because it is not a large Ministry it has been able to put confirm a comprehensive staff list of eighty-seven officers.

7.24 Unlike other MDAs, a good number of the staff in the Ministry are well trained and qualified, some from very renowned international institutions. But the poor conditions of service, weak management structure, and lack of job satisfaction have all contributed to the low staff morale which has overshadowed the performance of staff.

7.25 Interviews with staff across both the administrative and technical divisions and other research revealed a significant absence of proper schedules of duty. The result is a lack of effective and co-ordinated job design leading to inefficient use of resources and staff time. We noted that while most of the staff claimed not to have seen a written schedule of duty for a long time, the Deputy Secretary in charge of Human Resource Management later submitted schedules of duties for Planning Officers (dated 2004) but not administrative officers. Some staff indicated that they felt that the work was often assigned on a random basis.

7.26 We also noted the involvement of administrative staff in technical matters (reportedly due to a shortage of technical staff). We noted that currently, despite its small size, the Ministry is top-heavy with three Deputy Development Secretaries graded at the level of permanent secretaries. Technical work is thus being potential undertaken out of grade.

7.27 In addition to our analysis of the staff list we were informed that the Ministry’s small number of staff (especially professionals) is not as a result of efficient manpower planning, but a combination of negative factors, some of which are beyond the ability of the Ministry to handle. Planning is a lucrative profession, and coupled with the level of training provided in the past by GoSL, the Ministry became a major transit point for staff now in PIUs, in new and well paid agencies such as PASCO, NaCSA, DACO, NASSIT, and in private sector and international organisations. This problem is further exacerbated by slow and/or non-existent recruitment and succession/promotion processes.

7.28 We also note that the donor community may have also inadvertently contributed to this state of affairs in MoDEP by paying more emphasis on Public Financial Management in order to safeguard expenditure to the detriment of strategic planning.

7.29 The staff list also indicates that there are too many junior support staff. We found the number of messengers, clerks and drivers at the disposal of the Ministry too high for a Ministry with a skeletal technical and administrative staff complement. In other words, the Ministry’s support staff takes almost two/thirds of the entire size of the Ministry. (See facing page for the staffing categories of the Ministry).
7.30 It is therefore clear that HRM in the Ministry is in need of urgent attention and we provide detailed recommendations concerning this in the next section of this report. The parallel project to transform the Establishment Secretary’s Office into a modern Human Resource Management Office, and the proposed introduction of the Senior Executive Service will provide opportunities for solutions in this area.

Management Processes, Procurement, and Record Systems

7.31 We discovered from interviews with various officials of the Ministry that management meetings have a tendency to be unstructured and irregularly scheduled. The management committee (consisting of the Minister, his Deputy, the Development Secretary and three Deputies, Director and Deputy of Central Planning as well as other heads of units) meets infrequently, Management meetings are summoned as and when required and not as part of a co-ordinated and effective business planning process to review and chart forward progress.

7.32 The Ministry, however in compliance with the new Government Budgeting and Accountability Act 2005, has set up its own Budget Committee with the Development Secretary as chairperson. Similarly, a Procurement Committee
meets in the Ministry with a Deputy Development Secretary as chairperson and membership includes the Accountant, the Director of Central Planning and some other senior officials. This committee makes recommendations to the Development Secretary who in turn forwards approved recommendations to the Minister. However the Ministry is yet to set up a Procurement Unit as required by the Procurement Act 2004.

7.33 The records management system has been examined and displays similar characteristics to those found elsewhere in the GoSL’ Ministry structure and systems. Poor record keeping and lack of definite procedures and controls leads to slow access, retrieval and inefficiency.

Internal Budgeting and Accounting

7.34 The financial and accounting matters of the Ministry of Development and Economic Planning are taken care of by a small unit headed by a Graduate Accountant. This unit is a branch of the Accountant General’s office of the Ministry of Finance. The Development Secretary is the vote controller and is responsible for the authorisation of all emoluments.

7.35 The Graduate Accountant prepares all vouchers relevant to the day to day operations of the ministry, and is a member of the Ministry’s Budget Committee and Procurement Committee. The Accountant is responsible for managing the distribution of fuel for vehicles and to some senior officials of the Ministry through a system where (authorisation) chits are provided to these staff collect fuel from selected fuel providers. The Accounts Division maintains a register for this purpose.

7.36 We noted that the Graduate Accountant is not involved in reviewing audited reports accompanying applications for renewal of licences of NGOs. Nor are the audited statements of NGOs, when submitted to the Ministry, transmitted to the Ministry of Finance and the financial information is therefore not captured in the national accounts.

7.37 Currently there is no Internal Auditing Unit in the Ministry, although the Government Budgeting and Accountability Act requires this.

Communications and Relations with Stakeholders

7.38 The ministry has got a large customer base to service which includes line ministries and departments, civil society organisations, NGOs and donors. Its functions and responsibilities makes it a strategic focal point for a wide range of stakeholders. For example, the budget process brings the Ministry into contact with numerous MDAs and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs); and the NGO Coordinating Unit provides a forum for liaising with both local and international NGOs. Nonetheless, the relationship and flow of information between the ministry and the entire citizenry is weak. The ministry lack the appropriate mechanisms to reach the various sectors of society and receive feedbacks on key government development policies and priorities.
Priority Equipment Needs

7.39 The ministry is currently very short of essential equipment to carry out its functions. Most of what it has was provided by donors for the purpose of implementing their projects. The situation was even worse when we visited the regional offices. There is hardly any basic equipment like computers, photocopiers, printers etc. to be able to support even the simplest day to day activity let alone communicate with stakeholders. We note the present situation has serious implications on staff moral and performance in the entire ministry.

Institutional Arrangements for Managing Change

7.40 At present there is no internal change management team in operation. Our remit in the terms of reference is to facilitate agreements and mechanisms to enable implementation of our emerging recommendations. At this stage we were unable to progress this issue.
8.0 ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 In undertaking our analysis and shaping our recommendations we are mindful of the following key considerations:

- The importance to GOSL of formulating effective socio-economic policy and development planning strategies – the potential benefits are very high, but equally there is a serious downside if development planning strategies are not effective
- The desirability of streamlining and integrating the apparatus for such planning, developing appropriate financial budgets and plans and identifying where efficiency cost savings can be effected.

Statutory Framework

8.2 We noted earlier in para 7.2 that the original mandate of MoDEP has been significantly curtailed by the new laws which have devolved planning to the Local Councils and sector Ministries. **We therefore recommend** that the laws defining the development planning apparatus should be updated after the Government decides on the exact form and structure which the apparatus should take.

Functions

8.3 When reviewing the functions of MoDEP we noted in para 7.9 above that they can be classified into 3 categories:

- The core policy formulation and evaluation function which is the central part of GOSL’s apparatus for strategic social and economic development planning (par 7.14)
- The non-core development-related functions which are not strictly part of the Government’s apparatus for this strategic planning (para 7.17)
- The internal administrative support functions (as in para 7.18)

8.4 The distinction between core and non-core functions is important because it is the core functions of a Ministry that provide the rationale and justification for the Ministry’s existence. The non-core functions and the internal support functions are not, by themselves, sufficient justification for the existence of a separate Ministry.

Core Functions

8.5 Hence in analysing what structure would be appropriate and in considering the present and future status of the institutions which currently undertake related functions in whole or in part in this area it is necessary to examine the scope and scale of the core policy formulation and evaluation apparatus across government. In doing this we consider what should form the central part of GOSL’s
development planning apparatus, as set out in para 7.14, and assess the substance and volume in this work and its structure and location.

8.6 The first component of the work is formulating national policies, priorities, and strategic plans for development (e.g. poverty reduction strategies) and gaining collective political support for implementation. This type of work involves strategic thinking and identifying institutional and policy obstacles to economic and social development of the country and proposing solutions to Government. It also involves considerable facilitation skills in persuading politicians and other stakeholders to follow good planning advice. This work does not require an army of planners – rather it requires a small team of experienced and well-qualified strategic analysis and policy development staff. We consider that this work should be undertaken within a centralised policy development and strategic planning apparatus.

8.7 The second component of the work is setting agreed ‘benchmarks’ for nationwide economic and social development and monitoring and evaluating progress in meeting the benchmarks and feeding this data back to stakeholders. A key example of this is the measuring of poverty levels – a cross-sectoral task currently of great importance to GOSL as the PRS is implemented. The current arrangements (para 7.16) for completion of the PRSP include a Technical Working Group to coordinate the activities of 4 PRS working groups consisting of relevant staff from government agencies and civil society. In the future we recommend that the PRS Secretariat will facilitate the working groups and collate incoming data – work which requires a small core of expert planners with one to monitor each of the working groups. Currently the PRS work is assigned to DACO, but its permanent location is still under review through the MFRs of MoDEP and MoF (as suggested by the PRSP March 2005 page 112).

8.8 The third component of the work is evaluation of large cross-sectoral projects. This involves the use of social cost-benefit analysis and other project appraisal techniques to determine the relative merits of different capital investments. Given that the number of large projects is limited by resource constraints it is not envisaged that this work would require more than 2 permanent well-qualified analysts, with occasional support from specialists in areas such as civil engineering or agriculture which could be assigned by co-option into an advisory group capacity.

8.9 The fourth component of the work is participating in the meetings at the beginning of the formal budget cycle to assist with:

- the cross-sectoral coordination of the strategic plans of those Ministries which have inter-related functions (e.g. social services)
- ensuring that the Local Councils’ plans are not incompatible with GOSL’s national development goals (as required by the Local Government Act).

This work normally occurs between July and September and requires examination of the policy papers submitted by the Ministries and the development plans.
prepared by the Councils. It is recommended that this work could be incorporated into the duties of policy planning officers.

8.10 The fifth component of the work is acting as a think-tank for Government on development management, dialoguing with the outside world, feeding the Government with new initiatives for development, and identifying key priorities. This work is similar to the first category above and requires high level strategic and creative thinking, as well as the ability to facilitate new ideas from other stakeholders. Best practice from elsewhere suggests that when it is necessary to do detailed research on a complex topic it is better to commission independent expert studies rather than solely employ civil servants to try to do this in-house. The role of civil servants is to define the issues and help shape policy rather than do the detailed research needed to inform policy, and this requires significantly fewer permanent staff. It is envisaged that this work would only involve one or two very capable in-house policy development specialists.

8.11 The sixth component of the work is overseeing the effectiveness of the development strategy and efficiency planning machinery in the Ministries and Local Councils – but not by micro-managing individual development plans. It would require periodic visits to Ministries and Local Councils to talk to the planning teams in the field, and if problems are identified then making recommendations on improving the planning machinery. (Although all Ministries are expected to have a strategic plan, some Ministries do not yet have formal planning units, and it may be necessary to strengthen the law in this area - so we recommend that this matter is examined.) It is envisaged that the central task of overseeing the planning machinery will require a small team of expert strategic planners.

8.12 From the above it is evident that the core functions of the Ministry can be undertaken by a relatively small number of high quality policy and strategy planners.

8.13 Finally, although we have previously (in para 7.17) grouped as non-core some aspects of the work performed under MRU, ECOWAS, Commonwealth/UNDP units, we have however considered Sierra Leone’s unique development agenda in its current context and we therefore recommend the creation of a Technical Co-operations Unit within the new policy development and economic planning structure to interface with Governments, Regional and International agencies and current and new initiatives on technical co-operation. This unit would thus focus on:

- Formulating programmes/projects of technical co-operation in accordance with overall national development priorities
- Assess the demand for and supply of technical co-operation to contribute to meeting the priority needs of the country
- Provide information on technical co-operation opportunities to public sector agencies and civil society
- Liase with donor agencies to ensure that there is no overlap of technical co-operation initiatives and to minimize gaps
Managing International Relations relating to development issues (for example South-South, NEPAD etc)

Non-Core Functions

8.14 The non-core functions of the Ministry are set out in para 7.17 above, and there is a need to consider whether these should be carried out, and if so, by MoDEP, or by transfer of the functions to other institutions. The functions are:

- **Aid Administration.** This work is already split and thus fragmented between 4 different organisations, DACO, the Economic Affairs Division (EAD at MoF), and Foreign Affairs, as well as MoDEP, and so some rationalisation is needed in this area. Given the new Government Budgeting and Accountability Act it is envisaged that MoDEP’s activities in this area would be transferred to the new MoF Division for Aid Management and Coordination.

- **Scholarship Awards** under the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Corporation - The work involved in managing the overseas training awards for Civil Servants can be transferred to the ESO.

- **Communication, Registration and Co-ordination of NGOs.** Given GOSL’s aim of incorporating NGO aid flows into the national budget this work could also be absorbed into the new Aid Co-ordination and Debt Management Division at MoF.

- **Managing the Youyi Building,** this work should be transferred to the agency responsible for public works for overall management of the property, with an allocation made to the major occupier of the building to take over day to day management and liaison with other occupiers.

8.14 In conclusion the review of core and non-core functions suggests that:

- The core policy development and strategic planning functions remaining at the centre require a small group of well qualified expert policy and strategy planning staff capable of strategic, creative, and analytical thinking, assisted by a few support staff

- It would be a feasible option for GOSL to realign most of the non-core functions of MoDEP within other institutions

Following the review of core and non-core functions we now need to examine possible structures which would be required for the effective execution of GOSL’s core policy and development planning functions.

The Structure of the Development Planning Apparatus at the Centre

8.15 Recent legislation has given a major boost to development planning by devolving it to the Ministries and the elected Councils. The structure at the centre of Government has also been impacted by the legislation and we see the need to
examine the various options for streamlining and strengthening this structure as a priority. However, before doing so it will be helpful as a first step to summarise some of the key issues.

**Aid Management and Coordination**

8.16 As noted in para 8.14 the function of coordinating and managing aid is currently fragmented between 4 main institutions. The recent legislation set out in the GBA Act of April 2005 supersedes previous laws and mandates and it is therefore a legal requirement to integrate and refocus this fragmented functionality at the new Aid Coordination and Debt Management Division at MoF. **We recommend** that action is taken to implement this law as it is in line with the ongoing GOSL budget reforms, and fiscal best practices elsewhere, aimed at transparent national budgets and accounts showing total donor funding flowing into the country, including funds for technical assistance projects and the programme spending by the NGOs. **We recommend** that the aid work of the PDMU and EAD of MoF is merged into the new Aid Co-ordination and Debt Management Division, together with the work of DACO, and the aid coordination activities of MoDEP and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This will also facilitate the process of approving allocations of counterpart funds - because when doing this it is necessary to be aware of the overall budget available. Similarly the integration into a single Division at MoF and a clear definition of the process should facilitate greater transparency into issuing duty waivers for imports by NGOs and donors.

**PRS Management and Monitoring**

8.17 This is an issue of paramount importance to GOSL. The continuing flow of donor funding is contingent on satisfactory progress in implementing the PRS. But as explained in para 8.7 the task of implementing and monitoring the PRS has been temporarily assigned to DACO because there are doubts about MoDEP’s current capacity to take on this work. Also we noted above that DACO’s aid coordination work is expected to move to MoF and there is thus the need to decide where to position the ongoing management of the PRS. Our view is that the formulation and monitoring of national development programmes such as the PRS is a core function of the policy and development planning apparatus at the centre of Government, and that this should have a degree of independence from the MoF. This means that there is an urgent need to strengthen the policy and strategic planning capacity to fully take on PRS work, and **we recommend** that this is tackled with some focused technical assistance, mentoring and training following on from any recommendations made in the proposed horizontal review across all Ministries in early 2006. In this regard, we are implying that DACO would cease to exist as its two main functions of, aid coordination and the temporary function of PRS management is subsumed into MoF and the new policy development and planning apparatus respectively. The residual function of serving as the secretariat for the DEPAC meeting would be handled jointly by MoF and MoDEP

**Role of the EPRU**
8.18 The EPRU in MoF has been built up with donor assistance so that it can undertake meaningful macro-economic analysis and economic research, and dialogue effectively with the IMF, World Bank, and donors. It has been located in the MoF as part of its capacity building strategy but there is now an issue about whether the EPRU should remain in MoF or be realigned with the economic and social research activities envisaged for a strengthened policy and strategic planning institution at the centre of Government, see paras 8.6 and 8.7 above. Our preference would be the latter but we recommend that its current functions in the MOF be revised to focus more on formulating and analysing socio-economic policies, issuing guidelines for managing the economy as well as designing and carrying out studies and research on various aspects of economic development. In this context it must be remembered that the EPRU still relies wholly on contract staff who are paid a significantly higher rates than civil servants, and thus there are doubts about its future in the medium term, unless the reforms envisaged for the SES result in better institutionalisation of EPRU into the Civil/Public Service arena. Part of the current EPRU function is that of monitoring the outcomes of work of MoF through PETS, which to some extent negates the normal practice of independent audit and monitoring. We see a case of this PETS monitoring activity to be separated out and undertaken by specialist Social and Economic Research officers within a restructured organisation.

Taking account of the above we have identified and considered 3 possible options for a new structure for development planning at the centre of Government:

Option 1 – Strengthening and Streamlining MoDEP - Appendix D

8.19 This option would involve a refocusing of MoDEP’s development planning work in line with the core functions summarised in para 7.14 plus an intensive capacity building process utilising technical assistance, mentoring and training. It would also involve streamlining the outmoded organisation structure and staffing arrangements which were put in place when MoDEP did top-down comprehensive national planning. The existing Central Planning Unit should be disbanded and replaced with the new Units set out in the organogram. The non-core functions should be transferred to other Ministries/Agencies where this possible e.g. aid coordination to MoF. The existing professional staff should be reassigned to the new Units, subject to an assessment of their current skills and their ability to match the competences required to carry out the functions described in paras 8.6 to 8.11. The administrative and support staff should be rationalised to a much smaller figure based on the actual work that needs to be done.

8.20 However a problem with this option is that it is relatively expensive to accord the status of a Ministry to a very small organisation which needs less than 20 professional and support staff to carry out its functions.

8.21 Also there is the danger with this option that the Ministry is currently seen as an organisation whose capacity is weak, and unless major changes are made in the Ministry (in terms of refocusing on development planning, hiving off the non-core functions, and bringing in new personnel) it will be difficult to persuade stakeholders that the Ministry has upgraded its ability to perform.
Option 2 – Merging MoDEP with the Ministry of Finance

8.22 Over the years attempts have been made to merge the 2 Ministries, but each time this has happened they have subsequently been separated again. This has to a large extent been as a result of the fact that such mergers only take place at the political level and never in terms of integrating staff and work. Experience has shown that when such mergers take place the focus has been generally on public financial management and budgeting rather neglecting the importance of the policy and planning function. Clearly also, the link between planning and budgeting is strong but there always remains the need to distinguish between the policy development role inherent in planning activities, and the narrower process of allocating resources to a time-bound financial budget.

8.23 Although there is a strong case for unifying responsibility for Aid Management and Coordination, as required by the new Act, we do not believe that there is such a good case for merging the core policy development strategic planning functions (set out in para 7.14), with it into MoF. Our concern is that MoF is already implementing major reforms and has enough to do without subsuming the policy and strategic planning functions. We believe that at this critical time in GOSL’s history there needs to be a sharper focus given to the core socio-economic policy development and strategic planning functions and that if it is positioned in MoF this sharper focus would not materialise.

Option 3 – Creating a new Planning Secretariat – Appendix E

8.24 In early 2006 it is intended to extend the current vertical reviews of individual ministries to undertake a horizontal study across the entire structure of government. Whilst not wishing to pre-empt the outcome of the review This study in MODEP and that of MoF are leading towards an option which would involve the creation of a new Policy Development and Strategic Planning Secretariat under the auspices of the Office of the President. It would focus solely on the core medium to long term policy development and strategy planning functions required at the central foci of Government, together with harmonising and translating successive government and presidential vision into national goals and strategies, and would consist of a compact group of policy developers and strategic planners assisted by a few support staff. It is envisaged that the SES reforms will result in the assessment selection and/or recruitment of the type of high calibre staff who will be needed to sustain credibility in such a unit. Existing staff of MoDEP who have the required competences would have the opportunity to apply for the positions to be created in the new Policy and Strategic Planning Secretariat.

8.25 Although this type of model would seem to overburden the ‘presidency’ as well as the tendency to dictate to MDAs the merits of this option are:
• a fresh start to be made on re-establishing an effective policy development and strategic planning function at the centre of Government
• the Policy and Strategic Planning Secretariat is seen to be a catalyst and support to the development and implementation of national policies and plans which take to account public opinion and have government and Presidential backing, collective agreements with wider ‘society’ and international stakeholders to support implementation (e.g. the PRS)
• less expensive and easier to co-ordinate than retaining a Ministry
• ensure that the policy development and strategic planning functions would drive the budget preparation process, rather than risk being submerged in it at MoF
• It would focus solely on the core development and strategic planning functions, and would avoid getting distracted by non-core activities which are easily assumed in MDAs

Preferred Structure

8.26 In making our recommendation for our preferred option for the structure we are mindful of the following considerations:

• The importance and potential benefits to GOSL of formulating effective policy and development strategies
• The potential risks inherent if planning process becomes overly output driven and does not focus on the outcomes which the policy and strategies seek to achieve
• The need to refocus and defragment the existing policy development and strategic planning efforts
• The desirability of streamlining the apparatus for this activity and reduce unproductive bureaucratic expenditures

In the light of these considerations our preference is for Option 3, and we recommend setting up a new Policy and Strategic Planning Secretariat under the auspices of the Office of the President, and that it should incorporate the work of the PRS Secretariat. The case for incorporating the EPRU should also be examined in the light of the proposed horizontal review.

HRM, Staffing, and Training

8.27 The credibility of the development planning function will depend on the extent to which it can influence events and demonstrate to stakeholders that the process can add value to the economic and social progress of the nation. This will depend on the quality of the leadership and the professional staff engaged on the planning work. The leadership will need to be visionary and able to influence the politicians of the day, as well as being very familiar with the factors which help or hinder economic and social progress. Staff will need to be able to think strategically and creatively, and be trained in the analytical tools that planners need when examining economic and social choices.
8.28 This implies that staff will have post-graduate training in economics and social sciences, with practical skills in analytical techniques. These competences are not easy to find but if the SES reforms do enable more attractive salaries to be offered, this would improve the chances of recruiting the type of high calibre staff who will be needed. Existing staff of MoDEP who have the required competences, or who can be trained up, could apply for the positions to be created in the new structure.

Management Processes, Procurement, and Record Systems

8.29 We recommend that regular internal meetings are held in order to foster an inclusive management style. We also recommend that a senior manager is assigned specific responsibility for ensuring that records are maintained in good order, and that the team who are leading the records management improvement programme should be invited to present their suggestions for setting up an upgraded records system. As regards procurement, the new Procurement Act has set out the procedures that should be followed across the Civil/Public Service.

Internal Budgeting and Accounting

8.30 We recommend that capacity should be enhanced by further training in MTEF and financial planning, thereby enabling effective participation in the work of the budget committee.

8.31 We also recommend that the organisation should have an internal audit unit that will monitor use of motor vehicles, issue of fuel etc. and see that proper procedures are followed in accounting for assets and financial operations.

8.32 However both these functions would be subsumed by the wider organisation if our recommendations to place the ‘Planning Secretariat’ within the Office of the President is accepted.

Communications and Relations with Stakeholders

8.32 Given that planning needs to be an inclusive process it is important that close relations are maintained with a wide cross-section of stakeholders across both the public services and civil society, as well as with the international community. Hence we recommend that there should be a well organised ongoing schedule of meetings for sustaining and broadening the network of stakeholders, and the budget needs to include adequate provision for this. The need to create a unit for developing and co-ordinating these communications strategies with this wide audience (Donors, the general public etc) will be paramount. The communications are complex and professional expertise will need to be employed to ensure policies, plans and programmes are well publicised.

Priority Equipment Needs

8.33 Given the importance of the function of monitoring and evaluating the impact of development policies and plans, and feeding this back into the policy process, it
is clear that mobility will be required to reach out to the Ministries, Local Councils, and Chiefdoms. It will also be important to ensure that there is an effective internet facility so that staff can readily communicate with international stakeholders and information sources. Following decisions on the recommendations in our report and any subsequent restructuring it will be necessary to access the equipment and software requirements of the new organisation.

**Institutional Arrangements for Managing Change**

8.34 **We recommend** that a change management team is set up to implement the approved findings of this report. In view of the importance of the strategic policy and development planning to GoSL, we recommend that the team in addition to internal managers would consist of members from outside of the new body to include officers from the centre of government.

**Conclusion**

We have reviewed the functions of MODEP in the light of the strategic importance to the development and progress of Sierra Leone given the prevailing economic conditions and continuing need to ensure policy and planning scenarios are formulated taking to account the ability of GoSL to sustain its programmes and projects beyond the point at which Donors are able to assist.

MoDEP has for sometime had a dual role which filled the void of good fiscal planning and financial management. With the development of the MTEF and increased capacity in MoF the need for MoDEP to extend beyond a policy and programme development mandate is diminished. Whilst Donor aid continues there is a need for relationship management and financial co-ordination but these responsibilities lay elsewhere.

Our preferred recommendations lead to the creation of a strategic planning and policy development body which develops strategic responses to government initiatives and provides professional support to MDAs in developing the foundations for modern implementation practices.
9.0 IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES

*To be completed after consultation*
LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED

**Appendix A**

**MoDEP**

Hon. Alhaji M. Daramy - Minister
Konnah C. Koroma - Development Secretary
Victor A. Kamara - Deputy Development Secretary
A.M. Bockarie - Deputy Development Secretary
Amadu Jam Jalloh - Ag. Deputy Director
Aladi A. Cole - Ag. Deputy Development Secretary
Desmond Ford - Deputy Secretary
Desmond S. Koroma - Senior Planning Officer
Abie Elizabeth Kamara - Senior Planning Officer
Wilfred M. Mansaray - Deputy Secretary
James Freeman - Assistant Secretary
Brima Munda Sowa - Senior Assistant Secretary
Umaru A. Konneh - Principal Planning Officer
Lahai S. Kain - Planning Officer
Joseph Benson Turay - Senior Planning Officer
Festus Kuyembeh - Accountant
Benson M. Lahai - Senior Planning Officer
Joseph S. Thornton - Assistant Secretary
James Romeo Koroma - Principal Planning Officer
Mohamed Mansaray - Regional Planning Officer- Southern Region
Franklyn Pabai - Principal Planning Officer
Fatmata Binta Wurrie - Deputy Secretary
Newton Reuben Marlin - Executive Officer

**MDAs**

Mohamed Timbo - Deputy National Authorizing Officer- NAO
Sylvanus Fannah - Executive Director- NaCSA
Seth Anipa - Budget Adviser- Ministry of Finance
Alimamy Bangura - EPRU- Ministry of Finance
Mike Dauda - Local Government Finance Department- MoF
John Paul Ngebeh - Director- Community Driven Programme- NaCSA
Kenyeh Barlay - Director- Micro Finance Programme- NaCSA
Kawusu Kabbay - DACK

**Donors**

James Sackey - Country Director- World Bank/ Sierra Leone
C. Bellini - Governance Adviser - European Union
Charlotte Duncan - Governance Adviser- DFID
Anna Mills - Programme Manager- DFID
Sylvia Fletcher - Senior Governance Adviser- UNDP
Local Councils

Bo
David J. B. Cobby - Chairman- Bo District Council
Fatmata Fornah - DECSEC Coach – District Council
Miatta Bayoh - DECSEC Coach Bo Town Council
Isata Sellu-Tucker - PADCO Volunteer- Bo Town Council

Kenema
Chief Evans M.B. Gbemeh - Chairman- Kenema Town Council
Margaret Adama Shiaka - Vice Chairman- Development Planning Committee
Yata Sama - Councilor
Patrick L. Samu - Councilor
Momoh Massaquoi - Councilor
Momodu Kutubu - Councilor
Abdul Rahman Forboh - Procurement Officer
Duke Eddie Pratt - DECSEC Coach- Kenema Town Council
Joseph Lamin - PADCO Volunteer- Kenema Town Council
Ahmadu Daramy - DECSEC Coach- Kenema District Council

Pujehun
Magnus B. Mussa - Chief Administrator- Pujehun

Kono
Momodu Yusufu Condeh - Chief Administrator- Koidu Town Council
Mary Sia Musa - Chairman- Koidu Town Council
Abdul Rahman Swarray - PADCO Volunteer- Koidu Town Council
K. D. Sandi - Deputy Chairman- Kono District Council
Sia A.B. Torto - Chief Administrator- Kono District Council
Laurence Saa- Karminty - PADCO Volunteer- Kono District Council
S. E. Tamba - Chairman - Kono District Council
Sylvanus Leslie Thomas - DECSEC Coach- Kono District Council
Tamba Aruna - Councilor- Kono District Council
Abdulai Kumasis - Councilor- Kono District Council
Morry Gbandawai - Councilor- Kono District Council
Tamba M. Sandy - Councilor- Kono District Council
Abu D. S. Bockarie - Councilor- Kono District Council
Tamba A. Mbayoh - Councilor- Kono District Council
Mohamed Salaam-Sheriff - Councilor- Kono District Council
Sahr Manga - Procurement Officer- Kono District Council
Tamba Allieu - Deputy Chief Administrator- Kono District Council
Aiah P.K. Fomba - Councilor- Kono District Council

Bombali
Umaru S. Dura - Chief Administrator- Bombali District Council  
Alhaji B. L. Munu - Chairman- Bombali District Council  
Musa Mansaray - Chairman- Makeni Town Council  
Benjamin B. Kargbo - Chairman Development and Planning Committee- Makeni Town Council  
Soriba Yansaneh - PADCO Volunteer- Makeni Town Council  
Brima T. Koroma - Councilor- Makeni Town Council  

**Port Loko**

Joseph Bob Amara - Chairman- Port Loko District Council  
Arun A. Bah - Chief Administrator- Port Loko District Council  
Mohamed Sheku Kargbo - Deputy Chief Administrator- Port Loko District Council  
Sama Nyallay - PADCO Volunteer- Port Loko District Council  
Sheku Gibril - Rural Development Officer- Port Loko District Council  

**NGOs/Civil Society**

Tennyson Williams - Country Director- Action-Aid Sierra Leone  
James A. Lahai - Asst. Secretary- Sierra Leone Teachers Union  
Francis W. Weber - Chairman- Sierra Leone Alliance Against Hunger  
B. R. Kabbage - President- Consumer Protection Council  
Rosaline McCarthy - Chairperson- Women’s Forum Sierra Leone  
Lamin Dumbuya - Programme Officer- NCPSL  
Hannah Turay - Motor Drivers Union  
Eddie A. Davies - Ag. Exe. Sec.- SLIBA  
Sampha Kamara - Organizing Secretary- Petty Traders Association  
Ibrahim Kamara - Vice-President- U. I. C. P. T U  
Abdul H. R. Gillen - Task Force Officer- Civil Society Movement S/L  
Beatrice H. Kelfala - Education Officer- Petty Traders Union  
Chief Ya Alimamy Turay - Cole Town Women Farmers  
Sahr L. P. Bayoh - National Youth Awareness Forum  
Joseph D. Brima - National Youth Awareness Forum  
D. A. Amadi - Deputy Sec- General, Sierra Leone Health Services Union  
Andrew T. Kanu - Administrative Secretary- Agriculture Union  
James A. Mahoi - Sec. General - Sierra Leone Fishermen’s Union  
Claudia Nimmeh - Administrative Secretary- N.M.D.H.R.
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8. Vision statement
9. Sierra Leone Gazette- 10th December 2002
10. NaCSA & Elected Local Council October 2004
11. Micro-Finance Programme – NaCSA
12. NaCSA and European Union, The Interment of Ex-Fighters from Liberia
17. Current Schedule of duties of the officers in the Central Planning Unit of MoDEP, 2004
18. Planning Guidelines for Local Councils, MoDEP, November 2004
21. Briefing Notes on the Activities of the Department of Planning and Economic Development
22. The Government Budgeting and Accountability Act, 2005
23. The Local Government Act, 2004