



2014:73

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Dr. iur. Mehari Taddele Maru

The Mid-Term Review of The West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)

Final Report

The Mid-Term Review of The West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)

**Final Report
June 2013**

Dr. iur. Mehari Taddele Maru

Authors: Dr. iur. Mehari Taddele Maru

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2014:73

Commissioned by Sida

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: June 2013

Published by Citat 2014

Art. no. Sida61839en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61839en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents.....	2
Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	3
Preface	4
Executive Summary.....	5
1 Background.....	12
1.1 Introduction	12
1.2 the Review: the Users and the Intended USE	13
1.3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology	14
1.4 Limitations and Lessons.....	19
2 RESULTS OF THE REVIEW	20
2.1 Evaluation of relevance	20
2.2 EvalUAtion of Impact	27
2.3 Evaluation of Effectiveness	31
2.4 Evaluation of Efficiency	40
2.5 Evaluation of Sustainability	43
3 Conclusion and Recommendations	50
Annex 1 – Inception Report	55
Annex 2– List of Persons Interviewed	66
Annex 3 – Documents Consulted	67

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ABD	African Bank for Development
ACBF	African Capacity Building Foundation
AGM	Annual General Meeting
AU	Africa Union
AUC	African Union Commission
CIDO	Citizens and Diaspora Organizations
CSDG	Civil Society Coordination and Democratic Governance
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
ECOSOCC	AU Economic, Social and Cultural Council
ECOWARN	ECOWAS Warning and Response Network
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
EWSRM	ECOWAS Early Warning System and Response Mechanism
FAS	Femmes Africa Solidarité
GPPAC	Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict
KAIPTC	Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre
M&N	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAPE	Non-Violence and Peace Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NNCs	National Network Coordinators
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PMC	Peace Monitoring Centre
RBM	Result Based Management
Sida	Swedish International Development and Cooperation Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Fund
UNoWA	United Nations office to the West Africa
VAM	Value-Added Management
WANEP	West Africa Network for Peacebuilding
WAPI	West Africa Peace-building Institute
WARN	West Africa Early Warning and Response Network
WIPNET	Women in Peace-building Network

Preface

From the outset, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the assistance offered to me during this review by officials of the Swedish Embassy in Addis Ababa and the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) as well as Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC). Moreover, I thank many officials of the African Union (AU), the United Nations (UN), Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES), and other partners.

In addition to the intrinsic difficulties of measuring achievements and challenges, a review of the work of a network like WANEP with a dozen country level coordination offices and network members, requires a wider mandate, and more time and resource. Thus, WANEP programmes that have been reviewed and evaluated are specified under the Terms of Reference (ToR). This mid-term review (hereinafter referred to as the Review) was done only to the extent that the reviewer considered necessary, in order to establish the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of WANEP and its relevant programmes. What is more, this Review would not necessarily disclose all the shortcomings and challenges of WANEP particularly specific weaknesses in financial management and programmes. It is based on selected areas and programmes that determine the overall performance of WANEP.

This Review summarises certain observations, some key findings and advances general and specific recommendations. The implementation of these recommendations should assist WANEP to improve the overall performance of WANEP and that of Sida's and other donor's contributions towards peace and security in Africa. Finally, the reviewer would welcome the opportunity to discuss and explain these findings and recommendations.

Mehari Taddele Maru

Executive Summary

Commissioned by the Swedish Embassy/Sida, the Review offers an evaluation of WANEP's work (funded by Sida) for the period 2010-2012 in three thematic areas: promotion of human security, prevention of conflicts, and peace-building. WANEP received a total contribution of SEK 18 million under Sida's *"Call for Proposals to Civil Society Organizations within the area of Peace and Security in Africa."*

By employing the five criteria of measurement provided in the ToR (see annex) namely; relevance, impact, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability, the Review provides a short assessment of the strengths and shortcomings of WANEP's programmatic work. While WANEP has many programmes and each programme has experienced differing degrees of success and challenges, the Review gives a general assessment of WANEP. It also offers some concrete proposals for improvement.

The Review reveals that WANEP and its projects are extremely relevant and have been reasonably effective with significant impact on the peace and security situation of the Western African region. Indicative of its significant contributions, impact and relevance, WANEP has been referred to by a key informant as "the Godfather of Peace Building" in West Africa.¹ In the words of one of the senior officials of ECOWAS, "whatever impact ECOWAS had registered in the early warning and early response programme, it is shared with WANEP."² With a network of more than 550 national organizations³ spread across the region in the 15 ECOWAS member states, and linking state and non-state actors at local level with national and regional decision makers, WANEP has managed to achieve unique access and has gained an increased understanding, over time established expertise, of local issues related to its work on conflict prevention, peace building and human security.

¹ Partners Key Informant No. 1

² ECOWAS Key Informant No 1.

³ WANEP Key Informant No 4.

Enjoying a privileged partnership with, and strong support from, ECOWAS, WANEP has become the leading driver of change in peacebuilding operations in Africa. The network of national organisations and the unique partnership with ECOWAS have enabled WANEP to respond quickly to these peacebuilding demands and to act responsibly to address peace and security challenges in the region. Consequently, national, regional and international institutions that have been approached during this evaluation have found WANEP to be a reliable and credible partner. WANEP exudes confidence both with non-state actors and state members of the ECOWAS, particularly as its extremely relevant and high demand projects have significant impact on the ground.

Nonetheless, these achievements could only be maintained and augmented through deliberate efforts to instil more reflections on effectiveness, efficient management practices and a more sustainable financial base.

Suggestive of a decline of the strong partnership between ECOWAS and WANEP, the delay in recruiting and opening the WANEP Liaison Office to ECOWAS is a source of concern for many of the key informants and the author of this review.⁴ While the reasons for the delay in recruitment could be lack of funding, however, the fact remains that WANEP was unable to implement this activity as planned. Consequently, at regional level, the relevance and impact of WANEP's work has decreased and therefore sustainability of the interventions made at regional level has been weakened. For instance, WANEP was not consulted in the development of the ToR for the recent review by ECOWAS of its Early Warning System and Response Mechanism (EWSRM). This was partly due to the absence of liaison officer in Abuja.

⁴ In contrast, the Secretariat is of the opinion that WANEP the Partnership between WANEP and ECOWAS remains strong contrary to conclusions derived from people interviewed. As a matter of fact, the Partnership has now smoothened out allowing for the type of work and interlinks that occur more regularly and with much more increased communication with the ECOWARN Directorate. More activities have also been organised with ECOWAS at several levels and with various divisions during the period under review.

Another, perhaps the major, shortcoming of WANEP remains its poor culture of reporting and recording impacts, outcomes, and significant success stories. It does not have a system of reporting or registering demands for WANEP intervention emanating from beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders.

Reflecting a limited focus and few considerations on the strategic benefits of impact and outcome reporting, WANEP displays a weakness in employing results-based and value-added strategic planning and implementation methods. While the formulation of strategic objectives, outputs and outcomes follows a Result-based Management (RBM) system, nevertheless, outputs and outcomes in the context of logical frames and proposals (see those submitted to Sida) could be crafted more clearly. There are numerous negative impacts resulting from this weakness. Improvement in this area would require a series of quality assurance measures including drafting project proposals and especially the preparation of high quality-impact and outcome focused narrative reports. These reports need to capture the quantity and quality of work undertaken by WANEP based on demand by partners and stakeholders.

By providing its partners, and particularly donors, with a record of impacts, outcomes and results captured in feedback stories, testimonies and narratives, as well as a list of requests and demands for WANEP's intervention from major actors such as ECOWAS, the AU and national governments, WANEP could easily show-case its relevance, impact and importance as a vital partner for peace and security in Africa.

If guided by a robust communication strategy, and supportive impact reporting, WANEP could easily convince, and indirectly enable and assist, donors to justify their decision to support the programme. Such a culture of impact registration and reportage would also prove helpful as a

procedure intended to also serve as a continuous feedback and monitoring technique. It will improve the quality of WANEP's outputs and outcomes over time by encouraging reflections on outcomes and impacts.

The review also found that WANEP suffers low-level implementation of some vital planned activities, for example the recruitment of staff members for a WANEP Liaison Office. While the introduction of M&E and the recruitment of appropriate staff is a step in the right direction, WANEP has to strive to instil an M&E system that allows sufficient emphasis for impact registration and reportage.

Dealing with these shortcomings will require in-depth strategic reflection, supported by training courses on RBM and VAM. Through efficient management, clear succession plans concerning leadership in the Secretariat, and stricter accountability in the financial system, mainly in regard to the National Network Coordinators (NNCs), as well as an improved system of monitoring and evaluation, WANEP could remove many of the constraints it is currently facing.

Accordingly, Sida and WANEP need to cooperate in implementing the following recommendations.

Recommendations to Sida:

1. Continue funding WANEP for a new strategic period of three years, if not more, but at least maintain current financial support.
2. Take the lead in the creation of a basket fund that would enable WANEP to enjoy multi-year funding for carrying out long-term strategic reforms that would bring financial sustainability for WANEP.
3. Convene a consultative roundtable to discuss and devise joint mechanisms to follow-up progress in addressing shortcomings and implementing recommendations that are advanced in this and previous assessments.

4. Encourage WANEP to engage in benchmarking and exchange of ideas with similar institutions in Africa and elsewhere on how to improve performance, particularly on communication and reporting strategy, financial and risk management, visibility and profile enhancement. An exchange of ideas on the enhancement of efficiency and sustainability through fundraising from non-traditional donors and consultancy/revenue-generation, as well as other areas of perceived shortcomings, would also be very useful.
5. Encourage WANEP to carry out an assessment of WANEP's cooperation with ECOWAS and that of the AU to ensure WANEP's work reflects the continental and regional directions but at the same time, and more importantly, also contributes to the priority setting process in the ECOWAS and the AU.
6. Arrange for technical training for WANEP relevant officers on the above areas of competence including Result-Based and Value-Added Management.
7. Consider the possibility of extending its support for one year sabbatical arrangement that will help WANEP for internal capacity building and succession plan within the leadership of WANEP at the end of the next strategic plan.

Recommendations to WANEP:

1. With emphasis on quality reporting and communication of impacts, establish a comprehensive system of *narrative impact reports*, *impact logs*, *records of outcomes*, *significant success stories*, and a *registry of demand for WANEP interventions*, not only to boost visibility, enhance profile, ensure relevance and impact, but also to ensure continuous support from partners and donors as well as encourage culture of continuous institutional deliberations, personal and professional reflections within the network on the work they are doing.
2. Maintain and foster a more robust partnership with ECOWAS and re-constitute a fully functioning WANEP Liaison Office with ECOWAS.

3. Carry out study on approaches and areas of cooperation with ECOWAS and AU.
4. Devolve more power to National Network Coordinators (NNCs) through more clarity in the division of labour between the Secretariat, the NNCs, and the network members.
5. Plan for an internal capacity building process, particularly in regard to Result Based and Value Added Management and M&E, for its leadership, including the Board, the Secretariat and all staff members.
6. Develop strategies aiming at bridging the lack of systematic consultative mechanism on strategic thinking, exchange of progress, challenges, solutions, regular analysis of current situation among NNCs and the Programme Director.
7. Develop and carry out consultations on WANEP's internal capacity building and succession plan within the leadership of WANEP, through continuous mentoring and probationary arrangements including sabbatical leaves.
8. Develop strategies on communications that guides all efforts of profile and visibility enhancement, reporting impact and results, and media engagement.
9. WANEP website shall have the list of the network members, a link to the websites of all its network members and a web-space with short summary for each its network members, and similarly all the network members shall have a link and a web-page for WANEP on their individual websites.
10. Design strategies for fundraising and resource mobilization that take into consideration the concerns expressed in this review related to sustainability.
11. Solicit funding beyond traditional donors, including South Korea, China, France, Canada, Japan, the Gulf countries, the private sector, and foundations.
12. Take the challenge of encouraging African donors such as ECOWAS, the AU, ADB, ACBF and the governments of Nigeria and Ghana to jointly own WANEP through funding some of the programmes.

13. Establish a Partners' Forum in which current and potential donors as well as key partners listed above, mainly ECOWAS, AU, ADB and ACBF, participate in some strategic issues of WANEP.
14. Consider developing a Strategy for Financial Risk Management, which may include establishing an endowment or cash reserve fund that could cover the total expense of running WANEP for 2-3 months during times of crisis.
15. Develop a Consultancy Policy that aims at revenue generation through a well-targeted and regulated fees and consultancy based on the in-house capacity of WANEP.

1 Background

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Since 1998, the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) has been working to complement the peace and security agenda of ECOWAS and the AU. After a decade of Peacebuilding practise, WANEP has grown to become a household name in West Africa with some 550 member organisations⁵ and a dozen of well-functioning national network offices in almost all the ECOWAS Member countries, WANEP has 12 functional national network offices and focal points in Mali, Niger and Cape Verde.⁶ WANEP hosts an Annual General Meeting (AGM) and features an elected Board of 7 members based on their professional competence. WANEP has 42 (13 female and the rest male) staff members (17 at the Secretariat, while the rest are National Network Coordinators (NNCs).

WANEP has a strong partnership with ECOWAS and is a member of the Peace and Security cluster of the African Union's (AU) Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOSOCC) representing West Africa. WANEP also has a Special Consultative Status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). It is also the Regional Initiator and the current Chair of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflicts (GPPAC) headquartered in the Netherlands. The purpose of this Review is to assess the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme supported by Sida from 2010 to 2012. It aims at achieving a fair, objective and accurate assessment of the performance of the WANEP on enhancing civil society capacity for the promotion of human security, conflict prevention and peace building in West Africa and at providing strategic lessons and recommendations for future interventions and possible Sida support.

⁵ The list of the members was not made available, but it would help if the list of the members of the network is listed in the website.

⁶ The process to have functional offices in Cape Verde and Mali is underway.

Methodology

1.2 THE REVIEW: THE USERS AND THE INTENDED USE

On the donors' side, the main user of the review is the Swedish Embassy in Addis Ababa and Sida. However, some other donors might be interested in the final product. This review is going to help Sida better understand the work of WANEP and will serve as an input when deciding on possible continued collaboration with WANEP. What is more the Review may also provide evidence to persuade potential donors and partners about the benefits of partnering with WANEP in their endeavour to improve the peace and security situation in West Africa.

For WANEP, the Review offers another additional opinion from an outsider's perspective on the organisation's strategies and accomplishments, and on its organisational structure and capacity. While assessing the past and present performance of WANEP, nonetheless, as a mid-term review, the ultimate object and purpose of the review remains futuristic, aiming at improving WANEP's strategic stature and performance. The findings, insights and lessons in this and other previous similar reviews could serve as useful inputs for the next strategic period and partnership agreement between WANEP and its donor partners.

1.3 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

1.3.1 General Approach

Based on the Inception Report that clarified the review criteria and the scope of the review, the review has integrated different methods. They have been adapted to the various types of informants and information that the reviewer believes were necessary to approach and to collect.

a. **Comprehensive desk review** of basic policy and operational documents, reports and organisational literature specified under VI of the Inception Report (annexed). The reviewer has analysed all relevant documents including:

- i. Agreement between Sida and WANEP;
- ii. WANEP strategic plan and other policy documents;
- iii. Organizational Structure of WANEP;
- iv. System-based Audit Report (2011);
- v. Minutes of Staff Retreats (2010) and (2012);
- vi. Programme and project action plans;
- vii. MoU with ECOWAS;
- viii. Official financial reports; and
- ix. Official correspondence, including emails.

b. **Online, telephone and face-to-face interviews** with relevant institutions and personalities identified in the Inception Report. These interviews provided an opportunity to assess and substantiate the review.

- i. **Location visit** – in order to conduct face-to-face interviews with individuals, the reviewer travelled to Abuja (to attend a meeting to validate the review of EWSRM and to conduct interviews with the officials of WANEP and ECOWAS, partners and NNCs) and Accra (to visit and conduct

interviews with WANEP Secretariat staff members and partners).

ii. **Face-to-face interviews** – the reviewer conducted interviews with the following:

1. ECOWAS Commission

- a. Acting Director for Early Warning Directorate
- b. Head of Early Warning System, Early Warning Directorate
- c. Programme Officer-Analyst, Situation Room
- d. Head of Bureau ECOWAS-Zone 1

2. KAIPTC

- a. Dean and Director Faculty Academic Affairs and Research
- b. Director, Plans and Programmes

3. UNDP-Accra

- a. Peace and Governance Advisor
- b. Peace Analyst

4. UN Office for West Africa

5. New Times Cooperation-Accra

6. Friedrich Ebert Foundation-Regional Office, Abuja

7. GIZ-Support Programme to ECOWAS Commission-Abuja

8. The AU Commission, Peace and Security Department

9. WANEP Secretariat

- a. Executive Director
- b. Programme Director
- c. Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
- d. WIPNET Programme Officer
- e. Program Officers, Peace Monitoring Centre
- f. Administrative Manager
- g. NNCs-Nigeria

- c. **Questionnaire and telephone interviews-** when face-to-face interviews were at times not possible or when follow-up interviews were necessary, the reviewer sent questionnaires to a total of fourteen persons (five Secretariat staff members, six NNCs, two former staff members and two partners), of which eleven responded.

1.3.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The review applies OECD/DAC approved evaluation criteria.⁷ The initial ToR indicated a series of review questions. Accordingly, the review is graded as A- very high, B- high, C-medium, and D- Low. The following questions were developed to guide the evaluation:

Evaluating relevance focused on how beneficial WANEP's interventions are for West African countries and their populations as well as CSOs. In a nut shell, it evaluates the extent to which the objectives of a capacity enhancement intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirement, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies. Thus, the review evaluated the demand-driven services of WANEP, the requests made for WANEP's interventions and correspondence in appreciation of WANEP's contributions.

Questions:

What kind of processes do you follow to ensure relevance? What are the indicators of relevance?

Have you received requests from main partnerships and beneficiaries of WANEP such as ECOWAS and the member states of ECOWAS, the AU, and other beneficiaries?

How relevant are WANEP's projects to the beneficiaries targeted? A) very high, B) high, C) medium, D) Low

⁷ The OECD/DAC, Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies. Paris, available from <http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/7571/index.htm> (accessed January 2013).

How relevant are WANEP's projects to the region's (ECOWAS) priorities?

A) very high, B) high, C) medium, D) Low

How relevant are WANEP's projects to the national programmes? A) very

high, B) high, C) medium, D) Low

How relevant are WANEP's projects to the donor's priorities? A) very high,

B) high, C) medium, D) Low

Evaluating Impact focused on what change WANEP's interventions have made at policy and ground level.

Questions:

Do you think the project enhanced the capacity of civil society in the promotion of human security, conflict prevention and peace-building? A)

very high, B) high, C) medium, D) none

Evaluating effectiveness focused on whether objectives specified in the programmes are achieved. In short, the review assessed the results registered vis-à-vis the objectives of the programmes, the outcomes vs. the efforts made. The reviewer analysed to what extent WANEP interventions contributed to peace and security in West Africa by shaping policies at national, ECOWAS and AU level.

Questions:

How effective are WANEP's projects in terms of the change they bring? A) very high, B) high, C) medium, D) Low

To what extent does WANEP contribute to shaping policies at national, ECOWAS or AU level? A) very high, B) high, C) medium, D) none

Are there success stories and significant stories that validate an outcome of the intervention? Give an example

What are the measures taken to ensure the achievement of the objectives on time?

Evaluating efficiency focused on value for money, and how economical WANEP uses its (finance, time, energy and expertise) to achieve results. The review assessed the results registered vis-à-vis the resource used, and the percentage of the budget used to programmes vis-à-vis administrative costs.

Questions:

How efficient are WANEP's projects in terms of value for money? A) very high, B) high, C) medium, D) Low

Is there delay in the implementation of the activities and the project? If yes, what are the reasons for the delay?

Is there a mismatch between the budget allocated and budget utilized so far?

Evaluating sustainability focused on whether WANEP's programmes have long-term benefits and if WANEP makes conscious efforts to ensure that its programmes are self-maintainable by beneficiaries. In short, it refers to whether or not the capacity of WANEP and its programmes as well as beneficiaries are built so as to support themselves.

Questions:

Do the projects focus sufficiently on the national and local capacity building of the network members, beneficiaries and partners? A) yes, B) no

What measures are taken to ensure the sustainability of the projects?

Areas requiring improvements

Questions:

What are the strong sides of the WANEP?

What are the areas of weakness in need of improvements?

What specific recommendations do you have for improvements to be made by WANEP?

Specific recommendations to the Swedish Embassy/Sida and other stakeholders?

1.4 LIMITATIONS AND LESSONS

The reviewer has held a series of several consultations with Sida, and the WANEP Secretariat. He has also visited several partners, including KAIPTC, ECOWAS, the AU, UN officials and staff members. The review also consulted several important documents, including reviews on WANEP and ECOWARN. The review depended heavily on the interviews and visits to Addis Ababa, Accra, and Abuja and the questionnaires distributed to the NNCs. Nonetheless, due to the intended scope of the review, the budget and time allocated to this assignment, the Review has the following limitations:

1. The reviewer was unable to meet board members, members institutions of WANEP, the NNCs of WANEP outside Accra and Abuja, or beneficiaries to assess the impact on the ground;
2. The Review is not final and comprehensive, but rather is indicative of the success and shortcoming of WANEP with a futuristic perspective on areas of improvement and assistance required from Sida and other similar partners;
3. None of the audits, external informants, or former staff members of WANEP has provided feedback that brings the relevance or financial integrity of WANEP and its Secretariat into question. While this enhances confidence in the credibility of the results of this Review, nonetheless, the absence of negative feedback does not carry the same weight as a positive financial audit.

2 RESULTS OF THE REVIEW

2.1 EVALUATION OF RELEVANCE

2.1.1 Relevance at National Level

Engaged at local level, WANEP's community monitors and its early warning system with national and regional networks provides a vital mechanism for ensuring relevance, and connecting local, national and regional policy makers. WANEP's projects are highly relevant to the beneficiaries targeted, the priorities of ECOWAS and national governments as well as that of the donor's community.

As a network of 550 national organizations spread over all the member states of ECOWAS, WANEP, through its specialist services have become a house-hold name in the West African sub-region. This is a great achievement. The National Network Coordinators (NNCs), and network members provide an excellent process that helps ensure relevance by ensuring services are based on the needs and demands of the population at national and local level. This is a source of the credibility for its early warning system, conflict prevention and peace mediation activities. Thus, WANEP is a very popular network among the stakeholders like the ECOWAS, the AU, the UN and academia. National governments have high respect and recognition for the expertise of WANEP. With the endorsement from ECOWAS, the AU and member states, WANEP exudes confidence both with non-state actors and state members of the ECOWAS.

Moreover, WANEP's presence over the whole region has ensured the relevance of, and demands for its various services by partners and stakeholders. The planning and activity development processes ensure participation of people in the communities/countries that are affected and therefore outputs and outcomes envisaged are those that are relevant to their needs.

Key Findings Grade: A- Very high relevance	Comments/Recommendations
- Clearly, the relevance and impact of the work of WANEP could be inferred from the demand driven services that it provides. WANEP's programmes are extremely relevant. WANEP projects are in high demand and invariably make an impact. WANEP receives numerous requests from its main partners and beneficiaries such as ECOWAS and its member states, the AU and others. - The relationship between WANEP with the ECOWAS, the AU and donors and other partners is good. However, it can and should be better. A lot of work still remains to be done. - WANEP has been requested to professionally assist the Conference of Chiefs and Election related works in Ghana, projects implemented in Jos in Nigeria and in Liberia. The demand-driven services include requests for specific assistance in managing electoral disputes and providing relevant information from joint activities that will be used for election petitions. Several ECOWAS member countries requested WIPNET⁸ to support the design programmes and implementation of UNSCR 1325. WANEP designed and supported the establishment of the Ghana Peace Council, convened the much appreciated dialogue processes in Nigeria (Jos Plateau), Ghana (Northern, Volta and Upper East Regions), and lend support to peaceful elections, in Senegal, and Guinea. WAPI⁹ has also received requests for the training of the staff of ECOWAS and the AU. This indicates the relevance of the work of WANEP with local, national and regional structures.	➤ While maintaining its demand-driven functions, WANEP, particularly the Secretariat, should proactively engage through supply-driven interventions in response to newly emerging threats to peace and security such as has happened recently in Mali and elsewhere. ➤ WANEP programmes are also relevant to the priorities of donors. In this regard WANEP may consider establishing a Partners Forum to which current and potential donors as well as key partners, mainly ECOWAS, and the AU, could be invited. ➤ WANEP should register, report and publish some of the indicators of relevance, including: • Governments and organizations/people/leaders that make specific demands for interventions and materials from WANEP. • Institutions and influential personalities reporting or citing WANEP's work • Letters of appreciations for WANEP work.

⁸ Women In Peacebuilding Network

⁹ West Africa Peacebuilding Institute

2.1.2 Relevance of WANEP at Regional Level

WANEP and Its Partnership with ECOWAS

The ECOWAS Protocol Framework of 1999 mandates its Early Warning and Early Response Department to work closely with CSOs. In September 2002, WANEP entered into formal collaboration with the sub-regional inter-governmental structure, ECOWAS. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between WANEP and ECOWAS defined the partnership that has since been renewed and consolidated until 2014.¹⁰ It identifies areas of cooperation on peace and security in the region.

WANEP has been the most important partner of ECOWAS since the launch of its ECOWAS Liaison office in 2002.¹¹ It has worked closely with ECOWAS on ECOWARN, voter education, election monitoring and observation. WANEP's partnership with ECOWAS constitutes the most important strategic achievement for WANEP and West African civil society as it offers a much sought opportunity to influence and shape policy responses to conflict early warning and early response. WANEP is therefore setting the stage for civil society contributions to peace-building in West Africa.

Through the partnership with ECOWAS, WANEP has contributed significantly to policy debates; the development of the ECOWAS Warning and Response Network (ECOWARN) with 94 pre-determined indicators (now reduced to 66); a web based database system capable of supporting the exchange of commentary, narratives and unstructured observations (ECOWAS Peace Exchange); Policy Briefs and Incident Reports. ECOWAS acknowledges the indispensable role played by WANEP in coordinating the civil society data collection and analyses.

¹⁰ The MOU was renewed in 2006 and has been extended for another five year period (2009 - 2014).

¹¹ About Us, WANEP Official Website, available from <http://www.wanep.org/wanep/about-us-our-story.html> (accessed April 5, 2013).

ECOWARN depends on WANEP and its various structures, including the community monitors and national focal points. For this, WANEP is the implementing partner of ECOWAS. Economically efficient, ECOWAS decided to partner and allow WANEP to serve as a focal point at national level for its ECOWARN. This is due to the network and wide presence of WANEP in almost all member states. This makes sense given the fact that the government focal points are not actively able to provide the information and data for ECOWARN. WANEP prepares and disseminates reports regularly and more effectively than the governments. In addition to this, WANEP produces Incident Report, Situation Reports and Policy Briefs which represents a major contribution of WANEP to the ECOWAS and its member states. WANEP has filled and still continues to fill the gaps that ECOWARN has experienced since its inception.

While one of the key informants thinks that the relationship between ECOWAS and WANEP has improved in recent years, a majority of the key informants confirm the decline in the engagement and partnership between the two. The delay in reconstituting the WANEP Liaison Office to ECOWAS, which was operational since 2002,¹² in the opinion of many key informants including officials in ECOWAS, is one of the binding constraints for the relevance, impact and effectiveness of its work. This interest on the side of ECOWAS on having the WANEP-Liaison Office and their understanding of the relevance and importance of the office is appreciated by WANEP. However, in the opinion of WANEP, ECOWAS has not demonstrated the type of support it needs including helping WANEP mobilise the necessary funding to replace the Liaison Officer. Although the WANEP-ECOWAS partnership is beyond - and more important than - opening the WANEP Liaison Office, the impact and sustainability of the work of WANEP was enhanced and augmented through this Liaison Office's close working relationship with ECOWAS. What is more, the relevance of WANEP's work at

¹² About Us, WANEP Official Website, available from <http://www.wanep.org/wanep/about-us-our-story.html> (accessed April 5, 2013).

community, local and national level was synergized through feedback from the regional and sub-regional mechanisms at AU and ECOWAS.

The change in the leadership of ECOWAS and rather diminishing role ECOWAS is playing in peace and security has also contributed to the decrease in the partnership on policy issues. This could be an outcome of diminished political will on the part of ECOWAS, limitations in understanding the vital contribution of WANEP in particular and CSOs in general, and/or lack of flexible management of the partnership that allows regular review of the existing approach. According to an ECOWAS official, another additional factor for the decline in the relations between ECOWAS and WANEP relates to the budget cuts and the recruitment slowdown within ECOWAS, which constrained joint collaboration.¹³ On the contrary, WANEP believes that “the reality and fact today is that the role of ECOWAS in peace and security has increased and not declined. The engagements between ECOWAS and WANEP have increased and not decreased”.¹⁴

In other areas of partnership, WANEP worked with the gender Directorate in the development of the Guidelines for the implementation of UNSCR 1325. The ECOWAS Gender Director actually wrote the foreword to this Guideline now published and widely appreciated. This year, WANEP has received a request for a meeting to review the two institution’s strategic plan with a view to more synergy in working together.¹⁵ At various levels especially in the establishment of the ECOWAS Mediation Division, WANEP also provided technical expertise in mediation. WANEP is a member of the ECOWAS Emergency Response Team under the Directorate of Humanitarian Affairs.¹⁶

Alluding to the importance of maintaining the strong partnership WANEP has with ECOWAS, key informants and staff members of WANEP pointed out the need to encourage ECOWAS to own ECOWARN and to regard it as ECOWAS’s

¹³ ECOWAS Key Informant no. 2

¹⁴ Feedback from WANEP on the First Draft, 16 April 2013.

¹⁵ Feedback from WANEP on the First Draft, 16 April 2013.

¹⁶ Ibid.

own project. Some fear that if ECOWAS withdraws from ECOWARN, the role of WANEP would be reduced to its own WARN project. While the WARN program is broader than ECOWARN, nonetheless, without ECOWAS's, utilization of the warning system the benefits and impacts of WANEP's work in this regard would be minimized significantly.

A vital mechanism for advocacy and critical institutional support to ECOWAS, the WANEP Liaison Office in Abuja, has to be re-established. Without that office, the disconnection between community level, national and regional decision makers will increase. As pointed out by a Board member, Mr. William Awinador, in his message to staff members of the WANEP, the ECOWAS partnership is the key to ensuring the visibility of WANEP.¹⁷

2.1.3 Reflecting on the changes within ECOWAS

The ECOWAS-EWD directorate has conducted a pilot study and intends to establish the National focal points for its EW systems in 2013-2014.¹⁸ The establishment of these government focal points would make ECOWAS function parallel with the WANEP focal points and community monitors in each country. Moreover, practitioners and policy makers at ECOWAS and its partners are questioning the added value and the core functions of Zonal Bureaux of the ECOWARN. Most of the Zonal Bureaux of ECOWAS are not functioning effectively.¹⁹ Indeed, some have suggested that the role of these Bureaux needs to be reconsidered at ECOWAS as they do not produce distinctive and significant added contributions. Others have suggested that they should be reformed or abolished altogether. However, implementation of the planned changes will be dependent on funding availability and also on the decision process by highest policy organs of ECOWAS.

¹⁷ Minutes of WANEP Staff Retreat, 13 – 16 February 2012, Mensvic Hotel, Ghana.

¹⁸ ECOWAS Key Informant No 2.

¹⁹ ECOWAS Key Informant No. 1 and Discussion on the Review of ECOWAS EWSRM, 12 February 2013, ECOWAS Commission, Abuja.

The nature of collaboration may change due to the internal ECOWAS restructuring. These changes by ECOWAS, if implemented, would have some implications for WANEP's current privileged status in the ECOWARN system. WANEP National Early Warning System is in place, but what are the implications of the establishment of these national focal points by ECOWAS on WANEP's National Early Warning System?

Depending on the answer to this question, accordingly, WANEP may also need to engage in critical thinking and strategic repositioning by considering the potential changes that ECOWAS intends to carry out. WANEP may undertake a strategic repositioning in terms of maintaining focus on early warning, but also needs to expand the partnership with other departments of the ECOWAS Commission and policy organs of ECOWAS. Taking the recent review of ECOWAS into account, and considering previous and more recent in-house competence of the network, WANEP should proactively identify new areas of cooperation and use its findings for strategic repositioning. This may create supply-driven proactive areas of cooperation with ECOWAS. In this regard, WANEP could take a leading role in assisting ECOWAS in the establishment and functioning of national focal points. WANEP may propose to ECOWAS to play a role in establishing a triangulated approach where WANEP NNCs, network members, and national focal points could spearhead such proactive role.

Key Findings Grade: A- very high relevance	Comments/Recommendations
• WANEP played a vital role in the progress of ECOWARN particularly the development of indicators and entry of data. Currently WANEP provides the backbone data for the functioning of ECOWARN. A recent review of EWSRM characterized this relationship between WANEP and ECOWAS as one of the best and most exemplary partnerships with CSOs.²⁰ • WANEP enjoys a special privileged	➤ Partnership with ECOWAS is vital for the development and impact of WANEP's programme. Similarly, given the decline in the leadership of ECOWAS, WANEP's increased partnership and engagement with ECOWAS will be much need than ever. ➤ Given that WANEP's partnership with ECOWAS will increasingly

²⁰ Ibid.

relationship with ECOWAS. The WANEP Liaison Officer was considered and treated as a *de facto* ECOWAS staff member. It has been six years since the post of Liaison Officer of WANEP became vacant. In the immediate past strategic plan (2010-102?), despite a plan to appoint three staff to the ECOWAS Liaison Office, WANEP failed to accomplish this. The main reason behind this was financial constraints, change in leadership within ECOWAS, and perhaps failure in the leadership of WANEP to the reconstituting of the office.

- Indicative of a decline in the strong partnership between ECOWAS and WANEP, the delay in recruiting and opening the WANEP Liaison Office is a source of concern for many of the key informants. Consequently, at regional level, the relevance and impact of WANEP's work has decreased and therefore, sustainability. For instance, WANEP was not consulted in the development of the ToR for the recent review of EWSRM. This resulted partly because of the absence of a liaison officer.
- WANEP has in strong partnership with the Gender Directorate and the Political Affairs Directorate.

become vital for the sustainability of WANEP's work at regional level, the establishment of a fully functioning WANEP Liaison Office to ECOWAS needs to take pride of place in the next action and strategic plan.

- The partnership with ECOWAS is too important for the growth of WANEP to leave it to personal relations. WANEP needs to nurture the partnership through deliberately crafted strategic considerations.
- At the ECOWAS level, WANEP may consider new areas of cooperation in addition to the ECOWARN, including cooperation with the departments in charge of political affairs, humanitarian protection and gender issues.
- The MoU will expire in 2014. The negotiation for a new MOU needs to reconsider some aspects of the partnership, particularly taking the new developments in ECOWAS, and the competence and comparative advantages of WANEP, into account.

2.2 EVALUATION OF IMPACT

Needless to say, measuring the direct impact of WANEP's project, programmes and interventions would be very difficult, but can be induced from various indicators of impacts. As discussed in the relevant sections of this Review, the WANEP programmes have significantly informed, influenced and shaped policies in the ECOWAS region. Heads of state and officials of governments as well as ECOWAS have extended praise and approval to WANEP and its achievements several times.²¹ In the words of one of the senior officials of ECOWAS, "whatever impact ECOWARN had registered it is shared with WANEP."²² The ECOWARN was

²¹ Key Informant-WANEP Secretariat-2

²² ECOWAS Key Informant No 1.

designed with WANEP technical support, advocacy and assistance. WANEP is the lead agency in the operationalization of ECOWARN. WANEP is now going further by advocating and persuading ECOWAS and Member States to establish their own National Early Warning Systems (NEWS). WANEP successfully advocated and influenced ECOWAS to accept and encourage its member states to make Peace Education part of the educational curriculum.

Also attributable to the interventions of WANEP, the National Assembly of Benin invited WANEP-Benin to help in the revision of the draft electoral code that will guide coming elections in Benin. After “national dialogue for a peaceful electoral conflict management” organized on 28 and 29 February 2012 with Sida funding, participants spontaneously set up a monitoring committee that has formally transmitted the results of their dialogue to the President of the Republic of Benin, Dr Boni YAYI.²³ As a result of the work of WANEP-Benin on the 2011 elections and its “national forum on peaceful management of electoral disputes”, for the first time the Benin parliament promulgated an electoral code.²⁴

Similarly in Ghana, communities have been able to gain more representation on the national political landscape and decrease the ethnic discrimination that confronted some of the ethnic communities. Intervention by WANEP has prevented and reduced violence also in Nigeria, and Ghana.²⁵ In Nigeria, particularly Jos, WANEP’s work with parliamentarians and security forces has been instrumental in reducing violent conflicts and has allowed dialogue to take place. Ghana’s National Peace Council establishment was largely driven by WANEP which still provides technical support. Today, the Ghana Peace Council is not only supporting peace processes in Ghana but also serves as a sample national peace architecture that could be emulated by many other African Countries. WANEP has also influenced the membership and leadership of the Guinean Electoral Commission. As a result of WANEP’s intervention, the

²³ Watch the video on the site www.wanep.org or http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=XocL-ZbbwLs#at=20

²⁴ Benin Parliament, Letter referenced 0177-13/AN/SGA/CSE of January 28 2013.

²⁵ Partners Key Informant no. 2.

leadership of the Commission is now directed by a member of civil society instead of a member of the ruling party, which resolved the major cause of Guinea's electoral problems. This change paves the way for further and more far reaching policy changes that WANEP plans to achieve in the near future in Guinea.

In a nutshell, despite these many significant success stories that validate impact and outcomes of its programmatic intervention, WANEP has no systematically recorded and reporting mechanism in place. While the work of the new M&N Officer may help, WANEP lacks a communication strategy for its work and impact.

Such Communication Strategy shall ensure that impacts and outcomes are well registered and narrated as well as reported on time to wider audience. Moreover, the Communication Strategy shall have an end state of profile and visibility enhancement of WANEP. But more importantly, it shall also facilitate efficient exchange of ideas, information, decisions and proposals among the Secretariat, the governance bodies of WANEP particularly the General Assembly, the Board of WANEP, the National Boards, the NNCs and even the network members. In this regard, WANEP website shall have a link to the website of all its network members and a web-space with short summary to all its network members, and similarly all the network members shall have a link and a web-page for WANEP on their individual websites. Such links and web-pages shall be updated regularly with new information as well as need to be utilized as intra-net information storage and communication platform for the whole network including network members and NNCs. The Communication Strategy shall be developed by an external consultant with experience with similar organization in Africa.

For staff and board members of the network, Impact Reports would have helped them to communicate the fruits of their work and remind them of the need to continuously reflect and strive to link their work to relevance and impact. For donor and regional partners, an Impact Report helps justify and relate the outcomes of their funding, endorsement and contributions to the actual improvement of peace and security in the region. It would serve as an

accountability measure to the tax payers and the donor community. The recently developed Sustainability Index which grades the performance of NNCs on a peer review mechanism could also provide an input for the Impact Report of WANEP. The Sustainability Index could be integrated to M&E works of the Secretariat so as to systemically institutionalize M&E and grading of not only NNCs but also the network members too.

Key Findings Grade: B-high impact	Comments/Recommendations
➤ WANEP's intervention has brought significant changes on the ground. WANEP has no or few systematic recording and reporting of change and impact stories. ➤ Indicative of the relevance of its work, WANEP receives letters demanding intervention and services such as the provision of training.²⁶ ➤ In contrast, in countries like Mali, WANEP was slow to establish an effective presence in a timely fashion even though the country was and is in need of CSOs' engagement on human security, conflict prevention and peace-building, now more than ever. In Benin, WANEP was not sufficiently nimble to design projects responsive to the peculiar circumstances and needs of the country. ➤ National networks are the face of WANEP. They convey, promote and preserve the image of WANEP. To ensure that all members of WANEP and staff members serve as agents of image building, a communications strategy that enhance the profile and visibility as well as support smooth and technologically efficient and advanced information exchange shall be drawn. Such strategy shall make use of in-house competences. Each network members, NNCs, members of regional and national boards and the Secretariat shall have designated role in this strategy.	➤ A network-wide recording and reporting of significant success stories and achievements in the form of an 'Impact Report' needs to be developed. The 'Impact Report' should be circulated to all staff and board members as well as partners particularly donors. ➤ WANEP need to establish a record and sharing of letters of request made for its intervention or letter of appreciation for the work it has done. ➤ WANEP has also to design a registry of citations or reference to WANEP's work in any reports or speeches at the UN, the AU, ECOWAS or national governments or other stakeholders and partners. ➤ WANEP needs to develop a communications strategy. ➤ WANEP website shall have a link to the website of all its network members and a web-space with short summary to all its network members, and similarly all the network members shall have a link and a web-page for WANEP on their individual websites.

²⁶ Partners Key Informant no. 3.

2.3 EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS

2.3.1 Effectiveness of WANEP specific programmes

Sida has supported six programmes of WANEP, namely: 1) West Africa Peacebuilding Institute (WAPI), 2) West Africa Early Warning and Response Network (WARN), 3) Women In Peacebuilding Network (WIPNET) Programme, 4) Non-Violence and Peace Education (NAPE), 5) Civil Society Coordination and Democratic Governance Programme (CSDG), and 6) Responding to Conflict through Dialogue.²⁷ These programmes are effective in their delivery and the majority of the outcomes have been achieved. Sida's funding has been used to support new deliverables including seminars, researches, Incidents Reports, Policy Briefs and various training courses on analysis.

The programme design has been articulated in a coherent manner, even if the definition of goals, outcomes and outputs require clearer articulation in the language of RBM and VAM. As discussed above under relevance, and particularly impact, the partners, target groups and beneficiaries consider that the programmes have contributed to the enhancement of the capacity and ability of CSOs to make a difference in human security, conflict prevention and peace-building.

With a professional reputation for delivery, WANEP has strong, committed and professional staff at the secretariat and serving at national levels. WANEP, through its relevant and impactful interventions, has achieved outcomes, and planned as well as shaped the policies at national and regional ECOWAS levels. The WANEP Secretariat and the members of the national networks offer a strong structure for implementation to achieve the outcomes of planned activities. For example, in relation to conflict prevention, 98 percent of the submission to the

²⁷WANEP, Narrative and End of Project Report (January 2010- December 2012), Submitted to Swedish International Development Agency (Sida).

ECOWARN comes from WANEP.²⁸ Many of the WANEP policy briefs and the analyses and recommendations were proven correct.²⁹

To a large extent, there is no delay in the implementation of the activities and the project itself. In addition, WANEP achieved the expected outcomes and expected results of the programmes. It is important to note here that its poor communication strategy in regard to its achievement has contributed to the less elevated assessment of its effectiveness. However, WANEP has also failed to implement some very few, but vital, activities and, thus, failed to achieve important outcomes. In an effort to strengthen its partnership with ECOWAS, the 2010-2012 Strategic Plan of WANEP intended to recruit three staff members to run the Liaison Office at ECOWAS, implement the WIPNET programme and recruit a communication officer. Given that WANEP conducts monthly debriefing sessions at the ECOWAS Early Warning Department, a functional WANEP liaison office in ECOWAS is essential for an effective CSOs/ECOWAS interface. A quarterly planning meeting between WANEP with the ECOWAS and the AU and the organization of *bi-annual* seminars, both of which are listed in the immediate past strategic plan, were not implemented. Furthermore, WANEP intended to initiate a steering committee involving WANEP, ECOWAS and AU. This also did not materialize. An approach to address this is to develop a Strategic Plan Review Sheet where a consultant could carry out specific assessment of all activities implemented, and targets met and explain the reasons behind unmet goals and unimplemented activities. This could be part of the development of the next WANEP Strategic Plan.

While the root cause of the failure of execution of the planned activities could be mainly financial constraints, nonetheless, the imbalance between time-allocated for management and for programmatic works by the leadership may have exacerbated the weakness in implementation.

²⁸ WANEP Key Informant no. 5

²⁹ WANEP Key Informant no. 5

2.3.2 Institutional Effectiveness - Strategy, Structure and Capacity of WANEP

An assessment of WANEP's efficiency attempts to establish whether or not WANEP's organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively support the delivery of the programme.

Strategy should determine structure. In other words, structure should follow strategy. Structure should be tailored as an effective implementation tool for strategy. The strategic end state of the six WANEP programmes³⁰ is to build the capacity of local, national, and regional stakeholders to be able to prevent and respond effectively to conflicts, to build peace and ensure human security. However, this review has pointed out that in some programmes, structure has determined strategic programmes, which therefore led to weak performance.

A challenge for any network of this kind with programmes implemented through a region is twofold. On the one hand, the network has to ensure that the mission and vision of WANEP is adequately and commonly shared across the whole network; and, on the other hand, it has to ensure that its institutional organization and capacity enables the NCCs and network members to respond to the contextual needs and peculiarities of their respective countries. This approach requires a delicate balancing of centripetal and centrifugal demands for collective leadership with individual responsibilities.

While the WANEP structure functions relatively effectively, it is not clear to what extent the respective NNCs, and national networks participate in the formulation of the programmes.

In explaining how programmes are designed, WANEP explains that “the regional programs are designed beginning with an indebt analysis of the West Africa socio-economic and political environment by the National Networks. In the last staff

³⁰ See the table below.

retreat, a problem tree was developed out of this analysis. The regional programs are then designed to complement one another in a comprehensive and human security approach. The national networks out of such analysis are also well placed to design their own national programs from the benefit of a qualitative analysis that is peer reviewed at regional level.”³¹

Currently, it seems that the Secretariat is more involved in programme planning, implementation and technical training. The decisions about activities and the programmatic interventions of WANEP come mainly from the Secretariat. This approach may sacrifice clarity and relevance for comprehensiveness and centralized regional programmes. In countries like Benin where the local situations differ from those in other countries, WANEP needs to look for relevant issues of peace and security for each country.³² For instance, the projects and types of intervention demanded in Benin are not the same as in the case of Mali. In Benin the consolidation of democracy through interventions on democratic political party mobilization could be more relevant, whereas in Mali the focus would be on hard security issues of peacebuilding and planning for post-conflict reconstruction.

In principle, WANEP seems to be a decentralized network of national peace-builders with the Secretariat focused on a coordination role. In practice, these centralizing tendencies may have influenced WANEP’s programme designers and implementers. There is a generalized approach in the designing of programmes and their objectives. The centralizing drifts of the powers exercised (mainly in financial, representational and technical capacity) and the daily activities of the Secretariat naturally resulted in a more uniform regional approach.³³ This may have instilled a culture of less appreciation for national peculiarities and the need for divergent approaches. In the opinion of WANEP, “regional programs have a leadership role from the regional secretariat with the need for strategic purposes

³¹ Feedback from WANEP on the First Draft, 16 April 2013.

³² NNCs Key Informant no. 3.

³³ Independent Key Informant no. 2.

of regional coordination of these programs. All national programs are designed at the national level and the regional secretariat does not and cannot centralise the coordination and implementation of such programs. Depending on the need for technical back up and support, the regional staff can be invited to provide back stopping to a national program”.³⁴

The focus of each NNC and national network should be determined according to the peculiarities of their respective environments and the comparative advantages that each NNC could offer. The threats of human insecurity and conflict vary in degree and in kind in each country. The comparative advantages of NCCs and national network members may emanate from this divergence in threats to peace and security and geographic-regional proximity or the interest of the regional institutional concentration, as in the case of Abuja or Accra. In order to respond to these demands by various stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries, the NNCs need a greater margin of appreciation in terms of decision making to cater to these demands from stakeholders and beneficiaries.

This approach would not only increase relevance of the works of WANEP on the ground, but would also make them beneficiary-driven services that would help in the delivery of the outcomes expected. In this regard, rethinking the structure, the planning and decision making process in WANEP may be required. The review and reconsideration of the core functions of the Secretariat may help to increase relevance, impact and sustainability of the projects of WANEP.

In the words of WANEP Secretariat, “WANEP adopts a two-pronged approach in terms of programming: a national approach led by the national secretariats and a regional approached managed and coordinated by the regional secretariat. At national level, the national networks have full responsibility, ownership and autonomy of their programs with technical support where it is needed by them from the regional secretariat. At regional level, it is acknowledged that factors

³⁴ Feedback from WANEP on the First Draft, 16 April 2013.

that fuel conflicts and their escalation in West Africa are no respecters of artificially imposed boundaries. WANEP regional programs cut across national networks and are designed to increase leverage in engaging diverse actors at regional and international level. Overall, WANEP's strategy is to locate, empower, support and accompany local actors as they respond to conflicts within communities".³⁵

While these are the directions set by the Secretariat management, however, the review has discerned rather a different opinion from some key informants.³⁶ To avoid a 'one size fits all programmes' in planning and implementation, WANEP, through capacity building and a decentralized planning and implementation approach, has to consolidate the existing competencies of the WANEP and cascade these competencies at national level. To ensure more relevance and long-term sustainability, in addition to the Secretariat's regional level programmes, WANEP needs to increasingly contextualise its programmes and target groups and desired outcomes according to the peculiarities of each country. This can be achieved through decentralized planning and implementation. This approach may encourage initiations of proposals for programmes from national networks and NNCs. Responsiveness to the demands of stakeholders could also be assured through more decentralization.

Through reflective equilibrium of the oversight role and regional programmes emanating from the Secretariat, and planning of the NNCs and implementation by the network members, WANEP could achieve an effective structure determined by strategy.

What is more, such decentralized and concentrated areas of competence would help the Secretariat to focus on long-term strategic issues. WANEP, its Executive Director and staff, have been visionary. The network has been able to express a

³⁵ Feedback from WANEP on the First Draft, 16 April 2013.

³⁶ NNCs Key Informant No 3, and Partners Key Informant No 1 pointed out that some years ago Cord Aid pointed out the issues related

vision on how to transform ideas into practice. Nonetheless, the WANEP Secretariat, particularly the Executive Director and Programme Director, need time and energy for the strategic leadership of WANEP. Both have heavy specialist workloads on specific projects. This requires a balance between the programmatic and managerial work of the leadership of the Secretariat.

The leadership within the Secretariat work as practitioners and managers. The more programmatic work they perform, the less time and resources they have available for strategic thinking and vision setting. The programmatic engagement of the Secretariat leadership should be more transnational and regional initiatives, as well as projects about new and emerging peace and security threats, could be managed more efficiently and effectively by the WANEP Secretariat. These functions may focus on responding to emerging regional threats that cannot be addressed by a specific national network member or members together. It can also focus on providing back-up support when a national network such as those in Senegal and Burkina Faso faces serious capacity limitations to effectively respond at national level. This would enable the Secretariat to be more responsive to the demands of the Member States, but also to regional organizations such as ECOWAS and the AU. In this regard, the Secretariat with the WANEP national offices in Nigeria could conduct analyses of emerging and new threats such as the case of *Boko Haram* in Nigeria and the crisis in Mali. These are examples for such division of tasks and specialization.

Moreover, decentralization requires the capacity to implement and discharge responsibility. Moreover, it requires a mechanism for performance and financial accountability. Thus, strategically, WANEP needs to carry out deliberations on optimizing strategic effectiveness and the capacity of its structural organization. The Secretariat may focus on the following six core functions: 1) strategic leadership of the network, 2) oversight of the Secretariat's work, 3) ensure financial and performance accountability, 4) conduct principal fundraising including coordination role NNCs in fundraising, 5) coordination and

implementation of region-wide and new threats to peace and security, and 6) representational duties of the WANEP.

2.3.3 WANEP M&N and Reporting

This issue has been partly addressed in the sections dedicated to the relevance and impact of WANEP. WANEP's M&E has been weak in the past. Despite some remarkable improvements as reflected in the content of its recent report to Sida,³⁷ nevertheless, WANEP's narrative reports (2010-2012) offers a list of activities and a description of events without any analysis of outcomes and impacts. WANEP needs to be more reflective and introduce changes on the impacts of its work. The appointment of an M&N Officer is an important step in ensuring that activities are turned into impacts, and impacts are properly recorded and reported to stakeholders and partners. With M&E built into the internal working of all members of WANEP and the Secretariat as well as the NNCs, this is expected to improve significantly.

Key Findings Grade: B- high effectiveness	Comments/Recommendations
In a bare outline style the effectiveness of six programmes is: • WAPI— that serves as a capacity building training centre of producing competent peace-building practitioners. WAPI has exceedingly succeeded in attracting trainees not only from West Africa but from the entire African continent and some trainees from outside Africa. Funding sustainability remains a challenge. • WARN- has become the backbone of ECOWARN, and has produced independent, credible and accurate early warning analysis, alerts, incident reports and other outputs. In the words of a key informant, if ECOWARN was to collapse, WARN would provide the same service to the region. • NAPE- designed curricula of peace education	➤ In countries like Mali, WANEP was slow to establish an effective presence in a timely fashion even though the country was and is in need of CSO engagements on human security, conflict prevention and peace-building more than ever. Until recently, in Benin, WANEP was not able to design projects responsive to the peculiar circumstances and needs of the country. ➤ By allowing a more decentralized approach, NNCs and network members should begin to establish their own niche and initiate projects that are relevant and effective on the ground.

³⁷ See WANEP, Narrative and End of Project Report (January 2010- December 2012), Submitted to Swedish International Development Agency (Sida).

regionally approved by ECOWAS and national governments are increasingly endorsing and integrating the works of NAPE in their educational system. • WIPNET- has helped in developing a guide for national policy on gender and peace building and assisting in the implementation thereof. Women are raising their voices in peace building issues and they are being heard more than before. In Benin, and Liberia, the guide has received commendations by the highest officials. • CSDG- this platform enabled WANEPs to play a leading role in forging CSO engagement to respond to Election Violence in West Africa as emerging threats. In countries like Ghana, Benin, and Nigeria, WANEP contributed significantly to the culmination of a peaceful pre-and post-election situation. • <i>Responses to Conflicts through Dialogue</i> –a special demand-driven programme that has helped WANEP to ensure its relevance to beneficiaries in need of communal dialogue, and in the long-term it has acquired all the basic elements to become a specialist niche of WANEP in contributing to the AU and ECOWAS’s mediation capacity at the community level. • Expressive of the need to capacitate and authorize the NNCs and network members, WANEP’s relevance, effective delivery of services and visibility, varies from country to country. In the 2012 Staff Retreat, while WANEP Nigeria was graded as the best, Gambia, Ghana, Sierra Leone and Cote d’Ivoire were graded B. The rest, Benin, Cape Verde, Niger, Mali and Senegal, were graded less than B and in need of continuous assistance.³⁸ • A major lacuna in effectiveness of the WANEP remains its inability to ensure the implementation of very vital planned activities. WANEP has failed 1) to recruit staff members Liaison Office in ECOWAS, 2) to institute a functioning quarterly planning meeting of	➤ The leadership should spend more time on strategic thinking to improve the coordination mechanisms, establishing institutional capacity and financial accountability, sustainable revenue generation and fundraising. ➤ WANEP may consider introducing the following two management principles: 1) a <i>centralized strategic planning and implementation oversight</i> which mainly focuses on a) responsibility of the Secretariat in the follow-up of the implementation of the WANEP-wide strategic plan; and b) oversight responsibility to ensure the financial accountability of the NCCs; and 2) <i>decentralized programme-national planning and implementation</i>, which devolves the task of planning and implementation to NNCs with the support of the programme director and staff members in the Secretariat. ➤ While an improvement is expected with the recruitment of the M&E Officer, WANEP lacks a systemic culture of monitoring and evaluation. ➤ Carry out capacity building training on Results Based and Value Added Management for programme staff. ➤ WANEP may need to prepare an M&E Manual with relevant templates (baseline, risk analysis, development of indicators). ➤ WANEP needs to integrate 1) M&E and 2) Impact Report with its 3) Sustainability Index to look all aspects of performance ➤ A short-training course on strategic planning, performance
--	--

³⁸ Minutes of WANEP Staff Retreat, 13 – 16 February 2012, Mensvic Hotel, Ghana.

steering committee of WANEP with the ECOWAS and the AU, 3) consider annual seminars.

management, communication skills and impact reporting could prove beneficial.

2.4 EVALUATION OF EFFICIENCY

2.4.1 Administrative efficiency

WANEP has clear organizational structures, managerial support and coordination mechanisms that effectively support the delivery of the programmes. It has a membership based General Assembly, an oversight Board, a Secretariat with programmatic, planning, oversight and a coordinating role, as well as representative NNCs at national levels.

ANALYSIS OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS						
FOR THREE YEAR PERIOD 2010 - 2012 in USD						
ITEMS	Funds Available 31/12/12	Prog. Expenses	Admin. Expenses	Total Expenditure	Remaining Balance 31/12/2012	Remarks
SIDA	2,641,295	1,194,840	1,179,584	2,374,424	266,871	90 % Budget Execution rate
MDG3 IFOR WPP Program	1,352,891	1,108,136	228,495	1,336,631	16,260	
ARD EWARDS	525,645	396,067	129,578	525,645	-	
Finnish Program	467,145	204,602	118,324	322,926	144,219	
ECCP-GPPAC	211,722	191,759	48,464	240,223	(28,501)	
WAPI Expenses	252,516	154,664	97,852	252,516	-	
IBIS Justice Lens Program	230,737	156,342	74,395	230,737	(0)	
STAR GHANA	100,000	48,912	15,994	64,906	35,094	
G-RAP Core Project	78,269		38,110	38,110	40,159	
MacArthur Foundation	75,000	70,597	4,403	75,000	-	
IBIS Rapid Response	70,105	69,128	977	70,105	-	
Transitional Justice Project (NPI)	40,000	18,176	16,358	34,534	5,466	

WANEP Strategic Plan	34,640		34,640	34,640	-	
IFOR WPP Programme	27,645	1,500		1,500	26,145	
ECOWAS Data Collection	20,383	20,136		20,136	247	
OXFAM	6,234		72	72	6,162	
Urgent Action Fund	5,000	5,000		5,000	-	
G-RAP ICB Project	951			-	951	
GRAND TOTAL	6,140,178	3,639,859	1,987,246	5,627,105	513,073	
Ratio Programme/ Budget		64.7 %	35.6 %			
Ration for Sida		50.3 %	49.7%			

The total budget of for 2010-2012 was 6,140,178. Sida's fund (2,641,295) constitutes 43 percent of the total budget. The ratio of programme expenditure to total budget is 64.7 percent, while for Sida funding WANEP utilized 50.3 percent for programme and 49.7 percent for administration expenditure. The budget execution rate of Sida's funding is very high at 90 percent. WANEP has more than 15 donors in 2010-2012, and Sida's funding is the highest of all donors.

Despite many efforts from the management, the ratio of programme budget-running cost remains unbalanced.³⁹ A previous evaluation puts the programme-running cost ratio as 53%-47% at Network level, and 56%-44% at the Secretariat level.⁴⁰ While the programme cost constitutes the institutional support for national coordinators and their work; running cost constitutes salary, meeting expenses for governance structure of the Board, the Assembly, Annual Retreats, Auditing, and office rent. Given that the programme staff members of the Secretariat including the Executive Director, Programme Director, Head of WIPNET, WAPI, the Monitoring Centre, and NNCs spend their time on their respective programme works, portion of their salary could constitute as

³⁹ Secretariat Key Informant no. 3.

⁴⁰ Sida, Systems-based Audit of WANEP, Swedish Development Advisers, December 14, 2011

programme expense. Thus, the network secretariat, this ratio is an acceptable allocation of budget.

In the past 3 years, 8 staff members of the total 42 (2 from the Secretariat and 6 from NNCs) left WANEP, making the turnover of staff 20%.⁴¹ This shows 24 % turnover rate for NNCs, that is relatively higher staff turnover of NNCs perhaps due their expertise which is sought after by national, regional and international organizations in peace and security. Resignation from the NCCs includes NNCs in Burkina Faso, Liberia, Benin, Guinea, and Mali.

Currently WANEP's (three) Zonal Coordinators' role is complementary to the NNC's work on quality control and weekly report from both state and non-state actors to produce a single report as input to ECOWAS. At the same time, not all Zonal Coordinators are fully functional. While WANEP needs to work closely with ECOWAS, all its structure should necessarily be determined by strategy and efficiency, not by the structure of ECOWAS. Furthermore, taking the benefit and value addition into consideration, the costs of maintaining zonal coordination looks rather unjustifiable. The Reviewer is of the opinion that WANEP needs to conduct a review of the efficiency of maintaining the zonal structure.

2.4.2 Financial efficiency and integrity

There is not significant mismatch between the budget allocated and budget utilized so far. With the exception in the case of NNCs of Guinea Bissau who reportedly⁴² was engaged in financial misappropriation, WANEP has high reputation for its financial integrity.⁴³ The Secretariat offers a specific amount of support annually to the NNCs and it monitors utilization and timely liquidations of the specified amount. Nevertheless, funds transferred from the Secretariat are not received on time. A continuous problem related to finance is the delay in the

⁴¹ Competent experts that left WANEP include Mr. Murtala Touray, Warn Coordinator, Mr. Takwa Suifon, who has joined the AU Commission in November 2009 and Mr Simon Asoba, WANEP-Benin joined Friedrich Ebert Foundation-West Africa Programme.

⁴² KPMG, Management Letter for the year ended December 2011, November 2012.

⁴³ Minutes of WANEP Staff Retreat, 20 – 23 January 2010, Sogakope – Volta Region, Ghana.

liquidation and inadequate submission of documents and authentic receipts in support all expenditure. On average, there is a delay of a month from the required time of liquidation. This makes financial control more challenging. There were also submissions of receipts that “look doubtful and create a great deal of inconvenience which may include tarnishing the image of the organization.”⁴⁴ The problem of liquidation was also related to delays in implementation of activities as soon as funds were secured and released. In this regard, WANEP lacks key institutional and financial policies identified by previous evaluations.⁴⁵ These include Procurement and Fraud policies.

Key Findings Grade: B- high efficiency	Comments/Recommendations
• WANEP is lean in its administrative aspect and thus its administrative costs vs. programmatic costs remains balanced. All costs associated with maintaining the current structure and offices are justified. • From the perspective of efficiency and impact, the Zonal Coordinators make no significant contribution.⁴⁶ • WANEP still faces difficulty concerning the timely liquidation of funds sent to the national networks and the submission of original receipts and supporting documents from suppliers to the regional secretariat.	➤ The reviewer is of the opinion that the human and financial resources allocated for the Zonal Bureaus would have been made WANEP efficient if used for re-establishing and strengthening the WANEP Liaison Office to ECOWAS in Abuja. ➤ The next strategic plan needs to critically examine the purpose and value of addition Zonal offices. ➤ Financial accountability and reports from the Networks still require systemic improvement.

2.5 EVALUATION OF SUSTAINABILITY

2.5.1 Ownership, Capacity Building and Leadership

WANEP programmes on human security, conflict prevention and Peace-building are strongly supported by ECOWAS, national governments, CSOs and local institutions. These institutions do demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue the efforts and activities supported by the

⁴⁴ The same was identified as a shortcoming in the 2010 Staff retreat.

⁴⁵ Sida, Systems-based Audit of WANEP, Swedish Development Advisers, December 14, 2011.

⁴⁶ WANEP Key Informant no. 4

programme and/or replicate them in some cases. Establishing the ownership of WANEP is very difficult. While the constituent units of WANEP are its 550 national network members, nonetheless, one cannot say these network members entirely own WANEP. Neither does WANEP own the national network members, as they have their separate existence. As the constituent units of the network, the *de jure* ownership resides in the members and the governing bodies, including the General Assembly and the Board. Although the Secretariat has significantly more power than usual roles of coordination and clearing office, it exercises the *de facto* ownership of the network.

At any rate, long-term sustainability rests on the capacity building of these members. As indicated above, a decentralized approach not only helps in ensuring sustainability of the projects, but also in building the capacity of the national networks, and sustainability thereof. With more decentralization, NNCs could sustain the work without the Secretariat. Without more devolved arrangement, sustainability will still be dependent on the network. The impacts and achievements discussed in parts of this Review dedicated to relevance, impact and effectiveness, attest to the ability of WANEP to identify, train, capacitate and motivate communities. This ability to engage with people, including chiefs and other eminent persons and institutions in many countries, is one of the organization's strengths and this allows for the building of local knowledge and ownership of relevant processes. This indicates not only the relevance but more importantly the sustainability of the work that WANEP does. If strategically managed, the nature of the network by itself will provide the required sustainability mechanism for its members.

Another critical area of improvement is the need for an in-built institutional mechanism for succession of leadership. Despite repeated internal discussions and preparations on the issue of succession within WANEP, nevertheless, many of the key informants express the concern that WANEP Secretariat is highly

dependent on the leadership of the Executive Director.⁴⁷ As founder, the long-serving Executive Director of WANEP, Mrs Emmanuel Bombande, has played a tremendous role in the development of WANEP, its visibility and credibility. The name ‘WANEP’ is intertwined to the work and reputation of the Executive Director.⁴⁸ This is not unique to WANEP, rather a norm in many African similar institutions such as the Institute for Security Studies, and ACCORD. What is more WANEP currently is efficiently managed both at the Program and Administrative levels by the Program Director and Administrative Manager respectively. However, what has been, and still is, a very valuable asset for WANEP might also be the very problem that inhibits growth by creating heavy dependency on the Executive Director for the sustainability and visibility of the organization.

As per a feedback from WANEP, some on-going discussion has been conducted for some time now at WANEP governance and management level.⁴⁹ However, no consolidated, official and institutionalized and recorded succession plan was discerned by the review. Hence, WANEP needs a succession plan for the leadership particularly the Executive Director. WANEP Secretariat has confirmed that this is one of the planned activities and the governance structures of WANEP will consider the matter after this mid-review.⁵⁰ Such succession plan needs to appreciate the vital role of the current leadership, and takes into account the needs to devise an exit plan that ensures the succession without disruption of the work of WANEP. Thus, a succession of the Executive Director needs a proper planning that will be implemented in the last years of the next strategic period. The process of succession could begin through an arrangement for Sabbatical leave for the current Executive Director during which a succession plan could be implemented while the Executive Director is jointly leading the network with his successor. Inclusion of personalities who served as directors of WANEP into the Board may also need institutionalized approach so as to ensure transfer of institutional memory and experience.

⁴⁷ Partners Key Informant no. 10.

⁴⁸ Partners Key Informant no. 2

⁴⁹ Secretariat Key Informant 3, and Partners Key Informant No 10.

⁵⁰ Feedback from WANEP on the First Draft, 16 April 2013.

2.5.2 Financial sustainability, fundraising and resource mobilization, as well as risk management

Concerns related to the heavy dependency of WANEP on few traditional donors have been also raised by many of the key informants as another serious challenge to the sustainability of WANEP. WANEP is in a situation of heavy dependency on a limited number of donors previously USAID and now Sida. Some NNCs entirely depend on financial support from the Secretariat.⁵¹ Very reactive and responding only to many short-term calls for proposals, WANEP approach to fundraising increases the workload of the staff and gives the impression of an organization that is spreading itself thin.

On the positive note, key informants from WANEP and the AU appreciated Sida's partnership and funding modality that is based on common understanding of the priorities of the region, WANEP and ECOWAS. More importantly, they indicated that the existing partnership empowers and capacitates WANEP to take responsibility for the financial accountability, effective management and in the long term of building the capacity to sustain in WANEP and those benefiting from WANEP's services. For instance, Benin-WANEP's was successful to make use of its research on "crisis that undermine women's groups and associations of income generating activities" funded by Sida to raise more funding from other sources.⁵²

Nevertheless, WANEP does not have non-traditional funders such as China, and Gulf countries as well as private foundations in USA and Europe. As a measure of long-term sustainability, WANEP has to make proactive, well-thought out concerted effort to diversify its resource and funding base.

While it has all the elements to attract resourceful donors, but WANEP has not sufficiently marketed its services either to raise funding or generate revenue

⁵¹ Minutes of WANEP Staff Retreat, 13 – 16 February 2012, Mensvic Hotel, Ghana.

⁵² Key Informant- NNC 3.

through consultancy. The implications and consequences of withdrawal of a donor could be enormous. WANEP is not able to provide middle-term employment security to its staff, and the staff turnover could even get higher. On top of this, WANEP does not have institutional preparedness and financial risk management strategy such as endowment. Consequently, WANEP remains in a fragile financial situation, which brings about negative consequences for the sustainability of the organization and of its programme.

For example, the sustainability of WAPI will be challenged until its courses are geared towards full cost recovery through revenue generation from course participants. WAPI is a capacity building wing of WANEP. Recently it has become global in the sense that trainees include from non-African countries. The Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) is currently subsidizing courses by WAPI from its core funding.⁵³ KAIPTC support for overhead cost of WAPI may not last long which will put more financial constraints on WAPI. While the revenue generation potentials of WAPI need to be explored more to cover the cost of trainings, WAPI has to focus on catering the specific demands West Africa, ECOWAS as well as AU request. WAPI needs to raise funding, generate revenue through aggressive marketing of its courses to the AU and RECs and other entities. WAPI may need to consider fee differentiations for those from Africa and other regions, and cost-sharing arrangement with ECOWAS and AU.

WAPI has some options: raise more funding, has to charge individual and institutions participants attending course to cover all or majority of the expenses, introduce fee depending on capacity and origin of the participants; it has to decrease the number of courses and participants. With the AU and ECOWAS as well as other institutions, WAPI should proactively approach and propose for cost-sharing arrangement including with African, Asian, European and American

⁵³ Partners Key Informant no. 1

universities that may be interested in sending their degree students to attend for specific graded course on African Peace and Security.

With extremely relevant and highly demanded projects that have significant impacts on the ground, WANEP, with the endorsement of ECOWAS, AU and member states, could raise more funding and increase its revenue generation from its services. ECOWAS and WANEP already have experiences in joint fundraising such as in the work on violent extremisms in Nigeria. ECOWAS is making use of and need to continue to make use of WANEP for specialist analysis of national level peace and security issues. WANEP, on its side, needs to request ECOWAS to create a basket fund for the CSOs complementary works. It has to lobby ECOWAS to access part of the multi-lateral funds for peace and security.

Key Findings Grade: C- medium sustainability	Comments/Recommendations
- Throughout the interviews, all key informants indicated and explained that Sida's approach respects the priorities set by WANEP. This constitutes one measure of ensuring sustainability of the project. - WANEP Secretariat is more focused on the implementation of programmes. It lacks deliberate and continued effort on building the capacity of national and local network members, beneficiaries and partners. The WANEP could bring more sustainability through more decentralization to the extent that the network members and NNCs could function with less dependency on the Secretariat. - Given the work required and demanded by WANEP, and the limited number of technically competent people, WANEP Secretariat is thinly spread. Due to his extensive experience, irreplaceable role played by the current Executive Director in the foundation and growth of WANEP, the Secretariat seems highly dependent on the Executive Director. As a result, WANEP is heavily dependent on few officials, particularly the Executive Director, risking sustainability.	➤ Sida should continue to support WANEP. ➤ A suggestion in this regard is to plan an internal leadership capacity building and succession plan that could be implemented in the next strategic plan. The succession plan may consider a Sabbatical leave for the Executive Director while he still discharges his responsibility and oversees the transition and assist his successor. ➤ WANEP/Sida should approach and encourage donors to establish a basket funding. The idea of establishing Joint Funding Arrangement between Sweden and Denmark is highly appreciated. ➤ Establish Fundraising Committee from its Board composed of prominent Board members and patrons ➤ The next strategic plan (2015-2019) of WANEP may include designing of strategies for fundraising and resource mobilization, financial risk management that takes into consideration the concerns

• NNCs are dependent on the Secretariat activities-based funding, not project multi-year budget. • WANEP faces serious challenge related to financial sustainability as it is entirely dependent on few donors, and its funding base is not diversified. It has to work to reduce the dependency on the core support Sida and other few donors provide. To lower dependency on traditional donors, some similar African organizations are approaching non-traditional donors and African institutions and governments including South Korea, Brazil, and middle-eastern countries and corporate funding as alternative sources of funding including private companies and government. • WANEP does not have fundraising and resource mobilization strategy/plan. WANEP engages in some income generation but in fragmented and <i>ad hoc</i> approach. It is time to consider a long-term planning. Such long-term planning may consider sustainability and a strategy for resource mobilization. • WANEP has made name but has been weak in making use of its name for revenue generation. It is also time for WANEP to aggressively collaborate with AU beyond the participation in ECOSOCC. • With the AU and ECOWAS as well as other institutions, WAPI should proactively approach and propose for cost-sharing arrangement including with African, Asian, European and American universities that may be interested in sending their degree students to attend for specific graded course on African Peace and Security. • WANEP needs to develop a revenue generation strategy that aims at revenue generation through a well-targeted and regulated consultancy based on in-house capacity of WANEP.	expressed in this review. ➤ WANEP need to approach beyond its traditional donors including France, Canada, South Korea, China, Japan, private companies, foundations and Gulf countries. ➤ Build capacity of national networks in fundraising through trainings. ➤ WANEP should also take the challenge of encouraging African donors such as ECOWAS, AU, ADB, ACBF and the governments of Nigeria and Ghana. ➤ Currently fundraising work is done by all the leadership of the Secretariat. With an aim of locating the responsibility and coordination role in one office, WANEP may consider appointing a Grant Manager. In order to reduce cost, a suggestion in this regard is to add the responsibility of grant management <u>temporarily</u> to the M&E Officer. Increasingly, donors demand impact for their funding. Linking fundraising with M&E may help both in efficiency and effectiveness of the work as well as in instilling the culture of M&E in WANEP. ➤ WANEP should consider developing a Strategy for Financial Risk Management which may include establishing Endowment of cash reserve that could cover the total expense of running WANEP for 2-3 months. This will be a contingency plan for times of financial crisis. Depending on the commitment of the leadership, amount revenue generated by WANEP (WAPI and consultancy), and the willingness of donors, endowment could be incremental beginning with an average of 5% of the annual budget of WANEP.
---	--

3 Conclusion and Recommendations

Criteria	Successes	Challenges	Way Forward
Very high relevance	✓ WANEP's programmes are extremely relevant and highly demanded projects. ✓ Main partners and beneficiaries such as ECOWAS and national governments as well as local communities request WANEP for its interventions ✓ WANEP played a vital role in ECOWARN and currently, WANEP provides the backbone data for the functioning of ECOWARN. ✓ WANEP enjoys special privileged relationship with ECOWAS. ✓ WANEP programmes are also relevant to the priorities of donors.	• Decline of the strong partnership of ECOWAS and WANEP • Weak partnership with the AU • Due to centralized programme planning, WANEP was not swift in its response to country- specific situations and demands like the crisis in Mali and in Benin	Maintain the demand-driven services Secretariat should focus on supply-driven interventions in response to newly emerging threats to peace and security such as it happened in Mali and elsewhere. Establish a fully functioning WANEP Liaison Office to ECOWAS Revitalized quarterly exchanges between WANEP/ECOWAS Carry out an assessment of WANEP's cooperation with ECOWAS that can be used as input for new MoU when the current one expires. Use the re-negotiation of new MoU in 2014 to consider robust and new areas of cooperation with ECOWAS. Establishing Partners Forum for current and potential donors as well as key partners mainly ECOWAS, and the AU

4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Very high impact	✓ WANEP's intervention has brought significant changes on the ground.	• WANEP has no or little systematic recording and reporting of change and impact stories.	Develop a communications strategy including impacts. Establish network-wide 'Impact Report' that record and report of significant success stories and achievements Establish system of publishing of letters of request or appreciation for intervention and citations or reference by major stakeholders and partners
------------------	---	---	---

4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

High Effectiveness	✓ The six programmes of WANEP supported by Sida are effective. ✓ WANEP's sustainability index and grading of effectiveness is good. ✓ WANEP has coherently articulated programmes ✓ WANEP has recruited an M&E Officer ✓ WANEP has improved its narrative report by including some outcome indicators	• Relevance and effective delivery of services and visibility varies from country to country. • WANEP failed to establish a functioning liaison office and steering committee of WANEP with ECOWAS and the AU • Lack of sufficient involvement of networks and NCCs to design programmes • Lack of clear articulation in the language of Result-Based and Value-Added Management • Lack of systemic culture of monitoring and evaluation	WANEP and its different governance organs, notably the board, and the NNCs need to be more functionally integrated, communication-wise effectively networked and financially accountable Adopt nimble organizational structure in responding to the peculiar circumstances and needs of the countries Carry out capacity building training on Result Based and Value Added Management Capacitate NCCs to search and build their own niche and initiate projects that are relevant and effective on the ground
--------------------	---	--	---

High Efficiency	✓ Clear and lean organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms that effectively support the delivery of the programme ✓ High level of financial integrity ✓ Highly qualified management team that performs both programmatic and management duties ✓ Administrative costs vs. programmatic remains balanced.	• In terms of value for money, Zonal offices not justifiable • Delay in the liquidation and inadequate submission of documents and authentic receipts in support of all expenditure • Secretariat is heavily involved in programme planning, implementation and technical training • <i>De jure</i> decentralized, <i>de facto</i> centralized programmes	Spend more time on strategic thinking to improve the coordination mechanisms, establishing institutional capacity and financial accountability, sustainable revenue generation and fundraising. Financial accountability and reports from the Networks still requires systemic improvement <i>Maintain centralized strategic planning and oversight of implementation and financial accountability; and decentralized programmes planning and implementation</i>
-----------------	--	--	---

4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Medium sustainability	✓ Network as mechanism of sustainability of the project ✓ Sida's enabling and assisting sustainability	• Lacks deliberate and continued effort on building the capacity of national and local network members • Entirely dependent on few donors • Heavily dependent on few officials, particularly the Executive Director, risking sustainability • No fundraising and resource mobilization strategy/plan • No financial risk management plan • Fragmented and <i>ad hoc</i> approach to revenue generation	Sida should continue to support WANEP Maintain current donors, approach new but traditional donors to establish partners forum and a basket funding Approach non-traditional donors including private sector, foundation and African donors Develop a succession plan and capacity building within the leadership of WANEP Develop strategies for fundraising and resource mobilization, financial risk management
-----------------------	---	---	---

Annex 1 – Inception Report

I. Introduction

By starting with the aim of the consultancy, this Inception Report provides the methodology to be employed, the specific deliverables, timeline and the budget breakdown for the consultancy. Draft Table of Contents of the main output—the Report of is also provided in the annexure for consideration, and comments.

II. Main Purpose of the Consultancy

As provided in the ToR, the main purpose of the consultancy is to undertake an evaluation that assesses the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the projects implemented by WANEP funded by Sida from 2010 to 2012, and provide strategic lessons and recommendations for future partnership between WANEP and Sida (see the ToR).

III. The Content of the Study⁵⁴

The Study shall provide the following three major components:

⁵⁴ See the Annexure for a tentative draft Table of Contents.

1. Assess the impact and advancement made of the set goals as contained in the logical framework
2. Evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programmes
3. Provide strategic lessons and recommendations for WANEP, Sida and other stakeholders

IV. Methodology

1. **Comprehensive desk review** of basic policy and operational documents, reports and organisational literature specified under **VI**
2. **Online, telephone and face-to-face interviews** with relevant institutions and personalities identified in 3 below. These interviews will provide an opportunity to assess and substantiate the review.
 - a. **Location visit**—in order to conduct face-to-face interviews with individuals and consult documents identified. These location visits would provide an opportunity to secure information from relevant personalities in WANEP, partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries within their respective context.
 - b. **Face-to-face interviews** – In order to better gauge the successes and challenges in the implementation, face-to-face interviews with relevant personalities will allow for a more comprehensive evaluation. It will also assist in identifying the major lessons and recommendations.
 - c. **Online, telephone interviews**- when face-to-face interview is impossible for any reason or follow-up interviews are necessary with those face-to-face interviewees, then online or telephone interviews may be conducted.
3. Visits to, and interviews will be conducted with the following institutions:
 - a. WANEP-Accra and Abuja

- i. Regional and national Board members
 - ii. Management
 - iii. Staff members
 - iv. National Network Coordinators
 - v. National Programme Staff members
 - b. RECs-Abuja
 - i. ECOWAS-Early Warning Directorate Staff
 - c. AU—Addis Ababa
 - i. AU Commission- Peace and Security Department
 - ii. ECOSOCC Secretariat
 - d. Selected partners—Accra
 - i. KAIPTC
 - ii. TOSTAN
 - iii. FAS
- 4. Comments from WANEP and SIDA on the First Draft Report of the Review
- 5. Stakeholders for Consultation on the Second Draft Review Report
 - a. WANEP
 - b. ECOWAS

c. KAIPTC

d. AU

V. Specified Deliverables

In addition to this Inception Report, the consultant will deliver the following outputs:

1. **Interview Questionnaire** (structured, semi-structured and open interviews)
2. **First Draft Report of the Review**
3. **Second Draft report** – consolidated based on feedback and comments received
4. **Presentation of the consolidated report** to Sida/WANEP *if required*
5. **Final Report** – after compilation of all feedback
6. **Final presentation of the report** *if required*

VI. Timeframe and Approach

Work commences as soon as the contract is signed (last week of January 2013 if possible) and will be completed within 20 working days, at the end of February 2013.

Given the tight project time frame within which this task has to be completed, the Consultant will be supported at critical times by an assistant with French language proficiency) who will facilitate communications and travel arrangements. Moreover, she will translate documents that are in French. This will be vital to ensure the quality and timely completion of the work.

VII. Working documents

The main working documents for this consultancy will be:

- d. Consultancy ToR
- e. Agreement between Sida and WANEP,
- f. WANEP strategic plan (2010-2014) and other policy documents,
- g. Organizational Structure of WANEP,
- h. The System-based Audit Report (2011),
- i. Other Assessment Reports of WANEP,
- j. Programme and project action plans,

Other working documents

- a. Reports of projects and meetings,
- b. Official correspondences,
- c. Profile projects and staff members and so on

VIII. Evaluation Management and Quality Assurance Plan

All written products and deliverables undergo a 3 Level quality assurance process as follows:

- a. **Level 1** – Self-check by the consultant to ensure technical accuracy and correct use of language.
- b. **Level 2** – Review by Sida/WANEP to ensure readability, technical accuracy, correct use of language and compliance with the ToR and compliance with Sida formatting/style.
- c. **Level 3** – Stakeholders review to ensure readability, correct use of language and compliance with Sida's formatting/style

IX. Budget

X. Plan of Action for the Study

Serial	Task / Output	Commence	Complete	Remarks
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
1	Phase I: Desktop Review <u>Inception Report.</u> Discussion and amendments and approval. <u>Research:</u> conduct comprehensive desktop research, review of basic policy documents. <u>Develop Questionnaire/interview protocols</u> for subsequent interviews. (Will be attached in as an annex to the main report). Decide who to interview in person/phone/email and send meeting requests to those identified. <u>Finance:</u> SIDS approval of all the flight, allowance and other costs and a daily sustenance allowance as per the EU rate.	5 Feb	8 Feb	Contracts signed, Inception Report and communications process approved by SIDA/WANEP <u>Information Request.</u> Discussion conducted with SIDA in Addis and WANEP in Ghana by phone. Initial request for all previous material developed as part of the collection and review of knowledge. Preparations for visits and interviews, Communications made WANEP/SIDA will write a letters informing selected institutions and personalities and also will provide the consultant with e-mails and fax address. Confirmation of all required points of contact and requests for meeting/interviews made. The consultant will buy tickets. <u>Risk:</u> Delay in financial approval may postpone the visit by weeks. <u>Delay in contract signing, confirmation from interviews.</u>

Serial	Task / Output	Commence	Complete	Remarks
	Phase II: Face-to-Face interview and Visit to Accra and Abuja <u>Visit:</u> WANEP, ECOWAS and other partners in Abuja, Accra, KAIPTC and others to conduct extensive consultations and interview as well as research. <u>Interview:</u> Co-ordination kick off meeting and initial meetings with concerned bodies. <u>Documents:</u> During the visits, in addition to the interviews with selected focal points, a written documents and report will be solicited and collected from the institutions visited.	13 Feb	20 Feb	After confirmation is made to meeting requests, the actual visit to Accra and Abuja takes place. <u>Risk.</u> Risk is that the officials of ECOWAS, WANEP, KAIPTC and others are not available at short notice within the specified time frame. <u>Mitigation.</u> Alternative personnel will be identified to ensure a range of interviews are conducted over a particular period so that should primary interviews fail to be achieved then there are a range of secondary interviews in place.
2	Phase IV: Write up of the Draft Report I Transcribe and draft/ Interview reports recorded and conduct analysis.	26 Feb	2 Mar	

Serial	Task / Output	Commence	Complete	Remarks
3.	Phase V: Presentation of draft Report I to SIDA and the wider stakeholder group, and Solicit Review and Comments Deliverable: Draft Report I Continue Reading and Refinement of Draft Report.	6 Mar	Same day	<u>Assumption</u> –SIDA/WANEP will review and provide comments on the first draft report and refinement of the report will be conducted by consultant based on the comments. <u>Risk.</u> Delay in feedback or request for clarification from SIDA/WANEP may cause some delay.
6.	Phase VI: Consolidation of Comments into the Draft Report II	7 Mar	8 Mar	<u>Assumptions.</u> The format and style of the report is agreed at the start of the project. <u>Risk.</u> In case many stakeholders are involved in commenting on the draft report, clarifying any final points and comments require time including possible new research efforts. This may delay in the finalization and submission of the final Report.
7.	Phase VII: Submission of Final Report to SIDA	13 Mar		

TENTATIVE TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Research Methods

An Overview of the Review

OVERVIEW OF KEY FINDINGS AND CHALLENGES

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS AND CHALLENGES

LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PART II: ANNEXTURE

Terms of References

Bibliography

Mission schedule and list of people met/interviewed

Basic Documents and Submissions

Annex 2– List of Persons Interviewed

Names	Organisation	Position
Partners (Individual and Focus Group)		
Mr Takwa Syifon	AUC	Expert, Former WANEP Programme Director and Liaison Officer to ECOWAS
Dr Jide Okeke	AUC	Expert, Early Warning Department
Mr Mohamed Jalloh	UNoWA	Sahel Advisor
Mrs Florence Iheme	ECOWAS	Acting Director Early Warning Directorate
Dr Gueye Abdou Lat	ECOWAS	Head, Early Warning System
Mr Valence Kadja	ECOWAS	Programme Officer-Analyst, Early Warning System
Mr Moussa Dabal	ECOWAS	Head of Bureau, Zone-1 Early Warning System
Dr Kwesi Aning	KAIPTC	Dean and Director, Faculty Academic Affairs
Mrs Levinia Addae-Mensah	KAIPTC	Director for Plans and Programmes
Mr Lawrence Lachmansingh	UNDP-Ghana	Peace and Governance Advisor
Mrs Vivian Bruce-Tetteh	UNDP-Ghana	Peace Analyst
Mr Simon Asoba	FES-Abuja	Programme Manager and Former WANEP-Benin NNC
Mrs Myriam Wedraogo	GIZ-ECOWAS Support-Abuja	Adviser, Peace and Security
Mrs Jennie Baldé	Tostan	Director of Grants Management and Assistant to the Founder
Harriet Williams Bright	FAS	Advocacy Officer New York
WANEP Staff		
Mr Bombande, Emmanuel	WANEP	Executive Director
Mr Chukwuemeka B. Eze	WANEP	Programme Director
Mr Vincent Azumah	WANEP	Monitoring and Evaluation
Mrs Esther Gordon-Mensah	WANEP	Administration Manager
Mrs Giesel Vedogbeton	WANEP	Finance Head
Ms Edwidge Dede Mensah	WANEP	Programme Officer, PMC
Ms Mfreke Ukpa	WANEP	Programme Officer, PMC
Ms Bijoue Kesia-Onam Birch	WANEP	Programme Officer, WIPNET
Mr Ifeanyi Okechukwu	WANEP	Nigeria-NNC
Ms Julien Ossou	WANEP	Benin-NNC
Mr Coulibaly Tiohazon	WANEP	Côte d'Ivoire-NNC
Individuals		
Mr Murtala Touray	Exclusive Analysis	Former WARN Coordinator

Annex 3 – Documents Consulted

Agreement between Sida and WANEP on Support of Enhancing Civil Society Capacity in Human Security, Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding during the Period 2010-2012, November 2010

Strategic Plan 2010-2014, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

Enhancing Civil Society Capacity for the Promotion of Human Security, Conflict Prevention and Peace Building, Revised Funding Proposal to Sida, July 2010, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

WANEP, Narrative and End of Project Report (January 2010- December 2012), Submitted to Swedish International Development Agency (Sida).

Official financial reports 2010-2012

Support to West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP), Sida Decision on Assessment and Preparation, 12 March 2010, Sida.

Narrative & Progress Report to Sida (Jan-Dec 2010 to Jan-Mar 2011, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

WANEP Detailed Implementation Plan (Dip) Sida Year 3, 2010.

WANEP Programme Implementation Matrixes, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

*Overall Three-Year Contribution Budget Breakdown for Sida, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.
WANEP Financial Reports to Sida, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.*

WANEP Financial Statements for the years 2008, 2009 & 2010, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

MoU with ECOWAS (2009 -2014)

WANEP Updated Staff List, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

Organizational Structure of WANEP

Sida, Systems-based Audit of WANEP, Swedish Development Advisers, December 14, 2011.

Audit Reports for the years 2008, 2009 and 2010, 2011 KMPG, Accra, Ghana.

Capacity Building Project Year 2 Detailed Implementation Plan, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

KPMG, Management Letter for the year ended December 2011, November 2012.

Assessment Mission WANEP, USAID-West Africa 13-17 August, 2012, Accra, Ghana.

Early Warning Directorate in Collaboration with the Directorate For Political Affairs, Department for Political Affairs, Peace and Security, Early Warning System and Response Mechanism Review, Final Report, Abuja, 30 November 2012.

Minutes of WANEP Staff Retreat, 13 – 16 February 2012, Mensvic Hotel, Ghana.

Minutes of WANEP Staff Retreat, 20 – 23 January 2010, Sogakope – Volta Region, Ghana.

Minutes of 2010, Staff Retreat, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

Minutes of Annual General Meetings, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

Minutes of Management Meetings, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

Minutes of Procurement Committee, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

Minutes of Programme Meetings, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

Minutes of Regional General Assembly meetings, WANEP, Accra, Ghana.

Various Official correspondences, including emails.

The OECD/DAC, Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies. Paris, available from

<http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/7571/index.htm> (accessed January 2013).

About Us, WANEP Official Website, available from <http://www.wanep.org/wanep/about-us-our-story.html> (accessed April 5, 2013).

Watch the video on the site www.wanep.org or http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=XocL-ZbbwLs#at=20



The Mid-Term Review of The West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

