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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

This report is the independent mid-term evaluation of the project “Support to Criminal Justice and Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic project”, implemented by the UNODC Office in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan (refer nr KGZT90). Implementation commenced in December 2009 and projected to close in December 2016, with an overall budget of USD 9,500,000.

Establishing an effective criminal justice system is one of the main priorities of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic since the country became independent after the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. Organized crime is considered a threat to security in the country as the porosity of sections of the Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan borders is exploited by organized crime groups to traffic drugs overland, mostly using Osh city as a hub. According to official statistics, between 20 and 30 per cent of all Afghan heroin transits Kyrgyzstan. In addition, crime rates are high. As of December 2014, there were 27,070 registered crimes in the country with more than 16,000 offenders. Crime trends reflect the prevailing socioeconomic difficulties with approximately 78.2% of crime suspects being unemployed. 47% of all crimes committed are economic in nature (e.g. theft, robberies) followed by violent crimes at a rate of 31.3%. The penitentiary policies applied to those convicted of crime are merely of a punitive nature rather than focusing on the reintegration of prisoners into society. No new prisons have been built and necessary renovation and reconstruction of living areas and other infrastructure in existing places of detention have not yet been undertaken or completed. Badly run prisons characterized by under-staffing and poor living conditions have also created favorable conditions for radicalization, with increased indications that some prisoners are turning to extreme religious or other radical thinking. Criminal recruitment, drug trafficking and abuse, and violence among prisoners are of major concern. Budget allocations for courts, law enforcement bodies and the penitentiary system are insufficient and efforts to bring criminal and other legislation in line with the 2010 Constitution and with international standards are still ongoing.

1 http://www.state.gov/j/inl/rls/nrcrpt/2014/vol1/222916.htm
The objective of KGZT90 is defined as ‘To strengthen the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic through improvement of prison management and social reintegration of offenders, enhanced multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice and strengthened forensic services’. It is supported by four outcomes:

1. ‘Counterparts adopt normative frameworks and strategies in line with UN standards and norms on crime prevention and criminal justice supported by one output,

2. ‘The prison administration manages prisons effectively, in line with UN standards and norms for the treatment of prisoners, promoting social reintegration of offenders’ supported by five outputs,

3. ‘The Government of the Kyrgyz Republic adopts and implements policies to increase public trust in the police’ supported by six outputs and

4. ‘The State Forensic Centre under the Ministry of Justice improves the provision of forensic services in line with international standards’ supported by three outputs. The outputs include delivery of capacity building activities, infrastructure development, equipment provision, legislation/policy improvement, and cooperation mechanisms.

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation was to measure the project’s achievements, lessons learned as well as areas requiring improvements identified during the implementation of the project activities in the Kyrgyz Republic. The evaluation covered the period of project implementation from June 2012 to March 2015.

**Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation methodology is based on the analysis of the OECD-DAC established evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Additionally, the

---

evaluation studied the extent of UNODC partnerships and cooperation with external partners and stakeholders as well as human rights and gender consideration during the design and implementation of the project, as per the Evaluation ToR. The evaluation was carried out in three phases:

- In the Inception Phase, a review of project-produced documents in the desk study was conducted and subsequently an Inception Report describing background and proposed evaluation methodologies including evaluation instruments was submitted to the UNODC, revised, and cleared by the Independent Evaluation Unit;
- The Site Visit to the Kyrgyz Republic and Data Collection Phase consisted of semi-structured interviews with a representation of key project beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders, site visits to the beneficiaries agencies and attendance of the project’s event along with surveys among UNODC staff, project partners and trainees;

In total, more than 100 project documents have been reviewed, 70 interviews with key project informants and project staff were held, and 42 stakeholders participated in the survey.

**Evaluation Findings**

**Design**

The project has a comprehensive design consisting of 4 components with 15 estimated results, and about 54 activities to be accomplished both on the national and provincial level in the course of its implementation. Evaluation interviews demonstrated that in spite of numerous revisions, the project was designed in a highly participatory manner and based on the strongly consultative approach to address the existed needs of the recipient government and respective beneficiaries’ agencies.

**Relevance**

As evident from the desk review of documents and interviews, the project is entirely consistent with priorities affirmed in both Government and UNODC programming documents\(^3\). Moreover, it constitutes the implementation modality for Sub-Programme 2 Criminal Justice and Anti-Corruption the new UNODC Integrated Country Programme (ICP) of Assistance for Kyrgyzstan for the period from 2014 to 2016.

Based upon an analysis of the triangulated data, in overall the project is relevant. There are no other actors providing a similar type of technical assistance in the Kyrgyz Republic, targeting the same stakeholders in the field of criminal justice reform.

Amongst the interviewed stakeholders, there was a consensus that the particular added value of the project is that it is the only project of the UNODC in Central Asia, which has such an all-embracing scope in the field of criminal justice reform that combines technical and capacity building assistance to the beneficiaries’ agencies (prison service, law enforcement and forensic service) with assistance in harmonization of the national legislation in line with UN standards and norms.

---

\(^3\) UNODC Medium Term Strategy 2012-2015, the UNODC Strategic Framework 2014-2015, the UNODC Strategic Outline for Central Asia and South Caucasus 2012-2015 and UNODC Thematic Programme on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice 2012-2015
Efficiency

Significant funds have been raised by the KGZT90 since start of implementation in 2010. In March 2015, the total amount of funds raised was $4,859,655 (USD, which is 1.4 times more in comparison to the year when the project was originally developed. In reviewing of the financial documents obtained from the desk report there is still a project short-fall of approximately $1,194,459 (USD). In review of the project’s disbursement history, the implementation has been cost-efficient and demonstrates good value for money. Overall, the project management structure is perceived by the project’s stakeholders as effective and the one which allows reaching sustainable and meaningful results. The project team is highly professional and recognized by donors and national counterparts as providing a significant contribution to the reform of the criminal justice system in the Kyrgyz Republic. Information gleaned from the desk review documents confirms the project has good M&E system; however, the project’s oversight function of its implementing partners is insufficient and requires improvement. The project management team pays attention towards ensuring a proper visibility of the KGZT90 through its own webpage on the UNODC web-site, social media, information campaigns, photo exhibitions, and documentaries, publications (news briefs, press releases, leaflets, posters, facts and figures, and analytical reports), nevertheless the project does not have a separate communication officer and all this work is undertaking mainly either by the International Project Coordinator or Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

Partnerships and Cooperation

The project is implemented in a consultative and participatory manner through well-established coordination mechanisms. The KGZT90 was able to establish strong partnership with the prison service, while the project still experiences difficulties in forming fully productive cooperation with the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic, especially in the area of gender and minority representation in the police. The project has impressive progress in establishing a sustainable platform for donors’ coordination in the field of judicial reform and engagement with civil society to facilitate police-community interaction. In reviewing the provided documents and holding interviews with donors’ representatives, it became obvious that project’s proactive engagement with donors has resulted in supportive relations and resource mobilization to cover new areas (police reform, forensic services). The project has also very good collaboration with other UN agencies in the framework of the PBF (including OHCHR, UNDP, UN Women, UNHCR) and other international partners (OSCE, SaferWorld) on police reform and crime prevention. In addition, the KGZT90 is having good synergies with other UNODC projects in the Kyrgyz Republic, in particular with the project “Strengthening the State Service on Drug Control of the Kyrgyz Republic” (KGZT50). Whereas the project communicates effectively on the central level, the project attitude towards communication with the national partners in the provinces and in particular in the project’s pilot locations needs to be improved.

Effectiveness

Based on triangulated data the project has made progress in achieving its outcomes in strengthening the capacity of the criminal justice system in the Kyrgyz Republic.

The overall delivery of outputs under Outcomes 1 and 2 are perceived as highly satisfactory and all planned activities have been already completed and others are on track. The main supporting factors comprising:

(1) Legal reform component: involvement of both international and national legal experts who provide expert commentaries and different type of expertise (human rights, anti-corruption) in order to ensure its further relevance and implementation, and participation in
the process of legislation expert community, non-governmental organizations and international partners;
(2) Prison Reform component: accurately chosen focus of the project - improving sanitary conditions, social rehabilitation and security in the penitentiary facilities.

Delivery of outputs under Outcomes 3 and 4 are assessed as either satisfactory or somewhat satisfactory. The main reason for that is a number of challenges faced by the project including:
(1) Police reform component: readiness to conduct systemic police reform initiatives, cultural and political sensitivity of such issues as gender and minority representation in the police, high turnover of the MoI management, lack of public demand for reforms in the area of the rule of law as well as lack of transparency, insufficient access to information and weak independent oversight mechanisms;
(2) Forensic Service component: agreement among the Government, Ministry of Justice and State Forensic Centre on future development of the centre and forensic services in the country as a whole along with the lack of funding to fully respond the needs of the SFC, in particular in terms of forensic equipment and relevant training.

Impact

The impact of the project is substantial. A considerable impact can be found in the improvement of prison management, social reintegration of offenders, security situation in the penal system, reduction in morbidity and deaths of prisoners and increase in drugs seizures. Early signs of positive impact could also be observed in legislation reform, police reform and forensic service components, namely:

(1) development of a new criminal legislation, which in case of adoption will humanize criminal law and create a more adversarial criminal justice system with better guarantees for the presumption of innocence and equality before the law;
(2) introduction of competitive recruitment, which promotes merit-based hiring practices of police officers, development of a 7 step action plan on women in policing, creation of a roster of qualified female officers who can be considered for management positions and introduction of a new police performance evaluation policy, which could lead to a more gender balanced and ethnically diverse police service, as well as greater transparency and accountability of the police;
(3) development of crime prevention plans can contribute to the implementation of the provisions of the Law on crime prevention; strengthen cooperation between police and local communities from all ethnic groups on crime prevention and public safety, which can lead to the decrease in the crime rates on the local level;
(4) accreditation of forensic laboratories can improve the quality of forensic service and contribute considerably to quality and the long term sustainability of forensic services in the country.

Sustainability

From the onset, the project recognized the importance of ensuring national ownership at every stage in order to achieve sustainability; therefore, all its activities have been designed and/or revised in close coordination with national counterparts, although the project does not have a separate sustainability plan.

The most sustainable are the results under prison reform and legislative reform components. The results of the police reform and forensic services components require longer term UNODC support for ensuring sustainability. It relates to such areas as gender and minority representation in the police, implementation of new or revised policies on competitive recruitment, performance
evaluation and disciplinary practice in the police service and accreditation of forensic laboratories.

**Human Rights and Gender**

The project is guided by the UN Norms and Standards in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and implements its activities in relation to criminal legislation, crime prevention, police reform and prison reform based on these standards. This involves: (1) Participation: includes representatives of civil society, human rights activists and NGOs supporting vulnerable groups in the PSC, roundtables and other meetings to ensure that they have a voice and may influence the implementation of the project; 2) Non-discrimination and support to vulnerable groups: developed training programme for the prison staff with focus on human rights, considered also the specific focus on female offenders, conducted advocacy to ensure vulnerable groups have access to the improved bathing facilities; (3) Oversight and accountability: supported and involved in its work the Ombudsman, the NPM and oversight councils to ensure better independent oversight; conducted specific monitoring on rights issues, such as disciplinary measures and the plight of prisoners who are placed in isolation 4) Strengthening legal guarantees: works to bring criminal legislation in line with international standards; e.g. the draft new penal code strengthens legal safeguards for prisoners; previously developed laws and bylaws increased access to lawyers, increased contacts with the outside world etc. Specific attention has also been given to contribute to fulfilment of the National Action Plan on implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security and in particular its two key priority interventions, i.e. gender analysis of policies and practices relation to women in the police and training on gender sensitivity.

**Conclusions**

The KGZT90 is a complex intervention with interlinked components, designed in a participatory manner and important pre-requisites for strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic. It has a high relevance, staking its claim as a central intervention in the field of criminal justice reform in the Kyrgyz Republic. The project has been cost-efficient with producing high quality of deliverables at reasonable overall cost, with an adequate project management structure for effective project’s implementation and highly professional project team. It is implemented in such a way that effective partnerships with government counterparts, donors, agencies of the UN family and other international and civil society organizations were set up and contributed to the establishment of strong cooperation ties, trust, mutual understanding and cooperation, especially under prison reform and legislative reform components. Despite a challenging environment, the project shows good progress in achievement of the set targets under all its components, but especially under prison reform and legislative reform components.

Based on the analysis of prison service data and interviews with prison service staff, the project enjoys a considerable direct impact under prison reform component (decrease in prison disturbances and prisoners’ morbidity, improvement in living conditions in prisons and competence of prison officers as well as social reintegration of offenders). The signs of potential impact in longer term can be seen in legislative reform, police reform and forensic services components. Information gleaned from the desk review documents and interviews with project’s stakeholders’ show that the project has good prospects for sustainability, especially for prison reform and legislation reform components. The human rights and gender have been effectively mainstreamed across the project; however, the project should focus more on anti-corruption in criminal justice system and fight against gender-based violence.
Major Recommendations to UNODC Bishkek

UNODC should consider introduction of dedicated legal experts for police reform and forensic services components who can work on the content of laws on a daily basis to ensure better results in the area of criminal legislation reforms.

UNODC should continue to work on the promotion of alternatives to imprisonment, improving prison conditions and security, strengthening human resources policies in prison system.

UNODC should work further with the Government Administration for ensuring better accountability and transparency of the work of the state enterprise Kelechek.

UNODC should consider developing its deliverables in the future with a larger focus on strengthening legal knowledge and awareness of citizens, developing legal aid and capacity of lawyers, building a culture of lawfulness through information campaigns, strengthen the capacity of civil society to promote police reform and developing measures to combat corruption in the police service.

UNODC should give additional attention to ensure anti-corruption is a core component in criminal justice work and consider how it can more fulsomely support the fight against gender-based violence in its programming.

UNODC should fundraise for ensuring provision of sufficient support for the State Forensic Center in attaining international accreditation under ISO 17025.

Main Lessons Learned

A broad-based consultative and responsive process to support project planning and design is effective in securing strong ownership for project objectives and programming approaches both among national partners and the members of the donor community.

To mitigate risks associated with a possible change of leadership of partner organizations, it is necessary to ensure that the project builds a broad set of working relationships with senior and middle management throughout the organization.

The experience of the project demonstrates the priority which must be given to investing in building and maintaining inclusive partnerships with government partners, civil society and donor representatives either through existing mechanism or creation of the dialogue platforms.

Building effective synergies with other international partners increases the impact of intervention and ensure the most efficient and effective delivery of activities for beneficiary agencies.
## SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The intervention was found to be central in the field of criminal justice reform in the Kyrgyz Republic.</strong></td>
<td>Meetings with Government officials and counterparts, UNODC staff, donor representatives.</td>
<td>UNODC should further continue to promote the rule of law in the country using a comprehensive approach combining legislative, prison, police and forensic services reforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The project is innovative and has an all-embracing scope in the field of criminal justice reform.</strong></td>
<td>Meetings with Government officials and counterparts, UNODC staff, donor representatives.</td>
<td>UNODC should consider replication of best practices and lessons learned from the project to future or on-going projects of UNODC in other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The project aligned well with national as well as donor strategies.</strong></td>
<td>Meetings with donor representatives, Government officials, UNODC staff. Review of project documents.</td>
<td>UNODC should maintain and where possible further develop its relations with the donor community and national partners to maintain the cooperation network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The project made efforts to improve the normative and institutional framework to combat corruption in law enforcement; however, the work on anti-corruption should be further strengthened.</strong></td>
<td>Feedback from interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders, UNODC staff.</td>
<td>UNODC should incorporate the work on anti-corruption as a specific objective of the criminal justice programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity of project’s implementing partners varied across country. At the same time, project’s oversight function of its implementing partners is insufficient and requires improvement.</strong></td>
<td>Feedback from interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders, UNODC staff. Project records.</td>
<td>UNODC should pay more attention towards capacity building of its implementing partners through organization of trainings/mentoring as well as undertaking systematic supervision of their work in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The project was instrumental in commencing collaboration between Prison Service and Drug Control Service.</strong></td>
<td>Discussions with UNODC staff, meetings with Government stakeholders, project records.</td>
<td>UNODC should work further on strengthening the cooperation between Prison Service and Drug Control Service to ensure better combating illegal drug trafficking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement.

5 Recommendations are proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a project/programme; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions of communication officer in the project is undertaken either by International Project Coordinator or Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.</th>
<th>Meetings with UNODC staff.</th>
<th>UNODC should consider introduction of a post of a communication officer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Legal reform component**  
The main legal and regulatory framework in penitentiary system was designed with participation of UNODC as it has a full-time legal expert. | Discussions with UNODC staff, meetings with Government stakeholders, project records. | UNODC should consider introduction of dedicated legal experts also for police reform and forensic services components. |
| **Prison reform component**  
Although, a state enterprise Kelechek was created for further development of prison production and improvement of the conditions of detention of prisoners, it requires further strengthening. | Feedback from interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders, UNODC staff. | UNODC should work further with the Government Administration for ensuring better accountability and transparency of income-generating activities. |
| **Police reform component**  
Success of crime prevention strategies depend not only on the effective collaboration between police and civil society. | Meetings with Government officials and counterparts, UNODC staff. | UNODC should focus more on strengthening of legal knowledge and awareness of citizens, developing legal aid and capacity of lawyers. |
| **Forensic services component**  
Accreditation of forensic laboratories was found to be a very complicated as well as lengthy process. | Meetings with counterparts, UNODC staff. | UNODC longer term support is necessary to ensure sustainability of this initiative. |

### Important recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of ownership is diverse under different project’s components.</th>
<th>Meetings with Government officials and counterparts, UNODC staff.</th>
<th>Ownership still needs to be reinforced under police reform and forensic services components.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although the project was highly successful in fundraising, it has still a funding short-fall.</td>
<td>Discussions with UNODC staff, project records.</td>
<td>UNODC should work further on securing funding for implementation of all planned activities under KGZT90 which are crucial for ensuring sustainability of project’s results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

This report is the mid-term independent project evaluation of the project “Support to Criminal Justice and Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic”, implemented by the UNODC Office in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan (refer nr KGZT90).

Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union and gaining its independence in 1991, Kyrgyzstan is in the process of building an effective, fair, humane and accountable criminal justice system. It went through a turbulent transformation process which started with civil unrest against nepotism and corruption in March 2005, which led to the removal of the first President Askar Akayev, followed by violent clashes in April 2010. It resulted in the ouster of the second President Kurmanbek Bakiyev and an outbreak of ethnic violence in the south of the country in June 2010 that left at least 470 people dead and 400,000 displaced, of who 75,000 fled to Uzbekistan.6

Economically, Kyrgyzstan is classified as one of two low-income countries in the Europe and CIS region with a per capita gross national income of $1,200 in 20147. Over one third of the population lives in poverty. Poverty rates are high and constitute 41.2% as of 20148. The country’s economy is largely informal (40-60% GDP by different estimations), especially in the service sector and agriculture. In 26% of households, at least one family member is working abroad. The total number of labor migrants from Kyrgyzstan is estimated over 600,000 out 5.8 million population of the country, with majority of them (83%) working in the Russian Federation. The amount of remittances from migrants in 2014 was about $1.9 billion, around 32% of GDP9.

Organized crime is considered a threat to security in the country. According to a Peace Building Needs and Priorities Assessment conducted in 2013, “violent and coercive methods for solving socio-economic problems have become quite common in daily life (e.g. racketeering, crime, blocking roads, raid, violent protests, etc.)”. As of December 2014, there were 27 070 registered crimes in the country with more than 16 000 offenders. The majority of the crimes (60%) were property crimes (theft, fraud, robbery) and crimes in the field of economic activity with 76% of crimes suspects were unemployed or did not study, where 13% were women and 6% minors10. In addition, Kyrgyzstan lies along a significant transit route for illegal drugs moving north from Afghanistan to Russia and other European countries. Illicit drugs are often smuggled through the southern cities of Osh and Batken, as well as the Tajik enclave Vorukh through concealed cargo originating in Tajikistan. Kyrgyzstan’s geographic location, limited resources, weak law enforcement, and politicized judiciary leave Kyrgyzstan vulnerable to exploitation by transnational drug trafficking networks. According to official statistics, between 20 and 30 per cent of all Afghan heroin transits Kyrgyzstan11. Over the past several years, Kyrgyzstan has experienced rising local consumption of drugs, especially heroin and hashish12.

7 http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploreeconomies/kyrgyz-republic
9 http://www.icco-international.com/int/linkservid/5994FA1C-B561-12BF-9E5537DCE46B4883/showMeta/0/
10 http://www.knews.kg/society/61299_60_prestupleniy_sovershennyih_v_kyirgyzstane_v_2014_godu_svyazanyi_s_ekonomicheskimi_voprosami/
11 http://www.state.gov/j/inl/rls/nrcrpt/2014/vol1/222916.htm
12 http://www.knowyourcountry.com/files/kyrgyzstanamlaug14_3_pdf
The prison system in Kyrgyzstan also faces lots of challenges including lack of material conditions, difficulties faced in separating and controlling the prisons population, acute overcrowding, and breakdown of prison industries and lack of prison staff training, which corresponds to the needs of a modern, civil prison system. Lack of package of social public service benefits for prison staff members and insufficient logistical and infrastructure support for prisoners’ detention centers create shortage of professional staff at the penitentiary system. Violence among prisoners is a concern. Provision of adequate healthcare in prisons is still a serious challenge, although the number of prisoners with TB shows a steady decrease, i.e. from 358 out of 9,828 prisoners in 2012 to 321 out of 9,997 prisoners in 2014 and the number of prisoners receiving antiretroviral therapy increased in more than two times, in particular from 72 in 2012 to 167 in 2014. There are also certain positive trends in developing prisoner rehabilitation and income generating activities, as a rule, prisoners are inactive, not engaged in any productive activities, which has a very negative impact on their mental wellbeing and on the general climate of the institutions, contributing to prisoner tension and violence.

Under-funding from the government budget for courts, law enforcement bodies and the penitentiary system is still present and efforts to bring criminal and other legislation in line with the 2010 Constitution and with international standards are still ongoing.

UNODC launched a 3-year project “Support to Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic” (KGZT90) in partnership with the EU on December 18, 2009 with a total budget of USD 3,995,600. The project was designed to contribute to strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic by focusing on one of the most problematic justice institutions in the country - the prison service. The Project had a 6 month no-cost extension by June 2013. Staring from June 2013 onwards the project is funded by the United States Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL). The project continued its support to strengthening capacity of justice and law enforcement institutions with a broader focus on five interrelated elements: enhancing multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice at the central level; revising criminal legislation in line with international standards; developing crime prevention strategies for the Southern provinces; improving integrity and transparency of selected police stations in the South; and developing a national prison security framework. In January 2014, two additional components were added to the project aimed at increasing public confidence and trust in the police and strengthening forensic services with funding from the UN Peace Building Fund (PBF) and INL respectively. To reflect the broader focus on criminal justice issues, the name of the project was amended to “Support to Criminal Justice and Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic”. During that time, KGZT90 was prolonged several times and is planned to be finished on December 31, 2016. The overall budget for the project for June 2013 to December 2016 constitutes USD 5,504,400.

The project’s overall objectives have been reviewed and expanded based upon the project’s revisions. As documented in the last version of the revised project document, the project seeks to: strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic through improvement of prison management and social reintegration of offenders, enhanced multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice and strengthened forensic services. It is supported by four outcomes: (1) Counterparts adopt normative frameworks and strategies...
in line with UN standards and norms on crime prevention and criminal justice; (2) The prison administration manages prisons effectively, in line with UN standards and norms for the treatment of prisoners, promoting social reintegration of offenders; (3) The Government of the Kyrgyz Republic adopts and implements policies to increase public trust in the police and (4) The State Forensic Centre under the Ministry of Justice improves the provision of forensic services in line with international standards. The outputs include delivery of trainings with development of training manuals, technical assistance, policy advice and the provision of legal assistance in setting up legal frameworks and cooperation mechanisms.

The KGZT90 was subject to three EC-ROM (Results-Oriented Monitoring) missions (December 2010, October 2011, and October 2012), a mid-term independent evaluation of project’s Income Generating Activities (IGA) component (July 2012), UNODC Participatory Self-Evaluation (June 2013) and an ex-post evaluation by the EU, performed shortly after the end of the EU-funded part of the project (July 2013).

Purpose and scope of the evaluation

The aim of this independent mid-term evaluation was to measure the project’s achievements; lessons learned as well as areas requiring improvements identified during the implementation of the project activities in the Kyrgyz Republic.

The specific objectives of the evaluation were as follows:
1) Assess relevance of project activities;
2) Evaluate the project’s achievements under each project component;
3) Evaluate early signs of impact on beneficiaries;
4) Providing unbiased recommendations for decision-making for future activities, especially in promoting sustainability.

The mid-term evaluation covers the project implementation starting from June 2012 to March 2015 inclusive.

The mid-term evaluation was initiated by the UNODC pursuant to donors’ requirements and UNODC internal regulations. The mid-term evaluation of the KGZT90 was carried out by an independent International Evaluation Expert between March and May 2015.

The evaluation results will be shared by the UNODC with the project donors and beneficiary agencies in the Kyrgyz Republic.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation methodology was developed in line with the Mid-Term Evaluation Terms of Reference (see Annex 1) and was discussed and agreed with key UNODC project personnel and Independent Evaluation Unit at commencement of the evaluation in order to ensure that UNODC approach towards evaluation have been followed.

The evaluation methodology is based on the analysis of the OECD-DAC\textsuperscript{17} established evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Additionally, the\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} OECD DAC: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee
evaluation studied the extent of UNODC partnerships and cooperation with external partners and stakeholders as well as human rights and gender consideration during the design and implementation of the project, as per Evaluation ToR.

The evaluation utilized a mixed-method approach. Data was collected from multiple sources: a desk review, interviews with key informants, observations and surveys.

1. Desk review:
   - Conducting a desk review and content analysis of all project documents including project planning documents and revisions, progress and expenditures reports, action plans, UNODC Strategic documents, project activities reports, external evaluation reports and statistics.

   Study of all relevant project documents provided comprehensive project background as well as achievements of the project on each of the intended areas (see Annex III).

2. Field mission to Kyrgyzstan during April 6-16, 2015 (Bishkek and four provinces: Osh, Batken, Jalalabad and Chui).

3. In-depth face-to-face or skype interviews with all relevant stakeholders:

   ![Graph showing distribution of stakeholders](image)

   In total, 72 interviews were conducted during field visit to the Kyrgyz Republic (see Annex IV). These key informants were useful in providing clarifications on the Project’s implementation, details of the challenges, good practices and suggestions on areas that merit improvements.

4. Observations:
   - Participation in the coordination meeting with the State Service on Execution of Punishment and State Service on Drug Control in Osh, site visits to (1) penal colonies #2 and #3 in Chui province, (2) refurbished police stations in Tash-Tumshuk, Ak-Sai district as well as (3) micro-district Sputnik in Jalal-Abad city and (4) State Forensic Centre in Bishkek.
The site visits to the beneficiary agencies and attendance of the project’s event gave an opportunity to the Evaluator to get first-hand experience of the events organized; small scale prison income generating activities launched and reconstructed/reconstructed facilities within the project.

5. Surveys\textsuperscript{18}
The structured survey forms were developed to gather information from different group of KGZT\textsuperscript{90} stakeholders, namely: (1) trainees participated in project’s trainings on gender issues and skills development to understand the level of application of the received knowledge and skills into their day to day work; (2) UNODC staff (programme, regional office and HQ) to identify the main lessons learned in the course of the Project implementation as well as (3) project partners (NGOs, Academia and IOs) to determine their satisfaction with the level of collaboration with the Project.

The finalized surveys were distributed among 48 trainees, 14 UNODC staff members and 47 partner contacts. The overall response rate with the breakdown of responses is shown in Figure 1, below.

Graph 1. Survey Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainees</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC staff</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The detailed analysis of the survey results is presented in Annex V.

Limitations to the evaluation

The Evaluator experienced constraints to data collection and analysis and addressed them as follows:

1. Time constraints for consultations and discussions with relevant stakeholders during field mission. During the short timeframe (9 working days) available for the field work on both the national and provincial levels, it was not possible to contact all project beneficiaries, which inevitably limited the quantity of data collected and the depth of analysis.

Mitigation: The mission programme was composed in such way to include all relevant project beneficiaries for each component. In addition, the Evaluator tried to give a chance to all relevant stakeholders to share their opinions about the project through other means except interviews, particularly surveys which were conducted among project’s partners, trainees and UNODC staff.

2. Dependence on Activity reports. KGZT\textsuperscript{90} progress reports of activities and results were an important source of information for this mid-term evaluation.

\textsuperscript{18} The questionnaires were adapted according to the recipient group. The survey forms were shared with UNODC for comments and suggestions prior to finalization and then were translated into Russian and Kyrgyz. The surveys among UNODC staff and project partners were administered using SurveyMonkey software.
Mitigation: Triangulation of data through interviews, survey, research reports, expert commentaries and other publications, visibility materials and media reports produced by the project and the documents of independent donors and agencies.

3. Memory Bias. The recollection by the interviewees of events, which took place up to three years ago, might have resulted in some memory bias.
Mitigation: The Evaluator triangulated (use of three or more sources) its findings as much as possible.

4. Potential lack of willingness of respondents to provide honest responses.
Mitigation: In order to encourage honest responses, the Evaluator informed participants of interviews that all information they provide would be treated as confidential, and opinions collected during the interview would be analysed and presented in the evaluation report in an aggregate form. The surveys among different groups of stakeholders were also conducted in an anonymous way to assure respondents that the results would be confidential and there would be no personal identification information.

5. Delayed effects. By the time of the evaluation, the actual effects of the project’s activities under police reform and forensic services components were at early to mid-performance results stages, which limited possibilities for answering fully the Evaluation Questions 9 and 10.
Mitigation: The Evaluator tried to identify actual effects of the project’s activities under both police reform and forensic services components, but also to discuss the expectations related to these projects.
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Design

The KGZT90 has a quite comprehensive design. Originally, the Project was designed with the intention to promote the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic solely by the means of improving penitentiary system, later the scope of the project was broadened to provide more comprehensive and holistic approach to preventing crime and violence and strengthening criminal justice institutions in the country through enhancing multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice, improving dialogue among local self-government, police and communities on crime prevention, developing the capacity of the police to improve oversight and accountability mechanisms and enhancing forensic expertise quality to establish a foundation for the sustainable management of forensic services.

As a result, the project is now structured of four components to address the identified needs and turned to become a complex intervention with 4 specific objectives, 15 estimated results, and about 54 activities to be accomplished both on the national and provincial level in the course of its implementation.

In spite of numerous revisions (in total 6, where 2 were no-cost extension and 4 cost extension), the project was designed in a highly participatory manner and based on the strongly consultative approach to address the existed needs of the recipient government and respective beneficiaries’ agencies. The activities for prison reform component have been determined through the UNODC assessment mission to Kyrgyzstan carried out in July 2009. Police reform component has been designed based on Peacebuilding Needs and Priorities Assessment conducted in 2013 and related Peacebuilding Priority Plan approved by a joint committee of government bodies, UN agencies and civil society in the country and the UNODC crime prevention assessment conducted in December 2013. Forensic services component has been planned on the basis of initial assessment of forensic services and infrastructure conducted by UNODC in 2011 and then in August 2014 as well as consultations with State Forensic Centre of Kyrgyzstan and INL. In addition, the project revisions allowed UNODC to position KGZT90 as the vehicle for implementation of Sub-Programme 2 on Criminal Justice within UNODC Integrated Country Programme for the period from 2014 to 2016.

The project Logframe is technically sound. In overall, its different components are well defined and a clear logic can be easily identified across the different vertical layers (Project Objective, Results, Outputs) and horizontal components (Objective/Results, Indicators, Baseline situation, End of Project Target, Source of verification and Assumptions), with some exceptions when some outputs are stated as outcomes (e.g. Output 2.3. Improved working conditions and sanitary facilities in four prisons of the Kyrgyz Republic; Output 3.3. Participation and representation of minorities in the police increased; Output 3.2. Integrity and transparency of police services in the Southern provinces improved) or activities (e.g. Output 2.1. Institutional capacity building; Output 1.1. Support to improve criminal legislation and policies in line with UN standards and norms on crime prevention and criminal justice). It happened as the overall LogFrame of the KGZT90 was composed from different project documents developed for specific donors with taking into consideration their requirements. Selected indicators do not reflect to the full extent
project performance/achievements under each Result area, despite being cleared through the standard oversight and quality control channels established by UNODC system-wide. In particular impact indicators for some components are missed (e.g. Component 2 “Prison Reform”, no indicator on social reintegration). Risks and assumptions in general held true. Nonetheless, the project underestimated the willingness and commitment of the Government and Ministry of Interior to develop measures for increasing gender and minority representation in the police in spite of choosing of these priorities in line with the Peace Building Priority Plan and national government policies endorsed by the authorities and signing of the project document by the Minister of Interior and the Head of the Presidential Administration. As a result, the project had to change the approach towards implementation of this activity, i.e. formation of political will rather than provision of methodological support in this area.

In addition, the work on crime prevention has been included in police reform component but could be developed as a separate component, as this not only targets the police, but a range of other actors (local government, local crime prevention centres, social services, educational system). Furthermore, following the completion of the EU-funded “Support to Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic” project in 2013, UNODC has been conducting consultations on ongoing needs in the prison sector, which showed that the deliverables remain highly relevant. However, evaluation interviews demonstrated a need adding of additional components in prison reform component, particularly (1) alternatives to imprisonments and establishing the probation service; (2) strengthening human resources policies in the prison system, including on issues related to competitive recruitment, performance evaluation, disciplinary practice and career advancement; (3) developing a proper prisoner classification system. In terms of improving prison conditions, UNODC should build in a bigger focus on pre-trial detention where conditions continue to be inhumane. Besides after the end of the EU prison reform project, the legislation was highlighted as a separate component. It has allowed the project to fully support the judicial reform process based on the 2012 Presidential Decree and in particular the development of completely new criminal legislation.

Relevance

In a review of the desk material and interviews with the project’s stakeholders, the overall directions laid out in the project document are entirely consistent with priorities affirmed in both Government and UNODC programming documents.

Relevance for the partner country (recipient government and beneficiaries’ agencies)

Information gleaned from the desk review documents and interviews with project’s counterparts confirm that KGZT90 is fully in line with the national priorities of the Kyrgyz Republic in criminal justice sector reforms and needs of the partner country. The project is in support of the National Strategy for Sustainable Development for 2013 – 2017, which identifies strengthening the rule of law, as the key precondition for increased stability and sustainability of the Kyrgyz Republic. The project has direct relevance to the Presidential Decree on Measures to Reform the Judiciary of August 2012 and related Plan of Action approved by the Presidential Council on Judicial Reform in October 2012, which guide judicial reform and on the basis of which expert working groups were created to develop new criminal legislation (Outcome 1). The relevance of the project was further cemented by the Approval of the National Strategy for development of

---

19 i.e. a mid-term evaluation of the national prison reform strategy and a prison reform assessment mission in 2015
penitentiary system of the Kyrgyz Republic for 2012-2016, signed May 15, 2012, which guides prison reform in the Kyrgyz Republic, including legislative reform, improving detention conditions and social rehabilitation (Outcome 2).

Similarly, the project’s priorities in the field of police reform (Outcome 3) are clearly consistent with the Police Reform Measures adopted by the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic in April 2013, which focuses on efforts to “strengthen cooperation between police and population on the basis of social partnership principles in crime prevention, provision of law and order, public safety, and development of the institution of civilian oversight over police work”20. National Action Plan on implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security, which foresees a gender review of the composition of the staff in various law enforcement agencies, including the MoI, as well as educational workshops for law enforcement officers on enhancement of gender sensitivity and acquisition of skills to provide help to victims of violence. The crime prevention activities of the project (Outcome 3) are based on the 2005 Law on Crime Prevention, which aims at identifying, studying, removing and neutralizing the causes and conditions that lead to crime; providing support to groups at risk of offending in order to increase their standard of living and level of individual education and personal development; promoting law-abiding behaviour of citizens; and developing and implementing legal, socioeconomic, organizational, educational, and other special measures to prevent crime.

The project’s objectives in the area of forensic services (Outcome 4) fit closely with the 2013 Law on Forensic Services, which defines guiding principles for forensic services, basic rights and responsibilities of forensic experts, and basic rules for the provision of forensic services in court proceedings.

The project document correctly realised the main challenges faced by the criminal justice institutions in the Kyrgyz Republic (State Prison Service, Ministry of Interior and State Forensic Service), including limited capacity for training for prison staff, lack of opportunities to create large-scale job opportunities for prisoners through development of production, insufficient logistical and infrastructure support for prisoners’ detention in the penal execution system, low level of trust and underrepresentation of gender and minorities in law enforcement agencies, limited capacity of the State Forensic Service to handle the number of requests for forensic services due to both absence of appropriate equipment at forensic laboratories and lack of training on specific forensic disciplines for forensic staff.

The objective of this project, defined as ‘Strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic through improvement of prison management and social reintegration of offenders, enhanced multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice and strengthened forensic services’ is of great relevance to the existed needs of the recipient government and beneficiaries’ agencies.

Relevance for donors

The project has three main donors: EU, INL, and United Nations Peace Building Fund (PBF). Through the strategies of each donor it is clear how this project was of direct support; a view that was further stressed during the interviews that this evaluation held with donor representatives.

The Project’s design was coherent with the “EU 2007-2013 Regional Assistance Strategy for Central Asia”\(^{21}\), which aims to support strengthening of political dialogue with the Central Asian States at regional and national levels and it defines the priorities for the EU cooperation with each Central Asian state, including establishing of “Rule of Law Initiative” by promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, sustainable development, peace and stability.

The activities of KGZT90 clearly were in direct support of the first outcome of the United Nations Peace Building Support Office/Peace Building Fund Priority Plan, which focuses on implementation of “critical laws, policies, reforms and recommendations of human rights mechanisms, including UPR, are implemented to uphold the rule of law, improve access to justice and respect, protect and fulfill human rights”\(^{22}\).

Finally, the project is in support of US INL strategic objectives in Kyrgyzstan for fostering the rule of law within the Kyrgyz criminal justice system, improving the investigation and prosecution of crime in a manner consistent with international standards, including those in the area of forensics in the field of the rule of law and enhancing the capability of Kyrgyz legal and law-enforcement officials to combat crime\(^{23}\).

Relevance for UNODC programming


Graph 2. UNODC Regional/Country or Thematic Programme Outcome to which the KGZT90 directly contributes

| UNODC Strategic Framework 2014-2015 | Sub-Programme 5 Justice “To strengthen the rule of law through the prevention of crime and the promotion of effective, fair, humane and accountable criminal justice systems in line with the UN standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice and other relevant international instruments” |
| UNODC Strategic Outline for Central Asia and South Caucasus 2012-2015 (Priority area 4 Rule of law and criminal justice systems) | Outcome 1 “Improved capacity of the States of the region to prevent crime in accordance with UN standards and other relevant international instruments”, Outcome 2 “Improved capacity of the States of the region to undertake criminal justice reform, administer justice fairly and transparently, to improve access to justice, to strengthen the integrity and transparency of their criminal justice and juvenile justice |
| UNODC Thematic Programme on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice 2012-2015 | Outcome 1: Requesting States have developed and implemented crime prevention and criminal justice reform initiatives, including strategies, action plans and measures in accordance with UN standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice and recognized good practices, Outcome 2: UNODC tools, manuals and training materials are used by Member States to improve criminal justice procedures and practices and to develop, adopt and implement effective strategies and programmes for crime prevention |


\(^{22}\) [http://www.unpbf.org/countries/kyrgyzstan/]

\(^{23}\) [http://www.state.gov/j/inl/rls/fs/178372.htm]
Moreover, the project constitutes the implementation modality for Sub-Programme 2 Criminal Justice and Anti-Corruption (“UNODC supports the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic in promoting the rule of law through strengthening the capacity of the criminal justice system”) under the new UNODC Integrated Country Programme (ICP) of Assistance for Kyrgyzstan for the period from 2014 to 2016, signed on June 23, 2014.

Based upon an analysis of the triangulated data, in overall the project is relevant. There are no other actors providing a similar type of technical assistance in the Kyrgyz Republic, targeting the same stakeholders in the field of criminal justice reform.

Amongst the interviewed stakeholders, there was a consensus that the particular added value of the project is that it is the only project of the UNODC in Central Asia, which has such an all-embracing scope in the field of criminal justice reform that combines technical and capacity building assistance to the beneficiaries’ agencies (prison service, law enforcement and forensic service) with assistance in harmonization of the national legislation in line with UN standards and norms. The project is also working in the new areas, i.e. creation of supportive environment for women and ethnic minorities in the law enforcement agencies and introduction of competitive recruitment of police officers and a more modern performance evaluation system in the police service.

The project remains highly relevant and although the theoretical design of the project remains valid and practical implementation is in line with the agreed Logframe, real impact and sustainability proved to have been much more difficult and strategic in nature than originally foreseen.
Efficiency

Cost-efficiency

Significant funds have been raised by the KGZT90 since start of implementation in 2010. As of March 2015, the total amount of funds raised constituted $4,859,655 (USD). Major donors to the Project have been the EU, U.S. INL and UN Peace Building Fund (PBF). In reviewing of the financial documents obtained from the desk review there is a funding short-fall of approximately $1,194,459 (USD). In interviews with the KGZT90 project staff and in review of the desk material, it was determined that the short-fall was the result of the need to have a co-funding either provided by UNODC or other donors. This is an ongoing project so the funding short-fall must be addressed either through donor support or a project revision. This issue must be addressed, so that all stakeholders are made aware of a possible decrease in project activities.

Graph 3: Project planned expenditures per component

The biggest project component is Outcome 2 “Prison Reform” (about 53%), while for Outcome 3, Outcome 4 and Outcome 1 were allocated about 27%, 18% and 3% respectively of project’s budget.
In review of the project’s disbursement history, the implementation has been cost-efficient and demonstrates good value for money. In spite of increase in the coverage and adding two new components, the project management costs show a steady decrease from 62% in 2013 to 59% in 2014. This is so as the project expanded based on the existed structure left over by the EU project on prison reform.
The project utilization rate is good and as of April 2015 constitutes 58.75% of the overall budget (see Graph 5).

**Graph 5. Implementation rate per year**

The lowest implementation rates are under Component 3 and 4 due to the need of building and renovating of three more community police stations and undertake refurbishment and equipment of the premises of the new building of the SFC.

At large, all project activities were efficient, but especially those which were accompanied by technical support (prison service, law enforcement and forensic services) as it is a very substantial support for the reform process. The activities under crime prevention were also planned in cost-efficient way through quite low cost contracts with civil society organizations to cover all 14 priority areas.

The project maintains thorough records of meetings and all transactions, including when procuring goods and services for infrastructure development as part of the project. In reviewing of the financial documents obtained from the desk report, all procurement is done within the rules and regulations of UNDP. In addition, the project involves representatives of the beneficiaries in the tender commission to ensure shared responsibility. This attentive maintenance of records and adherence to good administrative and financial practice also contribute to the active promotion of transparency and accountability.

**Management**

Overall, the project management structure is effective and allows reaching sustainable and meaningful results. The project is implemented by a project team at the UNODC office in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. In order to ensure the capacity of the project team to implement new activities it was enlarged in 2014 and currently consists of 9 staff members: international project manager (P4), international project coordinator (P3), monitoring and evaluation officer, 2 national project officers, national legal expert, senior administrative assistant, senior finance assistant and administrative/finance assistant. The project also relies on expertise of the short-term experts (international and national) to achieve the set targets under each project component. The roles and responsibilities within staff members are clearly defined.

Evaluation interviews demonstrated that the KGZT90’s team is recognized by donors and national counterparts as providing a significant contribution to the reform of the criminal justice system in the Kyrgyz Republic. Positive observations from interviewees included: the depth of
the team’s technical knowledge of the penitentiary system and the unique partnership established between the UNODC and the Prison Service of the Kyrgyz Republic; legislative initiatives in the area of criminal justice and crime prevention; and the team’s responsiveness and action-orientation.

Gleaned from the desk review documents and from interviews with national stakeholders, the project experienced challenges in working at the local level as the UNODC does not have a field representative. To overcome this, the project introduced the practice of outsourcing to non-governmental organizations, specifically in the area of crime prevention. It helped to organize different activities in the regions including crime prevention campaigns, as well as development of crime prevention action plans.

The sharing of information in particular amongst donors and stakeholders on project progress is done through quarterly Project Steering Committee meetings and regular coordination meetings and perceived by interviewed counterparts as very good. However, agreement on single project activities still requires heavy engagement and consultations on an ad hoc basis. The project management team might consider replication of project’s practice of conducting planning meetings with the Forensics Centre and Prison Service and Drug Control Service at the beginning of the year based on which a detailed annual workplan are officially agreed with each single beneficiary agency during its work with the Ministry of Interior.

Monitoring and Reporting

Prior to 2014, the monitoring has been conducted by the project team with usage of monitoring tools such as work plans, reports and feedback from project partners and other stakeholders, along with regular monitoring site visits. Starting from June 2014, the project has a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, who strengthened substantially the project’s team capacity in results-based reporting and ensured more systematic monitoring of project’s activities within different components. As documented, the evaluator had the opportunity to visit and meet with different project stakeholders, which showed that the project’s oversight function of its implementing partners is insufficient and requires improvement in terms of more regular participation and/or observation of activities organized by them in the regions. In addition, capacity constraints of implementing partners is another issue to look at and need to be addressed by the project through targeted capacity building as part of partnerships with these organisations (including strategic planning skills, research skills, writing skills, substantive training on crime prevention and other concepts etc.).

The reporting of the UNODC (within the organization and to donors) has been in accordance with agreed formats and time-frames. The feedback of donors received during this evaluation shows that the donors are very satisfied with the quality and accurateness of the UNODC reporting (both progress and financial) and appreciate the level of the UNODC responsiveness to their requests and invitation for the thematic monitoring visits to different beneficiary agencies. The project’s annual and semi-annual progress reports are published on the UNODC website and accessible to donors and national stakeholders. Outside the different requirements, the reporting on activities by the project to the Headquarters is done on a monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual basis using

---

25 The Project Steering Committee includes representatives from all beneficiary agencies, the President’s Office and Government Administration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Justice, Ombudsman’s Institute and National Centre for Prevention of Torture, civil society organisations and international organisations active in the field of prison and police reforms.

26 https://profi.unodc.org/
Programme and Financial Information Management System (ProFi) system. UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia provides quality assurance control of the reports. The inclusion of data to measure the extent to which the project activities incorporate human rights and gender issues in the UNODC reporting would be useful as could provide with relevant data-sets to measure the adherence of the project towards UNODC standards in these areas (see section on human rights and gender).

Visibility

The project management team pays attention towards ensuring a proper visibility of the KGZT90. First of all, it is the only UNODC project in Central Asia, which has its own webpage on the UNODC web-site27. Moreover, it uses a variety of communication tools to raise awareness about project’s activities including social media (Facebook28), organization of information campaigns and photo exhibition29, production of documentary30, development and distribution of publications (news briefs, press releases, leaflets, posters, facts and figures, analytical reports). The interviewed stakeholders and surveyed partners confirmed the receipt of project’s publications and consider them as useful. Although, some of them believe that facts and figures (like Representation of women in the law enforcement bodies of the Kyrgyz Republic) could be more informative and should include some basis for comparison and short analysis of provided statistics. Additionally, the KGZT90 distributes information about the planned activities for the next month among project’s partners in the form of monthly calendar, which was highly appreciated by all stakeholders interviewed in the framework of this evaluation. At the same time, the project does not have a separate communication officer and all this work is undertaking mainly either by International Project Coordinator or Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

The evaluation finds that overall efficiency of the KGZT90 is satisfactory.

28 https://www.facebook.com/UNODCCriminalJusticeKG
30 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8D_H7oi9yw
Partnerships and cooperation

The project is implemented in a consultative/participatory manner between the UNODC and national and international partners.

In general, the KGZT90 has good relations with national counterparts and cooperated closely with them both at the stage of project design and delivery of technical assistance package. Practical coordination between the UNODC and beneficiary agencies is quite effective and done through well-established coordination mechanisms, i.e. Coordination Council on Prison Reform, Joint Working Group of Prison Service and Drug Control Service, Working Group of Prison Service on National Prison Security Framework; Council on the Reform and Development of Law Enforcement and Coordination Platform on Police Reform between the state bodies, civil society and international partners, Technical Committee under the Kyrgyz Accreditation Centre of the Ministry of Economy of the Kyrgyz Republic. The project was able also to establish good cooperation with the Prime Minister’s Office, Presidential Administration and the Parliament.

However, it is important to mention that the KGZT90 was able to establish strong partnership with the prison service, while the project still experiences difficulties in forming fully productive cooperation with the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic (MoI), especially in the area of gender and minority representation in the police. This is due to mainly to sensitivity of the topic, staff turnover, quite recent start of the close collaboration between the UNODC and MoI as well as lack of UNODC field representation. The project is employing diverse strategies to address this, including:

- mobilizing support and building public demand for change by facilitating coordination on police reform between all relevant stakeholders, including civil society;
- placing a focus on key reforms that are expected to open up the police service to a more diverse pool of candidates and change the internal working culture, namely the introduction of competitive recruitment procedures for police officers and new police performance evaluation policies;
- refocusing the work at the local level on issues related to crime prevention and public safety as a less sensitive entry point for dialogue between police, local self-government and communities;
- facilitating a dialogue between international partners which support police reform to ensure coordinated response and assistance.

In addition to the project’s work on infrastructure support and crime prevention initiatives, more efforts should be undertaken to establish close working relationship with the partners on sites to activate project initiatives.

There has been impressive progress in establishing sustainable platform for donors’ coordination in the field of judicial reform through establishing an informal mechanism where all interested partners come together during regular coordination meetings and have established a practice of cost sharing and division of responsibilities in support of the development of draft laws. During two years, 13 draft laws on Criminal Procedure and Criminal-Executive Codes have been developed jointly. UNODC played a key role in the development of draft Criminal Executive and

---

31 As per Action Plan to reform the judicial system of the Kyrgyz Republic for 2012-2014, approved by Council for Judicial Reform the President of the Kyrgyz Republic on October 12, 2012 number 2
Criminal Procedure Codes as evident from interviews with national stakeholders and other international organizations. In case of approval of all developed legislation by the Parliament, such collaboration could serve as a role model.

Furthermore, proactive engagement with donors has resulted in supportive relations and resource mobilization to cover new areas (police reform, forensic services). In addition, interviews with representatives of other UN agencies and international organizations demonstrated that the project has very good collaboration with other UN agencies in the framework of the PBF (including OHCHR, UNDP, UN Women, UNHCR) and other international partners (OSCE, SaferWorld) on police reform and crime prevention.

Other partners, from civil society and academia are also supportive of the KGZT90 and the UNODC. This is reflected in the strong appreciation expressed to the Evaluator by key stakeholders for the UNODC transparency and openness in working relationships and information exchange. It was further revealed by the results of the survey conducted among partners (see Annex V). The engagement with civil society became much stronger with introduction of police reform component through establishment of dialogue platforms with civil society in the provinces to facilitate police-community interaction. In addition, the UNODC ensured participation of the civil society and academia in drafting and discussion of the new criminal legislation that was submitted to the Parliament in December 2014 and made meaningful contributions to the improvement of the draft laws.

The KGZT90 is having good synergies with other UNODC projects in the Kyrgyz Republic, in particular with the KGZT50 on fostering cooperation between the Prison Service and the Drug Control Service of Kyrgyzstan, strengthening prison security procedures and improving the capacity of prison staff to prevent illicit drug trafficking in prisons.

As evident from the evaluation interviews, the project has very efficient and close collaboration with the UNODC Regional Office and Headquarters. The UNODC office in Kyrgyzstan reports to the UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia in Tashkent, Uzbekistan and works closely with the Justice Section, the Laboratory and Scientific Section (LSS) and the Regional Section for West and Central Asia (RSWCA) at UNODC Headquarters in Vienna. The UNODC Office in Kyrgyzstan provides an overall management to the project with the support of the HQ, including coordinating backstopping and offering technical, substantial and administrative advice and support throughout all stages of implementation.

Evaluation feedback through interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries and surveys among partners show that cooperation overall was perceived as very good.
Effectiveness

Evidence shows that the KGZT90 has made progress in achieving its outcomes in strengthening the capacity of the criminal justice system in the Kyrgyz Republic.

Graph 6. KGZT90 Results Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>Counterparts adopt legislation and policies in the area of crime prevention and criminal justice in line with UN standards and norms</td>
<td>Output 1.1: Criminal legislation and policies improved in line with UN standards and norms on crime prevention and criminal justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.1: Institutional capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.2: Social reintegration and income generating activities developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.3: Improved working conditions and sanitary facilities in four prisons of the Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.4: National prison security framework developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.5: Project results disseminated to contribute to better public support to prison reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>The prison administration manages prisons effectively, in line with UN standards and norms for the treatment of prisoners, promoting social reintegration of offenders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 3.1: Crime prevention strategies developed in line with UN standards and norms on crime prevention and criminal justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 3.2: Integrity and transparency of police services in the Southern provinces improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 3.3: Participation and representation of minorities in the police service increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 3.4: Participation and representation of women in the police service increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 3.5: Police accountability enhanced through improved complaints handling procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 3.6: Independent monitoring of police performance strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>The Government of the Kyrgyz Republic adopts and implements policies to increase public trust in the police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 4.1: Strategic plan for implementation of the Law on Forensic Services developed, including enhanced coordination and partnerships with law enforcement, courts and other relevant stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 4.2 Forensic capacity and standard operating and quality control procedures enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output 4.3 Training programme for staff of the State Forensic Centre implemented and institutionalized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In support of Outcome 1 (‘Counterparts adopt legislation and policies in the area of crime prevention and criminal justice in line with UN standards and norms’) the following has been delivered:

- Prepared 2 legal commentaries on the draft law on simplified criminal proceedings in case of guilty pleas and 1 paper on special investigative measures in 2013 to inform development of new criminal legislation.
- Provided expert support in drafting of a new law on probation.
- Developed a set of progressive criminal laws (Criminal, Criminal Procedure and Criminal Executive Codes) and submitted to the Parliament in December 2014. 56% of UNODC recommendations to the Criminal Executive Code were incorporated in the final draft
which was approved by the Council on Judicial Reform. The project conducted public
hearings on the drafts in the south and in Bishkek in February and April 2015.

- Co-organized the Fifth Expert Forum on Criminal Justice that gathered more than 65
policy-makers, academics, justice professionals and civil society representatives from
Central Asia and Mongolia on 24-25 November 2014 to discuss reform initiatives,
current challenges and good practices for criminal justice systems.

Feedback from evaluation interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries shows that the overall
delivery of outputs under Outcome 1 is perceived as highly satisfactory and all planned activities
are on track. The results of the project for this component have a great influence on the formation
government policy in the field of criminal justice. The main legal and regulatory framework in
the area of the prison in the Kyrgyz Republic is designed with participation of UNODC. Key
support factors include the involvement of both international and national legal experts who
provide expert commentaries and different types of expertise (human rights, etc) in order to
ensure its further relevance and implementation. Moreover, in the process of legislation drafting
not only the expert community, but also non-governmental organizations as well as international
partners participated. Nevertheless, the project might experience challenges with approval of the
developed legislation by the Parliament and it could take longer than initially expected due to the
regular parliamentary elections scheduled for November 2015.

In support of Outcome 2 (‘The prison administration manages prisons effectively, in line with UN
standards and norms for the treatment of prisoners, promoting social reintegration of offenders’) the
following has been achieved:

- Assistance with the development and adoption of 6 laws, 25 Government decrees, 5
Government decisions and 110 Prison Service orders aimed at improving prison
management and conditions during 2010-2012.

- Development of a new National Strategy for the Development of the Penitentiary System
for 2012-2016, endorsed by the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic in 2012.
Coordination Council on Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic was established and
holds regular meetings, which were facilitated by the UNODC.

- Institutionalization of prison staff capacity development through the adoption of a
training curriculum and manual to guide prison staff training from 2011 to 2015 by
Prison Service Staff Training Centre, accompanied by a comprehensive training
programme, including 16 seminars, 2 training of trainer courses and 2 study visits,
enabling 462 prison staff to upgrade their skills. Four selected prisons were refurbished
(new bath and laundry facilities) during 2012-2013 and became in line with the Standard
Minimum Rules on the Treatment of Prisoners.

- Launching of 6 new prison income generating activities and related professional training
courses in 4 prisons (2 closed and 2 open type prisons), employing 180
prisoners for the
production of bread, soya milk, macaroni, vegetable oil and manufacturing of textiles and
metal products.

- Inclusion of a section on prison income generating activities and vocational training in the
National Strategy for the Development of the Penitentiary System 2012-2016. In 2013,
the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic nominated a Director for the newly established
State Enterprise under the Prison Service. In December 2014 the Government of the
Kyrgyz Republic endorsed Resolution # 705 on strengthening control over the state
enterprises that requires stronger accountability and transparency of income-generating
activities. State enterprise of the Prison Service “Kelechek” that was created with support
of UNODC has also established a Public Council in December 2014. 50 % of members of
this Council are representatives of civil society.
FINDINGS

- Signature of the Memorandum of understanding between the Prison Service and the State Service on Drug Control in December 2012. Joint training plan was developed and officially endorsed by both agencies in March 2013. 169 prison and drug control staff on controlled drugs, psychotropic substances and precursors; criminal intelligence gathering and sharing; and drug treatment and harm reduction were trained.
- Provision of 2-weeks training in Colorado Training School to four senior prison officials to strengthen their capacity in prison management of penitentiary facilities.
- Publishing or broadcasting of more than 175 media reports about the project and prison reform in Kyrgyzstan.
- Conduction of security audit in 2013. Action Plans on implementation of UNODC recommendations on prison security and disciplinary measures endorsed by the Prison Service of the Kyrgyz Republic and working group established to monitor the progress in 2014.

Delivery of outputs under Outcome 2 is perceived as highly satisfactory. Most of planned activities were completed in June 2013, i.e. under Outputs 2.2, 2.3, 2.5; while planned activities under Outputs 2.1 and 2.4 are on track. Key supporting factors for good deliverables is the accurately chosen focus of the project - improving sanitary conditions, social rehabilitation and security in the penitentiary facilities. However, the major factors that hampering project’s effectiveness in this area is still serious underfunding of penitentiary system, weak capacity to implement meaningful reforms and lack of confidence between different state security agencies.

In support of Outcome 3 (‘The Government of the Kyrgyz Republic adopts and implements policies to increase public trust in the police’) the following has been achieved:
- Conduction of the assessment on gender and minority representation in the police in June 2014 and survey on gender and minority representation in the police and access to police services in February 2015.
- New policy on the competitive recruitment of police officers endorsed by the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic on 24 November 2014, which includes UNODC-advocated provisions to increase transparency of recruitment processes and reduce patronimial selection and promotion methods.
- Drafting of new guidelines for police performance appraisal, which were endorsed by the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic on February 24, 2015 and includes provisions for active involvement of the Public Oversight Council, local government and population in the evaluation of the police.
- Provision of training on gender equality and gender sensitivity for 30 senior managers of police departments from 14 priority districts and cities, as well as representatives of the Police Women Association to respond adequately to specific crime problems faced by women.
- Supporting with launching of a study on the labour rights of police officers by the Ombudsman Institute.
- Development of 2 local crime prevention strategies in conflict prone areas in the south of the country (Ak Say in Batken province and Jalalabad city) based on inclusive consultation processes involving local self-government, local crime prevention centres, police and civil society. Crime Prevention Action Plan 2015 – 2017 for Ak-Say, Batken province was endorsed by the local parliament on November 24, 2014.
- Establishment and equipment of 2 community friendly police stations in conflict prone areas in the south of the Kyrgyz Republic – Batken province and Jalalabad city to strengthen the cooperation between police and local communities on crime prevention and public safety based on social partnership principles.
- Provision of training on communication skills and ability to interact with the public for 42 police officers of Jalalabad and Batken.
- Holding of 5 national level police reform coordination meetings, including 1 public forum on building trust in the police with the involvement of members of the parliament and civil society.
- Conducted an information campaign on recruitment procedures and career opportunities (consisting of over 300 school briefings, dissemination of 1500 leaflets, 1000 posters, 10,000 copies of a newspaper dedicated to police work, 2 video ads, and 12 billboards) to encourage youth, women and minorities to apply to the Police Academy.
- Co-funded the conduction of the National Forum of Women in Kyrgyzstam on March 2-4, 2015, where about 1,200 women participated, which focused on issues related to access to justice, violence against women and representation of women in political and public affairs, including in the police service.

Overall, delivery of outputs under Outcome 3 is satisfactory. The project has managed to achieve some positive results (Outputs 3.1-3.3 and 3.6) at the micro level (better community-police coordination, locally owned crime prevention reports, introduction of special measures in the recruitment policy and performance evaluation system, development of accounting database on complaints handling for the MoI’s Internal Oversight Department). At the same time, so far it is quite difficult for the project to achieve tangible results at the macro level (Outputs 3.3-3.6), in particular with regard to increasing the participation and role of women and ethnic minorities in the police and the strengthening of internal and external police accountability mechanisms, although some positive steps are done in this direction, i.e. development of a 7 step action plan on women in policing and the decision of the Minister to create a roster of qualified female officers who can be considered for management positions. The main reasons for that are readiness to conduct systemic police reform initiatives, cultural and political sensitivity of such issues as gender and minority representation in the police, high turnover of the MoI management, lack of public demand for reforms in the area of the rule of law as well as lack of transparency, insufficient access to information and weak independent oversight mechanisms. At the same time, it is necessary to underline that the project has invested a lot in establishing informal relations with MoI staff at the working level (e.g. the MoI Gender Adviser, Internal Oversight Department, Public Safety Department, press service). These efforts have led to a high level of trust resulted in seeking UNODC advice by the representatives of on different matters (e.g. the MoI Gender Advise has received instructions from the Minister to draft an internal order on the creation of the abovementioned roster and contacted UNODC to provide expert assistance with this assignment).

In support of Outcome 4 (‘The State Forensic Centre (SFC) under the Ministry of Justice improves the provision of forensic services in line with international standards) the following has been attained:
- Conducted a needs assessment on legislation, management and training and developed a set of concrete recommendations.
- Provided legal advice on forensic services in the context of development of the Criminal Procedure Code.
- Conducted training for senior staff of the State Forensic Centre on drafting of standard operating and quality assurance procedures.
- Facilitated closer co-operation of the State Forensic Centre with other forensic services of the Central Asian region;
- Developed a roadmap to work towards international accreditation of the State Forensic Centre based on international standards ISO/IEC 17025 in November 2014.
FINDINGS

- Supported the establishment of the post of a Quality Manager in the State Forensic Centre to ensure compliance with internationally recognized standards of provision of forensic services;
- Supported the establishment of the Technical Committee under the Kyrgyz Accreditation Centre of the Ministry of Economy of the Kyrgyz Republic in December 2014 and development of 2015 workplan (including 12 major activities on development of forensic service);
- Increased the level of coordination between forensic laboratories in the Kyrgyz Republic by conducting joint trainings and expert meetings;
- Supported active participation of the State Forensic Service in the UNODC International Collaborative Exercises to ensure continuous monitoring and mentoring in drug analysis.
- Trained 20 forensic experts on quality management and more than 50 forensic experts on provision of forensic services.
- Developed design documentation for the reconstruction works of the SFC new building in February 2015.
- Provided technical assistance with the improvement of the ventilation system and video control in the old building of the SFC.
- Supported the development of an official website of the State Forensic Centre.

Delivery of outputs under Outcome 4 could be assessed only as somewhat satisfactory. Good progress can be seen under Output 4.3, while the project experienced some complications with implementation of the activities under Output 4.1 and in particular the development of the strategic plan for the State Forensic Centre, a draft of which has been only developed in April 2015 following additional meetings with the SFC and the Minister of Justice. Activities under Output 4.2 are only in process of implementation and it is too early to judge about their effectiveness.

The major challenges faced by the project include lack of a joint vision of the Government, Ministry of Justice and State Forensic Centre on future development of the center and forensic services in the country as a whole along with the lack of funding to fully respond the needs of the SFC, in particular in terms of forensic equipment and relevant training. The project is trying to address these challenges through establishing a coordination mechanism involving all relevant State bodies providing forensic services in order to develop a strategic plan for the sector as a whole. Although at the Government level there was lack of readiness to establish a Coordination Council, an inter-agency working group is currently elaborating proposals on the future direction of forensic services in the country.
Impact

The KGZT90 project document has identified three impact results:

a) improve prison management and social reintegration of offenders,

b) enhance multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice and

c) strengthen forensic services.

As this is just a mid-term evaluation; therefore, only short to medium term impact can be identified and projections for anticipated long term impact can be indicated.

A considerable impact can be found in prison reform component as the project determines the main directions for the improvement of penal system in the Kyrgyz Republic, which could be seen through the development and approval of Prison Reform Strategy for 2012-2016. The project has a positive impact on various areas of the penitentiary system including operational activities, increasing the employment of prisoners and improving the effectiveness of their social reintegration.

New prison income generating activities introduced by the project provided employment for about 200 prisoners and allowed them to have funds on their bank accounts to be used to support their families or to be used after their release from prison, which ultimately affects the reduction of recidivism. These income generating activities also generate good profit to the prison service. One of the positive impacts in this area is the creation of a state enterprise “Kelechek” for further development of prison production and improvement of the conditions of detention of prisoners.

In interviews with prison service administration, they confirmed that the professionalism of Prison Service staff has also increased over the years, which can be also seen through the absence of prison disturbances since 2012. In addition, according to the data of Prison Service, there is a decrease of 22% in the number of infectious and parasitic diseases among prisoners, on 18% in skin diseases and on 67% diseases of the nervous system as well as on 18% in the number of prisoners who were first diagnosed tuberculosis during last two years. It could be partly attributed to the KGZT90 and its work on improving sanitary conditions in prisons and introduction of new health policies.

32 As per prison service data, the gross production in 2014 at the IGAs launched by the project constituted 41469.4 thousands som.

33 As per government regulation #778, dd. November 20, 2012
In addition, this work had a significant impact on the improvement of security situation in the penal system, as confidence to the penal system as a social structure of the state started to be emerged among prisoners.

Drugs seizures increased on 1.87 times in comparison to 2012 as a result of intelligence shared between the SSEP and SSDC34. In the long-run, this cooperation could bring even better results in fighting illegal drug trafficking, specifically detecting new channels of distribution of drugs.

In addition, the project has increased opportunities for civil society and other stakeholders to work with the Prison Service on social rehabilitation of prisoners through the establishment of Coordination Council on Prison Reform, which serve as a platform for monitoring implementation of the Prison Reform Strategy 2012-2016 and raising issues of concern. It also allowed reinforcing external oversight of places of detention by civil society.

The work of the project on the issues of security in prison service is likely to have a positive effect in the long-term perspective as adherence to safety in prisons for prisoners and prison staff will ensure observance of basic rights of prisoners like separation of prisoners according to the category of prisoners and create more comfortable and safe working conditions for prison staff.

Positive impact could be seen in the field of legislation reform. UNODC supported the development of a new criminal legislation. Key innovations introduced in the new draft Criminal Procedure Code include provisions for judicial control over the use of special investigative measures by the police and automatic initiation of pre-trial investigations when a crime is reported. These and other provisions strengthen external oversight of the police and improve legal safeguards to ensure that criminal investigations are conducted in accordance with the law, as well as provisions of the new Criminal Executive Code, which strengthen the focus of the prison system on the social reintegration of offenders and contains better provisions on the prohibition of discrimination in prisons, legal aid for offenders and public oversight. In a word, if adopted by the Parliament, new criminal legislation will humanize criminal law and create a more adversarial criminal justice system with better guarantees for the presumption of innocence and equality before the law. In spite of support needed for its implementation, the reform itself will contribute to preventing overcrowding in prisons and expanding alternatives to imprisonment.

Signs of positive impact could also be observed in the police reform and forensic service components in spite of their quite recent start. The introduction of competitive recruitment, which promotes merit-based hiring practices of police officers, is a major policy innovation and is now starting to be implemented, in particular in traffic police and Academy of MoI. In addition, the MoI created a reserve of female police officers who are eligible for management positions and the roster of young female cadets who will be given the opportunity to get work experience in operative work.

The new police performance evaluation policy can over time completely change the focus of police work away from the concentration on crime detection to achieve results. New policy includes provisions for active involvement of the Public Oversight Council of the MoI, local government and population in the evaluation of the police, which is expected to strengthen independent oversight and creating more opportunities for constructive interaction and dialogue.

34 UNODC, report on “Number of Drug (opium/heroin/hashish/marijuana) Seizures based on Prison Intelligence 2012-2014”
In the longer term, these policies can lead to a more gender balanced and ethnically diverse police service, as well as greater transparency and accountability of the police. Refurbishment of community friendly police stations in conflict prone areas in the south of the Kyrgyz Republic can facilitate police-community interaction on crime prevention and public safety in the long run. Early impacts are already observed in the village Tash-Tushmuk, Batken province, where the refurbishment of the police station brought significant decrease in interethnic conflicts\(^{35}\). Development of crime prevention plans can contribute to the implementation of the provisions of the Law on crime prevention; strengthen cooperation between police and local communities from all ethnic groups on crime prevention and public safety, which can lead to the decrease in the crime rates on the local level.

In addition, the attitude of the experts of the State Forensic Services towards quality standards has already been changed due to the work of the project. For the first time ever, the State Forensic Centre introduced a new post of a Quality Manager to ensure compliance with international recognized standards for provision of forensic services. In the long-term, new laboratories of the State Forensic Services will contribute to the improvement of working conditions of the forensic experts; meanwhile the approval of the plan for accreditation under ISO 17025 will put in place a structure to work on better procedures and quality control.

It does not however exonerate the project from its responsibilities to maintain a close watch on developments and achievements of the anticipated long terms effects of the project.

\(^{35}\) As per data of MoI, the number of interethnic conflicts for the 1st quarter 2014 constituted 12 cases, while for the same period in 2015 any cases have been recorded.
Sustainability

Dependent on the nature of the results, and the availability of financial resources, capacity and political ownership, the achievements of the KGZT90 results can be sustainable. Gleaned from the desk review of documents and from interviews with the project team and project’s stakeholders, the UNODC undertakes all necessary steps, which are under its control and within its mandate to promote sustainable project’s outcomes. From the outset, the project recognized the importance of ensuring national ownership at every stage in order to achieve sustainability; therefore, all its activities have been designed and/or revised in close coordination with national counterparts, although the project does not have a separate sustainability plan.

The most sustainable are the results under prison reform and legislative reform components. Many UNODC legal recommendations were incorporated in laws and policies and are obligatory for implementation. The Prison Reform Coordination Council has ensured ownership of the reforms by the stakeholders. Secretariat is now run by the Prison Service and regular meetings continue. In addition, 90% of created\textsuperscript{36} by the project income generating activities in prisons, except production of soya milk\textsuperscript{37} continue to work and involve prisoners in constructive activities as well as ensure that prisoners have regular income to help reintegration after release. The State Enterprise under the Prison Service took ownership for further development of prison production facilities. At the same time, as of now this state enterprise lacks proper fiscal transparency as well as support from correctional institutions for its operation, so the support from the project will still be needed to ensure its proper functioning. Improved sanitary conditions in prisons is preserved and ensured by prison administrations and prisoners. Moreover, a conceptual framework of development and reform of the prison system was outlined in the National Programme for Reforming the Kyrgyz Republic Penitentiary System. The Programme includes a long list of objectives, the fulfilment of which will depend to a large extent on the assistance of international agencies, since the prison service receives only a part of the required funds from the state budget for its work (i.e. only about 30\%-40\%). The cooperation between Prison Service and Drug Control Service is likely to be sustained as it is established on the basis of the MoU, although the support of the project will be still required to ensure its further strengthening. Whilst some progress has been made in reforming the prison service, much remains to be done to bring the management and conditions in prisons closer to the UN standards and norms and guarantee its sustainability in the long run.

The criminal legislative initiatives will be sustainable if key progressive concepts introduced in the drafts remain in the criminal legislation adopted by the Parliament. Based on the interviews held with project’s stakeholders there are good chances for its adoption; however, it might happen only in the first half of 2016 due to parliamentary elections to be held in autumn of 2015.

The results of the police reform and forensic services components give a diverse picture when considering these from the angle of sustainability. On the one hand, the project initiated the development of strategic plan for the State Forensics Centre, which is crucial for sustainable development of forensic services in the country and implementation of the Law on Forensic Services. The project also commenced the development of new or revised policies on competitive recruitment, performance evaluation and disciplinary practice in the police service, which is important in particular for increasing gender and minority representation in the police and

\textsuperscript{36} based on Prison Service data
\textsuperscript{37} due to lack of proper management by prison service
improvement of the police performance in overall. In addition, development of crime prevention plans in priority areas of the Kyrgyz Republic can ensure sustainability of crime prevention activities on the local level. Moreover, it is one of the requirements of the existed law on crime prevention. On the other hand, accreditation of forensic laboratories can improve the quality of forensic services in the country, but it is a quite complicated process and requires some time plus depends on the willingness of the SFC and competence of the staff. So UNODC longer term support will be necessary to ensure proper sustainability of this initiative. Also ownership of MoI for development and implementation of key policy reforms is still insufficient and require much more work for ensuring sustainability.

At the same time, the project tried for all its components to ensure sustainability of the results by paying attention towards capacity building (both ToTs and a series of trainings) of prison service, law enforcement and forensic service staff. These capacities will remain after the lifespan of this project and can contribute towards strengthening the capacity of the recipient country to sustain activities.

In addition, the KGZT90 safeguarded the maintenance and repair of the equipment/building(s) provided to prison service and/or law enforcement bodies through (1) preparation of the certificate of transfer and acceptance as per the national legislation requirements where it is mentioned that equipment/building is entered into the accounting books of the relevant national stakeholders and its maintenance and repair should be done at their expense and (2) UNODC general handover report signed by recipient agencies where it is stated that the UNDOC can do monitoring of proper use of the supplied equipment/building wherever it needed.

The project was effective in engaging with donors and managed to multiply funding commitments over a five year period making it the largest national project of the UNODC Office in the Kyrgyz Republic. This has been achieved through establishment of credible and trustworthy relationships that are likely to be sustained based on the evaluator’s meetings with project’s national counterparts and donors.
Human Rights and Gender

Overall, human rights and gender have been effectively mainstreamed across the KGZT90, with a few technical caveats.

The KGZT90 follows human rights based approach and promotes human rights in implementation of project activities. First of all, the project includes representatives of civil society, human rights activists and NGOs supporting vulnerable groups in the PSC, roundtables and other meetings to ensure that they have a voice and may influence the implementation of the project. Secondly, during the development of legislation, all new draft laws and policies are passing legal, human rights and anti-corruption assessments. Thirdly, the training curricula for prison staff has a separate training module on how to work with vulnerable groups such as women, juveniles, persons serving life sentences and other prisoners with special needs.

Furthermore, the project strengthened realisation of the rights of prisoners through improved prison conditions and enhanced opportunities for vocational training and employment. Furthermore, it improved the plight of female prisoners by investing in the establishment of income generating activities in the women's prison. Besides, in order to improve the health situation of prisoners, sanitary conditions in selected prisons have been improved. The public oversight council and Ombudsman Institution together with the UNODC undertake its oversight to guarantee equal access to the facilities, including for vulnerable groups. At the moment, the project is working on the development of national security framework for state corrections institutions as well as promotion and protection of the human rights of prisoners through revision of Criminal Procedure and Penal Codes which envisage the creation of conditions for social reintegration of offenders, establishment of a probation service and contains better provisions on the prohibition of discrimination in prisons, legal aid for offenders and public oversight creation, and advocating for reforming health care in the prison system (i.e. its transfer to the Ministry of Health).

Specific attention has also been given to contribute to fulfilment of the National Action Plan on implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security and in particular its two key priority interventions, i.e. gender analysis of policies and practices in relation to women in the police and training on gender sensitivity. The KGZT90 helped the MoI with organization of gender sensitivity trainings for police officers to inform them on the national legal and policy framework governing gender equality and assisted with creation of webpage on gender policy in the law enforcement bodies of Kyrgyzstan. Despite the fact that the number of women and minority representation in the police is still not yet increased, the project made important steps in this direction through conducting an assessment on gender and minority representation in the police, police-public partnerships and feasibility of establishing police points and/or patrols with the involvement of women and minority police officers at the local level plus assisting with drafting of new policy on recruitment of police officers, which

38 Stated in Objective 2 ‘Strengthening the role of women in the security sector, defence, law enforcement and emergency situations, including in decision-making’ and Objective 3 ‘Formation of zero tolerance for violence against women and girls in conflict situations’
39 In summer 2014, the KGZT90 conducted two five-day training courses on gender sensitivity for 30 senior managers of police departments from the 14 PBF priority districts and cities, as well as representatives of the Police Women Association and further training plan developed for the roll out of gender sensitivity training in the 14 PBF priority districts and cities and inclusion of gender sensitivity training in staff training.
40 http://gender.mvd.kg/en/
includes special measures aimed at increasing representation and role of women and ethnic minorities in the police (i.e. if two candidates obtain equal results, preference shall be given to the candidate belonging to the underrepresented ethnicity or gender).

The KGZT90 also provides regular inputs to different UN treaty bodies (most recently CEDAW but also SR on torture etc); supports participation of key officials in the reporting meetings of Kyrgyzstan before the treaty bodies and promotes implementation of recommendations from UN human rights mechanisms (e.g. prevention of torture, representation of women and minorities in the police etc).

At the same time, the project does not have sex disaggregated indicators under each project component for all its capacity building activities in its LogFrame, except one indicator under Output 3.4, i.e. Number of police officers trained (disaggregate by gender); although this information collected by the UNODC but was not presented in the progress reports. In addition, the reporting on human rights and gender in the UNODC semi-annual and annual reports is absent, except for several indicators which targeting these areas.

Although, fighting corruption is not part of the KGZT90, the project has nevertheless made efforts to improve the normative and institutional framework to combat corruption in law enforcement as per UNODC mandate and mechanisms, specifically provisions of United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC)\textsuperscript{41}, namely: (1) setting up the State enterprise to manage prison income generating activities; (2) developing new criminal legislation which will strengthen judicial control over the use of special investigative measures by the police; (3) support to the introduction of open, competitive recruitment of police officers; (4) support to the introduction of a new police performance evaluation policy which includes provides for external oversight and (5) work with the police internal oversight department to strengthen its capacity to investigate police misconduct. However, the work on anti-corruption can be strengthened further and incorporated as a specific objective of the criminal justice programme as well as addressed in future in a more comprehensive way by UNODC in Kyrgyzstan.

\textsuperscript{41} Ratified by the Kyrgyz Republic on September 16, 2005
III. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings presented in this report, the mid-term evaluation has come to the following conclusions.

**Design:** The project has a comprehensive design and should be seen as complex intervention. All components of the project (prison reform, police reform, legislation review and forensic services) are interlinked, designed in a participatory manner and important pre-requisites for strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic. In some areas of the logical framework, however, there is space for improvement.

**Relevance:** The project has a high relevance, staking its claim as a central intervention in the field of criminal justice reform in the Kyrgyz Republic, which is entirely consistent with the Government priorities as expressed in official policy documents and UNODC programming documents.

**Efficiency:** The project has been cost-efficient with producing high quality of deliverables at reasonable overall cost. The most efficient aspects of the portfolio are the ones which are accompanied by the technical assistance under prison reform, police reform and forensic services components. Overall, project management structure is adequate for effective project implementation. The project team is highly professional, has highly valued expertise and deeply experienced in the matters of the project.

**Partnerships:** The project is implemented in such a way that effective partnerships with government counterparts, donors, agencies of the UN family and other international and civil society organizations were set up and contributed to the establishment of strong cooperation ties, trust, mutual understanding and cooperation, especially under prison reform and legislative reform components. The project has also effective internal cooperation and coordination with other UNODC Bishkek projects, UNODC regional office and headquarters.

**Effectiveness:** Despite a challenging environment, the project shows good progress in achievement of the set targets under all its components. More visible and substantial achievements can be seen under prison reform and legislative reform components due to much longer work in this area by UNODC, whereas most of activities under police reform and forensic services have been recently launched and are under the process of implementation.

**Impact:** The project enjoys a considerable direct impact under prison reform component (decrease in prison disturbances and prisoners’ morbidity, improvement in living conditions in prisons and competence of prison officers as well as social reintegration of offenders). The signs of potential impact in longer term can be seen in legislative reform, police reform and forensic services components.

**Sustainability:** The project has good prospects for sustainability, especially for prison reform and legislation reform components. Ownership still needs to be reinforced under police reform and forensic services components.
Human rights and gender: While human rights and gender have been effectively incorporated into the project design and implementation, it will be advantageous if the project expand its human rights and gender mainstreaming work through focusing more on anti-corruption in criminal justice system and fight against gender-based violence.

In general, the project has been successful in achieving its objectives up to this point and with the changes recommended has high potential to achieve all outputs and outcomes at the end of the extended implementation period. The particular added value of the KGZT90 is that it uses a complex approach in reforming criminal justice system in the Kyrgyz Republic with introduction of innovative ways in the work with law enforcement bodies. It would be valuable to replicate best practices and lessons learned from the KGZT90 to future or on-going projects in the Central Asia region.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this mid-term evaluation, the following recommendations are made:

General recommendations

Recommendation 1: UNODC Bishkek, Tashkent and Vienna should expand its donors’ base to ensure that adequate funds are made available for future projects. Regular donor briefings should be held in places where donors covering Kyrgyzstan reside and have a decision making power on funding like Astana, Kazakhstan, Vienna, Austria and other capitals. In addition, the project’s inter-components links should be further promoted and offered for donors’ consideration.

Recommendation 2: UNODC Bishkek, Tashkent and Vienna should encourage better coordination of activities at the level of Government Administration to ensure synergies with other programmes funded by the state and international partners.

Recommendation 3: UNODC Bishkek should ensure more clear responsibilities of the beneficiaries’ agencies on the stage of signing the MoUs with them as it might contribute to greater effectiveness and sustainability of project’s results.

Recommendation 4: UNODC Bishkek should provide technical assistance and coaching to its implementing partners in the design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems under crime prevention/police reform component as well undertake more active monitoring and stronger oversight of their work in the regions.

Recommendation 5: UNODC Bishkek should carry on the practice of continued monitoring and oversight based on the good practice established under prison reform component targeting the police in those areas where the project has provided technical assistance and for forensics when the new lab is completed.

Recommendation 6: UNODC Bishkek should consider revision of the project’s Logframe with incorporation of gender-based indicators to ensure gender equality in all its activities as well as development of impact indicators for some components (e.g. Component 2 “Prison Reform”, impact indicator on social reintegration).

Recommendation 7: UNODC Bishkek should ensure conduction of more in-depth training needs assessments prior to organization of trainings to ensure meeting of trainees’ expectations in future criminal justice projects.

Recommendation 8: UNODC Bishkek should consider introducing some periodic meetings between the general project staff and donors, apart from the meetings at the managerial level, to enhance the comprehensive feedback on the project’s activities.

Recommendation 9: UNODC Bishkek should consider introduction of a post of a communication officer to improve communication and outreach of the project to wider number of key stakeholders and general public both on national, regional and local levels.
Recommendation 10: UNODC Bishkek should consider providing additional technical assistance to its staff, e.g. in the form of PCM training, to improve skills on project formulation (especially SMART results and indicators).

Recommendation 11: UNODC Tashkent and Vienna should consider the introduction of the requirement to report on human rights and gender in its semi-annual and annual reports.

Recommendation 12: UNODC Bishkek should strengthen contacts with beneficiaries to jointly address challenges and ensure ownership, particularly under police reform and forensic service components. UNODC Bishkek should consider options for developing stronger regional cooperation with its key stakeholders in priority locations.

Recommendation 13: UNODC Bishkek should undertake a lessons learned exercise and share with its experience of reforming criminal justice system with wider audience including donors and other UNODC offices.

Recommendation 14: UNODC Bishkek should consider the development of op-eds and other analytical pieces that can be published in the media and disseminated amongst target audiences for promoting legislative reforms in the area of criminal justice.

Recommendation 15: UNODC Bishkek should in addition to formulate clear terms of reference and picked organisations based on the results of open and competitive tenders; however, improvements should be made at the planning stage when contracted organisations start their work to clarify the methodology and agree on the work plan.

Specific recommendations

Legislative reform component

Recommendation 16: UNODC Bishkek should continue to work on legislation as a separate component; additional deliverables should be built in on implementation of laws and monitoring of implementation, i.e. working more actively with the Government Administration and the Parliament.

Recommendation 17: UNODC Bishkek should consider introduction of dedicated legal experts for police reform and forensic services components who can work on the content of laws on a daily basis to ensure better results in the area of criminal legislation reforms.

Recommendation 18: UNODC Bishkek should strengthen its advocacy work on new criminal justice legislation among parliamentarians and civil society to ensure support and greater buy in. After the new legislation will be adopted by Parliament, UNODC Bishkek should consider the development of explanatory materials/comments for law enforcement and prison service staff to ensure awareness and proper usage.

Prison reform component

Recommendation 19: UNODC Bishkek should continue to work on the promotion of alternatives to imprisonment, improving prison conditions and security, strengthening human resources policies in prison system.
Recommendation 20: UNODC Bishkek should work further with the Government Administration for ensuring better accountability and transparency of the work of the state enterprise Kelechek.

*Police reform component*

Recommendation 21: Given the current level of commitment to implement the police reform measures and also the continued closed nature of the police service, the project could consider developing its deliverables in the future with a larger focus on strengthening legal knowledge and awareness of citizens, developing legal aid and capacity of lawyers, building a culture of lawfulness through information campaigns, involvement of civil society and strengthening their capacity to promote police reform process in addition to implementation of crime prevention activities as well as legislation drafting and developing measures to combat corruption in the police service.

Recommendation 22: UNODC Bishkek should during provision of infrastructure support and organization of crime prevention initiatives, make more efforts in establishing close working relationship with the partners on sites to activate project’s initiatives.

Recommendation 23: UNODC Bishkek should give additional attention to make anti-corruption a core component in criminal justice work and consider how it can more fulsomely support the fight against gender-based violence in its programming.

*Forensic services component*

Recommendation 24: UNODC Bishkek should fundraise for ensuring provision of sufficient support for the State Forensic Center in attaining international accreditation under ISO 17025.

Recommendation 25: UNODC Bishkek should streamline its capacity building work for forensic experts by focusing more on strengthening their knowledge and skills in different types of expert examinations.
V. LESSONS LEARNED

A number of lessons can be drawn from the experience of implementing the project.

A broad-based consultative and responsive process to support project planning and design is effective in securing strong ownership for project objectives and programming approaches both among national partners and the members of the donor community.

As a means to mitigate risks associated with a possible change of leadership of partner organizations it is necessary to ensure that the project builds a broad set of working relationships with senior and middle management throughout its partner organizations.

The experience of the project demonstrates the priority which must be given to investing in building and maintaining inclusive partnerships with government partners, civil society and donor representatives either through existing mechanism or creation of the dialogue platforms.

Transparency in awarding contracts and in implementing interventions builds trust and goodwill, as does using participatory implementation methods.

In order to have impact on the quality of legislation, it is necessary to be close to the action. Expert commentaries will not have impact if they are not backed up by qualified and motivated members of drafting working groups who can make the concrete changes required.

Building effective synergies with other international partners increases the impact of intervention and ensure the most efficient and effective delivery of activities for beneficiary agencies.

Training, conducted outside the context of a comprehensive and grounded capacity development plan, focusing on the learning needs, circumstances and basic capabilities of those to be trained, as well as organizational priorities, is unlikely to have any impact for either the trainee or the organization.

The following set of actions could be effective in addressing the readiness of the Government authorities to implement reforms: (1) holding meetings with high level officials are crucial for advocating support at a higher political level; (2) provision of assistance with developing normative and regulatory frameworks are essential for guaranteeing the development of a proper legislation in line with UN standards; (3) facilitating of interagency communication and cooperation is a sine qua non condition for strengthening criminal justice system in the country; (4) capacity-building events are critical to helping government agencies to understand, and feel more comfortable with changes required by international standards; (5) international study tours are critical to strengthening the confidence of agency personnel in working toward UN standards; (6) development of infrastructure and provision of equipment are important for increasing the motivation of beneficiaries agencies to implement joint projects.

The implementation of this project sent a strong message that was felt and identified by all parties involved about the importance of stability in the staffing especially on expert-, coordination- and executive levels.
Preparation of facts and figures could serve as a good advocacy tool for promoting legislative reforms in the area of criminal justice, while media coverage of key project’s events help to raise public awareness on these issues.

Whatever the preferred timetables of donors may be, realistic plans for achieving both capacity development and government objectives in the area of reforming of criminal justice system will unfold over a 5-10 year period and possibly longer.
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Project overview and historical context in which the project is implemented

Since gaining independence after the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the Kyrgyz Republic has been going through an at times turbulent transformation process. Civil unrest caused by popular dissatisfaction with nepotism and corruption in March 2005, known as the “Tulip Revolution”, led to the removal of the first President Askar Akayev. In April 2010, violent clashes triggered by public anger at price rises and corruption resulted in the ouster of the second President Kurmanbek Bakiyev. This was followed by an outbreak of ethnic violence in the south of the country in June 2010, which left at least 470 people dead and 400,000 displaced, of whom 75,000 fled to Uzbekistan.43

In 2010, a new Constitution was adopted signalling the start of a transition from a presidential to a more parliamentary system of governance. Parliamentary, presidential and municipal elections took place in 2010, 2011 and 2012 respectively.

Economically, the Kyrgyz Republic remains a low-income country with a per capita gross national income of $2,009 in 2012.44 Over one third of the population lives in poverty. Unemployment, which officially stood at 8.5% in 2011, but in reality is estimated between 14-16%.45 mostly affects young people, in particular those between 20 and 29. Over 70% of the employed population work in the informal sector.46 Lack of decent employment has pushed many skilled workers to migrate abroad in search of a better life.

Organized crime is considered a threat to security in the country. According to a Peace Building Needs and Priorities Assessment conducted in 2013, “violent and coercive methods for solving socio-economic problems have become quite common in daily life (e.g. racketeering, crime, blocking roads, raid, violent protests, etc.)”. This is also related to drug trafficking, as the porosity of sections of the Tajik and Kyrgyz borders is exploited by organised crime groups to traffic drugs overland, mostly using Osh city as a hub. From Osh the opiates are smuggled to Kazakhstan and further on to the Russian Federation either through the Northern Talas province or alternatively via Bishkek.47

Corruption and a lack of transparency and accountability continue to be another threat to the national security and to plague Kyrgyzstan since independence. In 2010 the country ranked 164th out of 178 in the Transparency International Corruption Perception Index (CPI). In 2011 the corresponding figures were 164 out of 182. Corruption has been and still is a daily factor in the lives of the majority of the population.

Within this overall political and socioeconomic context, Kyrgyzstan struggles to build an effective, fair, humane and accountable criminal justice system. Budget allocations for courts, law enforcement bodies and the penitentiary system are insufficient and efforts to bring criminal and other legislation in line with the 2010 Constitution and with international standards are still ongoing.

---

43 Peacebuilding Needs and Priorities Assessment in the Kyrgyz Republic, July 2013.
44 Idem.
In December 2009, UNODC, in partnership with the EU, launched a 3-year project entitled “Support to Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic” with a total budget of USD 3,995,600. The project was designed to contribute to strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic, with a focus on one of the most problematic justice institutions in the country - the prison service, which faces many challenges, such as poor and unhygienic living conditions in prisons, difficulties in separating and controlling the prison population, a breakdown of prison industries and lack of prison staff training.

This project achieved the following results:

- Prison staff capacity development institutionalized through the adoption of a training curriculum and manual to guide prison staff training, accompanied by a comprehensive training programme approximately 500 prison staff to upgrade their skills
- 6 new prison income generating activities and related professional training courses launched in 4 prisons, employing 180 prisoners for the production of bread, soya milk, macaroni, vegetable oil and manufacturing of textiles and metal products; the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic allocated 350,000 EUR and established a State Enterprise under the Prison Service to further develop prison production facilities
- Sanitary conditions and the quality of water improved for 3,000 prisoners (more than half of the overall closed type prison population).

During the initial 3-year life span, the project was evaluated on an annual basis within the framework of the EU’s Results Oriented Monitoring Programme for EC projects in Asia and Central Asia. Follow up plans were developed to implement recommendations received from the EU in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

In 2012, a mid-term independent project evaluation was conducted in order to measure project achievements, outcomes and overall impact of the project activities with a major focus on social reintegration and income generating activities in the prison system of Kyrgyzstan. The major evaluation conclusions were as follows:

“Relying upon the improved functioning of prison production activities, (albeit supported by a number of inputs), to deliver the dual output of both increased income generation and support to prisoners’ reintegration is highly ambitious. Some production units may be efficient at income generation but may not reach many prisoners. However it must be noted that the component has had other positive aspects that can contribute to reintegration and is part of a broad range of project activities that should also facilitate prisoner reintegration”.

“There is a need to build on the work and achievements of the project component as this will be critical in supporting prison service in a transitional phase to enhance the likelihood of increasing adherence to improved prison practice and international standards and norms”.

The project was recommended to:

- work in a coordinated approach at suitably high levels within the State Service on Execution of Punishments and other Kyrgyz Government departments, including the office of the Prime Minister, to ensure the timely establishment of the State Enterprise.
- monitor and respond to opportunities to support the Kyrgyz Government to commence preliminary budgeting work for the State Enterprise to establish if projected income
matches cost of the State Enterprise.

- monitor and respond to opportunities to continue to support State Service on Execution of Punishments in the development of their Income Generation strategy so it is ready in time and is of optimal quality to feed into the Kyrgyz Government’s discussions with other donors.

- consider reviewing the indicator that 200 prisoners will be beneficiaries in a model open colony in view of the fact that open prisons are consistently under populated and actually hold very few prisoners.

- monitor and respond to opportunities to support the Kyrgyz Government to attend to the wide range of obstacles to prisoners’ reintegration under its direct control: ensuring prisoners have identification documents, the provision of basic immediate support under release.

- monitor and respond to opportunities to meet any gaps that may arise from inadequate provision in the project colonies from the State Agency for Vocational Training.

An evaluation follow up plan was developed in order to implement the recommendations of the mid-term independent project evaluation. Upon completion of the EU funded activities in 2013, the project conducted a Project Self-Evaluation. Within this context, in May 2013, a national prison reform conference was held to present the results of the EU funded activities and to evaluate these with project beneficiaries and stakeholders. A report was issued reflecting the discussions and the recommendations made, including a communique adopted at the end of the conference, in which the participants:

- expressed appreciation for the important contribution of the project to prison reform in the Kyrgyz Republic and the improvement of prison conditions;
- took note of the assistance provided to legislative reform, prison staff training and skills development, improvement of prison conditions and promotion of social rehabilitation of offenders;
- expressed support for the effective partnership and level of coordination, achieved between the State Service on the Execution of Punishments under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic, the European Union, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and civil society within the framework of the project;
- stressed the important role of the Coordination Council on Prison Reform, which has united efforts of State bodies, civil society and international organisations;
- acknowledged the sustainability of results achieved and the readiness of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic to continue prison reform within the framework of the National Strategy for the Development of the Penitentiary System 2012-2016;
- noted that the current situation in the prison system requires continued cooperation between government institutions, civil society and international organisations and non-governmental organisations with a view to ensuring a stable and secure prison system;
- emphasized the responsibility of the State to ensure adequate funding for the prison system and at the same time acknowledge the continued need for international donor support.

In 2013, an EU funded and managed independent final evaluation of the implemented activities took place. This evaluation found that the project is highly relevant and addresses a broad range of high priority issues. The evaluation concluded the project met its targets (NB. UNODC informally received an excerpt of the evaluation report; the EU did not share the full report with recommendations).
In 2013, additional consultations were held with national beneficiaries, government and non-governmental partners and interested donors to discuss additional needs and priorities for UNODC support in the area of the rule of law. Based on these consultations and with funding from the United States Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL), from June 2013 onwards, the project continued its support to strengthening capacity of justice and law enforcement institutions with a broader focus on five interrelated elements: enhancing multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice at the central level; revising criminal legislation in line with international standards; developing crime prevention strategies for the Southern provinces; improving integrity and transparency of selected police stations in the South; and developing a national prison security framework. In January 2014, two additional components were added to the project aimed at increasing public confidence and trust in the police and strengthening forensic services. Activities under these components are funded by the UN Peace Building Fund (PBF) and INL respectively.

To reflect the broader focus on criminal justice issues, the name of the project was amended ("Support to Criminal Justice and Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic"). Currently, the project is made up of the following components:

(a) reform of the legal/normative basis for crime prevention, criminal justice, prison reform and alternatives to imprisonment, with focus on the development and application of new, humanised criminal legislation and policy/strategy development on crime prevention, criminal justice and prison reform;
(b) building the management capacity of the prison service via development of a national prison security framework;
(c) support to measures aimed at increasing public trust in the police, including (i) the development of crime prevention strategies in pilot locations; (ii) technical assistance and capacity development aimed at increasing integrity and transparency of police services in pilot locations; (iii) promotion of increased participation and representation of women and minorities in the police; and (iv) enhanced complaints handling procedures and independent monitoring of police performance;
(d) improve the performance of the State Forensics Centre so that it provides its clients (including the judiciary, law enforcement bodies, and health and regulatory authorities) with timely and reliable forensic data in line with international standards.

Justification of the project and main experiences / challenges during implementation

The project is aligned with key national development priorities of the Kyrgyz Republic, as set out in the following policy documents and laws:

National Sustainable Development Strategy for 2013 – 2017, which identifies strengthening the rule of law, as the key precondition for increased stability and sustainability of the Kyrgyz state. The strategy assigns a key coordinating role to the Defense Council of the Kyrgyz Republic in the provision of strategic direction to the country’s efforts in this regard;

Presidential Decree on Measures to Reform the Judiciary of August 2012 and related Plan of Action approved by the Presidential Council on Judicial Reform in October 2012, which guide judicial reform and on the basis of which expert working groups were created to develop new criminal legislation;

National Prison Reform Strategy 2012 – 2016, which guides prison reform in the Kyrgyz Republic, including legislative reform, improving detention conditions and social rehabilitation;
Police Reform Measures adopted by the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic in April 2013. These measures guide efforts to reform the police in the country with a particular focus on efforts to “strengthen cooperation between police and population on the basis of social partnership principles in crime prevention, provision of law and order, public safety, and development of the institution of civilian oversight over police work”.48

National Action Plan on implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security. This action plan foresees a gender review of the composition of the staff in various law enforcement agencies, including the MoI, as well as educational workshops for law enforcement officers on enhancement of gender sensitivity and acquisition of skills to provide help to victims of violence;

The 2013 Law on Forensic Services, which defines guiding principles for forensic services, basic rights and responsibilities of forensic experts, and basic rules for the provision of forensic services in court proceedings.

The project component funded by the UN PBF is based on the results of a Peacebuilding Needs and Priorities Assessment (PBNPA) conducted in 2013 and related Peacebuilding Priority Plan approved by a joint committee of government bodies, UN agencies and civil society in the country.

As acknowledged in the PBNPA, lack of trust and underrepresentation of minorities and women in state institutions, including law enforcement, cause social tensions, in particular in the South of the Kyrgyz Republic, and contribute to feelings of insecurity among different parts of the population. This has created a fragile environment, in which conflicts can continue to occur and may escalate. In order to address these challenges, the PBNPA listed the following peace building needs and opportunities, which the project seeks to address:

- Continue/finalize reforms of law enforcement systems;
- Increase representation, particularly of women and minorities, in the law enforcement sector;
- Ensure internal supervision and oversight mechanisms within the governance structure, including law enforcement bodies;
- Work on gender-sensitivity awareness among law-enforcement in order to secure and respond to the safety, physical and mental health, well-being and economic security and dignity of women and girls.

The main government counterparts have shown commitment to the project and generally provide support towards implementation of project activities. The project team is able to have regular meetings and consultations with project beneficiaries to ensure proper implementation.

Project implementation is monitored by a Steering Committee consisting of representatives of project beneficiaries, other state bodies, civil society and international organizations working in the field of criminal justice in the Kyrgyz Republic.

At the same time, the project faces a number of challenges, which hamper effectiveness and sustainability of results. These include the cultural and political sensitivity of a number of issues, such as gender and minority representation in the police, as well as the following general challenges observed in the political environment, in which rule of law reform is taking place:

---

• Elite and popular political culture remain fragmented;
• Public demand for reforms in the area of the rule of law is weak;
• Underfunding of security sector institutions remains serious;
• The leadership lacks the know-how or the willingness to implement meaningful reforms;
• Lack of transparency, insufficient access to information and weak independent oversight mechanisms make it hard to hold law enforcement bodies accountable
• Law enforcement and criminal justice approaches essentially remain punitive with little attention for appropriate legal safeguards and ineffective crime prevention strategies.

Project documents and revisions of the original project document

The project KGZT90 has been revised five times:

Revision 1
In January 2010, UNODC, in partnership with the EU, launched a 3-year project entitled “Support to Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic” with a total budget of USD 3,995,600. The project was designed to contribute to strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic, thereby promoting justice, peace and stability in the country. The specific objective of the project was to assist the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic to reform its penitentiary system, at legislative, policy and management levels, thereby improving the treatment of prisoners and contributing to their social reintegration.

Since the start of the project, the Prison Service of the Kyrgyz Republic provided full support and strong commitment towards implementation of all project activities. This led to the development of a draft National Strategy for Prison Reform in Kyrgyzstan for 2012-2016, a revision of secondary penal legislation, increased institutional capacity of the prison service and establishment of a healthier working and living environment in selected prisons. Through the establishment of a Coordination Council on Prison Reform collaboration and coordination among all stakeholders involved in prison reform was ensured.

Challenges faced by the project include a 6 month delay at the start of the project due to the political and security situation in Kyrgyzstan in 2010, which was marked by political instability and ethnic clashes; reorganisation of the prison service resulting involving frequent changes in the prison service’s senior management and a high rate of staff turnover; and major prison disturbances in 2011.

The main reason for the project revision in 2011 was a downgrading of P-4 post of International Project Coordinator to P-3 post of International Project Officer. P-3 post was to satisfy the requirements of project implementation and downgrading did not affect changes in the operational activities. A downgrading of a post involved a reduction of tasks initially envisaged in the TOR. TOR for P-3 post was developed to reflect a lower grade of responsibilities. Funding for this post was available under project KGZ T90 from mid-2011 to December 2012. Relevant changes were made in the project budget. No changes were made to the original project document.

Revision 2
The aim of this project revision was to extend the project until 18 June 2013. Addendum No. 1 to Contribution Agreement No 2009/217-266 Support to Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic was signed by the EU and UNODC in August 2012. According to the Addendum No. 1 the implementation period for the Agreement was prolonged to 42 months. The revised duration of the project was 18 December 2009 -18 June 2013 (3 years and 6 months). As part of the project revision Overall Budget was decreased in the amount of USD 137,362. At the date of the project revision KGZT90 received three instalments from the EC and amount of each instalment was
calculated by the exchange rate on the date of funds transfer. Thus, the overall budget was decreased and revised overall budget was USD 3,858,238 (proxy).

This no-cost extension was necessary to offset a 6-month delay in project implementation at the start of the project, incurred due to the political upheaval and adverse security situation in Kyrgyzstan during the first semester of 2010. In October-November 2011 and January-February 2012, a series of prison disturbances also occurred. These events constituted security threats hampering project implementation beyond UNODC control. The extension allowed the project to complete all remaining activities and fully reach its objectives.

Revision 3
The aim of this project revision was to extend the project KGZT90 until 31 August 2013 in order to implement activities funded by the Government of Turkey.

On 18 June 2013, UNODC completed all foreseen activities within the framework of the Contribution Agreement No 2009/217-266 signed between UNODC and the European Union. On 28 February 2013, addendum 2 to this contribution agreement was signed, according to which the European Union undertook to finance a maximum of 2,500,000 EUR.

In addition to the funding received from the European Union, KGZT90 received funding from other donors. In April 2013, 44,280 USD was allocated to KGZT90 by the Government of Turkey (as part of its 2011 contribution to the UNODC Crime Fund).

As part of the revision, the project’s overall budget was decreased from 3,858,238 USD to 3,798,935 USD. The decrease was due to a deterioration of the EUR/USD exchange rate, which meant that the latest instalment received from the European Union in February 2013 was lower than previously reflected in PROFI.

Revision 4
The aim of this project revision was to extend the project KGZT90 until 31 July 2014 in order to implement activities funded by the Government of the United States of America (Agreement No. 01871). On 13 June 2013, UNODC received a letter from the United States (US) Department of State with a pledge of 883,660 USD from the Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) for the KGZT90 project. The letter was countersigned by UNODC on 17 June 2013. These funds were specifically allocated to KGZT90 in order to extend the project following the completion of activities funded by the European Union (EU). Contribution Agreement No. 2009/217-266 signed between UNODC and the EU expired on 18 June 2013.

The US contribution, which is available for a period of up to two years, is intended to support additional activities to strengthen the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic through improvement of prison management and social reintegration of offenders, and enhanced multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice. The project title, objective and outcomes have been partially amended to reflect the additional activities planned, which are in line with national priorities, as expressed i.a. in the National Sustainable Development Strategy 2013-2017, the Judicial Reform Action Plan 2012-2014 and the National Prison Reform Strategy 2012-2016.

As part of the revisions, the project’s overall budget was increased from 3,798,935 USD to 4,682,595 USD.
On 16 January 2014, UNODC received a letter from the United States (US) Department of State with a pledge of 1,497,250 USD from the Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) for the KGZT90 project. The letter was countersigned by UNODC on 20 January 2014.

On 13 February 2014, UNODC received a payment of 1,460,700 USD from the Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Office for a series of activities to be implemented by the KGZT90 project within the framework of the UN PBF.

The aim of this project revision was to extend the project KGZT90 until 30 June 2016 in order to implement activities funded by the Government of the United States of America and the United Nations (UN) Peace Building Fund (PBF). These funds were specifically allocated to KGZT90 for additional activities to strengthen the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic.

Revision 6

In January 2015, the project was again revised based upon additional funding in the amount of $680,000 (USD) from the U.S. INL. The project was extended for additional 6 months.

UNODC strategy context, including the project’s main objectives and outcomes and project’s contribution to UNODC country, regional or thematic programme

The Project expected accomplishment in the strategic framework is: Enhanced capacity of Member States to develop and maintain fair, humane and accountable domestic criminal justice systems in accordance with the United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice and other relevant international instruments

The Project contributes to UNODC Thematic Programme on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and Justice Reform, 2012-2015 on 2 major outcomes:

Outcome 1: Requesting States have developed and implemented crime prevention and criminal justice reform initiatives, including strategies, action plans and measures in accordance with UN standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice and recognized good practices;

Outcome 2: UNODC tools, manuals and training materials are used by Member States to improve criminal justice procedures and practices and to develop, adopt and implement effective strategies and programmes for crime prevention

The overall project objective is to contribute to strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic through improvement of prison management and social reintegration of offenders, enhanced multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice.

As per the Project Logical Framework there are 4 major Outcomes:
**Outcome 1:** Counterparts adopt normative frameworks and strategies in line with UN standards and norms on crime prevention and criminal justice

**Outcome 2:** The prison administration manages prisons effectively, in line with UN standards and norms for the treatment of prisoners, promoting social reintegration of offenders

**Outcome 3:** The Government of the Kyrgyz Republic adopts and implements policies to increase public trust in the police

**Outcome 4:** The State Forensic Centre under the Ministry of Justice improves the provision of forensic services in line with international standards

---

**II. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,799,999</td>
<td>7,625,541</td>
<td>4,791,626</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

Reasons behind the evaluation taking place

UNODC is to provide its donors with regular narrative and financial progress reports on the activities undertaken with these funds, with particular attention to monitoring and evaluation of the outputs and activities outlined in the project proposal and in accordance with stated performance indicators.

Pursuant to the project donors’ requirements and their evaluation guidelines, while final external programme evaluations are mandatory and should not take place 6 months prior to the financial closure of the programme, mid-term evaluations remain optional (may be required though prior to any consideration for a renewal allocation).

Given that independent evaluations provide an impartial assessment of the project and so help determine its strategic positioning based on the project success, added value, and lessons learned on how to achieve a strategic impact, mid-term evaluation is foreseen at the stage of a project design and agreed with donors.

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to measure project achievements, lessons learned, the implementation of recommendations from the evaluation in 2012 as well as areas requiring improvements identified during the implementation of the project activities in the Kyrgyz Republic. The evaluation’s conclusions will serve as the basis for improving planning, design and management of the project during its final year, as well as to ensure ownership, result-based orientation, cost-effectiveness and quality of the UNODC services.

The results of this formative evaluation are intended for use by the project team and the Regional Office in Tashkent to learn from and make desirable adjustments to ongoing implementation. It will also inform stakeholders (beneficiary agencies in the Kyrgyz
Republic, UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia, Project Team and Donor Countries (US Government and UN Peacebuilding Fund) of project accomplishments.

The main stakeholders will get the possibility to provide comments on the Terms of Reference, take note of the selection of consultants; be interviewed and briefed as part of the evaluation process and shall receive the key findings. Their comments, opinions and ideas shall be reflected in the report where appropriate. Please see attached the list of the Core Learning Partners in Annex 3.

It will be carried out by an Independent Evaluation Consultant, with logistical arrangements provided by the UNODC Programme Office in the Kyrgyz Republic and in line with the UNODC evaluation handbook, policy, norms and standards.

Assumed accomplishment of the evaluation

Through this evaluation, UNODC ROCA should obtain a frank assessment on the effectiveness of the activities conducted in this specific area and draw on recommendation and lessons learned to inform future programming. This evaluation will also offer an opportunity to increase accountability for all stakeholders involved and identify problems that may have to be addressed differently in the future. Furthermore, this evaluation will assess the progress made in implementing the recommendations from the previous evaluation in 2012.

Specific questions, among others, that are expected to be answered include; To what extent have the resources available converted to output in a timely and cost-effective manner for the knowledge products?; To what extent has the Project improved the capacity of the prison service and police service to contribute to strengthening the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic?; And To what extent are the project results (outcomes and impact, if any) likely to continue / be sustained after the project has finished?

This evaluation will give an opportunity to learn lessons for a possible extension of project; to provide accountability to donors by determining whether project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized; to identify areas of improvement in a project; to get feedback, appraisal and recognition; to attract resources toward a project.

The main evaluation users

The main users and benefactors of this evaluation will be the UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia and Project management, Core Learning Partners (see Annex 3) and the project donors and beneficiary agencies in the Kyrgyz Republic.

IV. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The unit of analysis to be covered by the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the whole project including the following components:

✓ Legislative reform
- Enhanced multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice;
- Revised criminal legislation in line with international standards drafted and adopted.

✓ Crime prevention
- Enhanced multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice;
- Crime prevention strategies for Southern provinces of Kyrgyzstan developed.

✓ Police reform
- New recruitment and performance evaluation policies for the police drafted and endorsed;
- At least two community-friendly police stations established;
- Special measures aimed at increasing gender and minority representation in the police developed and endorsed;
- Police oversight and accountability mechanisms strengthened;
- Improved integrity and transparency of selected police stations in the South of Kyrgyzstan.

✓ Prison Reform
- Management capacity of the prison service through the provision of training and expert advice enhanced;
- Expert advice on income generating and other programmes to improve the social reintegration prospects of prisoners provided;
- National prison security framework developed;
- Security audit conducted and Action Plan developed and endorsed;
- Discipline practice in prisons revised and Action Plan developed.

The evaluation will also assess the extent to which the project contributes to the UNODC Thematic Programmes (e.g. design, efficiency, appropriateness to/support to thematic objectives etc.).

The time period to be covered by the evaluation

Activities conducted over the period from June 2012 until the end of the evaluation field mission (tentatively end March 2015) at the national level.

The geographical coverage of the evaluation

The scope for the geographical coverage of the project will be Kyrgyzstan and project priority/pilot locations. One mission to Kyrgyzstan is planned, consisting of meetings with national counterparts in Bishkek, and field visits to project sites in Chuy, Jalalabad and Batken provinces.
V. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, as well as partnerships and cooperation, gender and human rights and lesson learned, and, will respond to the following below questions, however, provided as indicative only, and required to be further refined by the Evaluation Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent are the project outputs and activities consistent with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the expected outcomes and objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How well was the project planned in advance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent do the objectives, outcomes and outputs from the new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project revisions respond to present circumstances and stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How relevant are the project outputs to the recipient government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent is the project relevant to the respective beneficiaries’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies needs and priorities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent have recommendations on relevance from the previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation in 2012 (if any) been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent is the project implemented in the most efficient and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost-effective way compared to alternatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent was the structure and profile of the project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent is project reporting accurate, timely and satisfactory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there any good practices regarding efficiency, e.g. are certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspects or arrangements of the portfolio particularly efficient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How could efficiency be further improved in the next years of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent have recommendations on efficiency from the previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation in 2012 (if any) been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what degree were the programme’s outcomes and objectives achieved,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or are anticipated to be achieved? What chief factors were responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the achievement or failure of the objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How could project planning have been improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How could the effectiveness of the project be further increased in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next years of implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent have recommendations on effectiveness from the previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation in 2012 (if any) been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the anticipated long term impact of this project? Is the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project likely to achieve that impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have there been any positive or negative unintended results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent have recommendations on impact from the previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation in 2012 (if any) been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What measures are in place to ensure future maintenance and repair of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the equipment provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent are project interventions sustainable in the long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term? If not, what is needed to ensure their continued resilience and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viability in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent have recommendations on sustainability from the previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation in 2012 (if any) been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partnerships and cooperation

1. To what extent were stakeholders properly engaged and informed?

2. How was the project conducive to the development of partnerships at the bilateral and multilateral level?

3. To what extent have partnerships been sought with national and international partners, including UN-agencies, UNODC-internally, public oversight bodies and civil society, etc.?

4. To what extent have recommendations on partnerships and cooperation from the previous evaluation in 2012 (if any) been implemented?

### Human rights and gender

1. To what extent are human rights considerations included in the project development and implementation?

2. To what extent are gender considerations included in the project development and implementation?
   
   (i) To what extent the project intervention contributes to fulfilment of the National Action Plan on implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security.
   
   (ii) To what extent the project intervention contributes to increased representation of women in the police?

3. To what extent have recommendations on human rights and gender from the previous evaluation in 2012 (if any) been implemented?

### Lessons learned

1. What are the lessons learnt for future project implementation?

2. What are the best practices that could be applied in the future activities and similar projects?

---

### EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methods used to collect and analyse data

The evaluation will be undertaken through a triangulation exercise of data stemming from desk review, structured interviews, as well as other sources to be established by the evaluator. These could be primary data coming from questionnaires, surveys, or secondary data stemming from other entities.

1. A desk review of relevant documents. These documents will include but not limited to the following:
   
   - the project document; all project revision documents; quarterly, semi-annual and annual project progress reports;
   
   - Independent Project Evaluation Report of this project from 2012

   - assignment reports (expert reports), trainers’ reports and
   
   - mission and monitoring reports (a final list will be provided to the evaluator and further material can be requested by the evaluator at any time).

2. Field mission to Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan), and project pilot locations in Chuy, Jalalabad and Batken provinces, consisting of:

---

• Briefing and individual interviews with UNODC programme staff, including International Project Manager and International Project Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, National Officer and Financial Officer (a final list will be provided by an evaluator);
• Individual interviews with officials of the project beneficiary agencies in the Kyrgyz Republic: President’s Office, Ministry of Interior and local police units, Police Academy under the Ministry of Interior, Association of Police Women, State Service on Execution of Punishment, State Service on Drug Control, and representatives of civil society and academia.
• Site visits to selected project pilot locations, including 2 prisons in Chuy province and police stations in Jalalabad city and Batken province (Tash Tumshuk village), for physical inspection and discussions with beneficiaries.

3. Telephone interviews

The evaluator can request further interviews, as needed.

The sources of data

Interviews with CLP’s and donors and relevant stakeholders outlined in Annex 3, as well as further interviews with stakeholders as proposed by the evaluator. Briefing and individual interviews with International Project Manager and International Project Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, National Officer and Financial Officer.

Field missions to project pilot locations; training assignment reports, adopted legislative acts/policies, internal/donor reports, statistical data.

The evaluation will be undertaken through a triangulation exercise of data stemming from desk review, structured interviews, field missions, questionnaires, surveys, observations and other sources to be established by the evaluator.

The independent project evaluation is to be conducted following UNODC/IEU’s evaluation policy, handbook, guidelines and templates, (to be found on the IEU website, http://www.unodc.org/unode/en/evaluation/index.html), as well as UNEG Norms and Standards.

A list of materials to be used by the evaluator for the desk review can be found in the Annex II.
VI. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

Time frame for the evaluation is 1 March – 30 April 2015

Time frame for the field mission

It is anticipated that the evaluation will involve visits to Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek and project pilot locations in Chuy, Jalalabad and Batken provinces.

Tentative time-frame for the mission is 16 March -23 March 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When? (tentative dates)</th>
<th>Evaluator’s working days</th>
<th>What tasks?</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Where?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 March 2015</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Introductory meeting with the project team and interviews with project beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Brief interview reports</td>
<td>Bishkek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March 2015</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Meetings and interviews with project beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Brief interview reports</td>
<td>Bishkek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March 2015</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Site inspection: Prison visits</td>
<td>• Site visit reports</td>
<td>Chuy province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 March 2015</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Site inspection: visit to the police station in Tash Tumshuk</td>
<td>• Site visit reports</td>
<td>Batken province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March 2015</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Site inspection: visit to the police station in Jalalabad city</td>
<td>• Site visit reports</td>
<td>Jalalabad province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 March 2015</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Wrap up meetings with the project team and main project beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Brief interview reports</td>
<td>Bishkek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected deliverables and time frame

The Evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely Submission of all deliverables, as specified below:

- Inception Report, in line with UNODC evaluation guidelines, handbook, policy and templates\(^{50}\) containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools (to be reviewed and cleared by IEU – this can entail various rounds of comments);
- Draft Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation guidelines, handbook, policy and templates\(^{51}\)(to be reviewed and cleared by IEU – this can entail various rounds of comments)

\(^{50}\) To be found here: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/independent-project-evaluations-step-by-step.html
- Final Evaluation Report, in line with UNODC evaluation guidelines, handbook, policy and templates, including annex with management response (if needed), to be cleared by IEU.
- Presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations to CLP and other key stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review: Inception Report (including review by IEU)</td>
<td>1 March - 14 March 2015</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>List of evaluation questions; Evaluation tools; Inception Report with refined work plan, etc. – to be reviewed and cleared by IEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field mission: Interviews with UNODC staff; Evaluation mission: briefing, interviews; presentation of preliminary findings</td>
<td>16 March - 23 March 2015</td>
<td>UNODC Kyrgyzstan; project locations</td>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to IEU and Project Management</td>
<td>23 March - 15 April 2015</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report in line with UNODC evaluation guidelines, handbook, templates, etc. – to be reviewed and commented on by IEU; Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of IEU and Project Management comments.</td>
<td>3 working days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager shares the draft report (after initial IEU clearance) with CLPs for comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of report incl. Management response (if necessary)</td>
<td>5 working days by 30 April 2015</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>Final evaluation report to be cleared by IEU; Presentation of final evaluation findings and recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

Number of evaluators needed

The mid-term evaluation of the project will be carried out by one International Independent Evaluation Expert identified by UNODC through a competitive selection process and supported by the Project staff. The Evaluation Expert will be an expert in criminal justice/law enforcement area, and have experience of evaluating technical assistance projects. Costs associated with the evaluator will be borne by the project. The expert evaluator shall act independently, in line with UNODC evaluation policy, handbook and guidelines and UNEG Ethical Guidelines and in his individual capacity and not as a representative of any government or organisation that may present a conflict of interest. In his individual capacity and not as representative of the government or organization which appointed them. She/he will have no previous experience of...
working with KGZT90 project (except as independent evaluator) or of working in any capacity linked with it.

The Evaluator shall act independently in his/her individual capacity and must not have been involved in the development, implementation or monitoring of the project neither will be not be rendering any service to UNODC in the near future, to avoid conflicts of interests. He/she should adhere to the independence and impartiality of the evaluation process discussed in the UN Evaluation Group’s Norms and Standards.

The role of the Evaluator

Carry out the desk review; develop the inception report, including sample size and sampling technique; draft and finalize the inception report and evaluation methodology, incorporating relevant comments, in line with the guidelines and template on the IEU website http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation-step-by-step.html; lead and coordinate the evaluation process and the oversee the tasks of the evaluators; implement quantitative tools and analyze data; triangulate data and test rival explanations; ensure that all aspects of the terms of reference are fulfilled; draft an evaluation report in line with UNODC evaluation policy and the guidelines and template on the IEU website http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation-step-by-step.html; finalize the evaluation report on the basis of comments received; include a management response in the final report; present the final evaluation findings and recommendations to stakeholders.

More details will be provided in the respective job descriptions in Annex I.

Conflict of interest

According to UNODC rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation.

Reference to job description detailing qualifications and responsibilities

The Evaluation Expert/Evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:

• An academic degree in project management, business administration or international development and/or graduation from a recognised criminal justice/law enforcement academy both with at least 7 years professional experience;
• Substantial experience in evaluating & monitoring technical assistance projects;
• Experience in evaluating the design and implementation of organisational structures at a senior level, preferably in a criminal justice/law enforcement context;
• Previous experience of criminal justice/law enforcement in an operational capacity is highly desirable.
• Experience in conducting outcome and impact evaluations of projects and programmes in international development and preferably regarding criminal justice/law enforcement;
• Experience of having applied recognised quality management and assessment methodologies (such as the Balanced Scorecard or the Business Excellence Model of the EFQM) is desirable;
• Recognised project management training and/or accreditation skills. Membership of a professional body related to project management will be an advantage;
- Familiarity with the criminal justice/law enforcement situation in the region will be an asset;
- Technical knowledge of human rights and gender issues;
- Fluency in spoken and written English required, with proven drafting skills, working knowledge of Russian is an asset.

The evaluator will be responsible for drafting the evaluation report, ensuring the report meets the necessary standards and for submitting the drafts as described in a timely manner.

VIII. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS

Roles and responsibilities of the Project Management

The Monitoring and Evaluation Officer is responsible for managing the evaluation, drafting and finalizing the ToR, selecting Core Learning Partners together with the Project Manager and informing them of their role, recruiting evaluators, providing desk review materials to the evaluation team, reviewing the inception report as well as the evaluation methodology, liaising with the Core Learning Partners, reviewing the draft report, assessing the quality of the final report by using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, disseminating the final evaluation report, as well as developing an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations and follow-up action.

Project Management is responsible for managing the evaluation, finalizing the ToR, selecting and approving Core Learning Partners, reviewing the inception report as well as the evaluation methodology, reviewing the draft report, assessing the quality of the final report by using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, as well as developing an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations and follow-up action.

The evaluation should be planned and conducted in close consultation with UNODC ROCA. The evaluation tools and methodology must be agreed with ROCA and cleared by IEU.

Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are selected by the project managers. Members of the CLP are selected from the key stakeholder groups, including UNODC management, mentors, beneficiaries, partner organizations and donor Member States. The CLPs are asked to comment on key steps of the evaluation (Terms of Reference; Selection of evaluators; Draft Evaluation Report) and act as facilitators with respect to the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action.

Roles and responsibilities of the Independent Evaluation Unit

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process. Please find the respective tools on the IEU web site http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html. All deliverables of this evaluation (Terms of Reference; Inception Report; Draft Evaluation Report; Final Evaluation Report) are to be commented on and cleared by IEU.
Roles and responsibilities of the evaluator

The independent evaluation will be conducted by the evaluator following UNODC/IEU’s evaluation policy, handbook, guidelines and templates, as well as UNEG Norms and Standards Norms and Standards of the UNEG and UNODC guidelines by providing comments on evaluation tools and methods, the draft report and clearance of the final report.

The evaluator will submit a draft report to the Evaluation Manager, to ROCA and to the UNODC IEU for clearance, before submitting the draft evaluation report to “Core Learning Partners”. The report will contain the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation team. The report should be no longer than 20 pages, excluding annexes and the executive summary. The report will be distributed by UNODC as required to the governmental authorities and respective donors, and will be discussed at a Tripartite Meeting by the parties to the project.

Logistical support responsibilities

The Monitoring and Evaluation Officer will be in charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluator. For the field missions, the evaluator liaises with the UNODC Project Office as appropriate.

UNODC will provide office space, an internet connection and use of a desktop computer where appropriate as well as assistance with interpretation. The evaluator will need to provide his/her own laptop, cameras or other equipment. UNODC will assist with transport within the region and support international travel arrangements and the issuance of visa (where necessary).
ANNEX II. EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

Interview Guide for UNODC

Introduction
1. What was your role in the KGZT90?
2. What is the KGZT90 history (only for Project Coordinator and Project Officer)?

Relevance
3. How relevant is the project from your point of view to the needs of (1) recipient government and (2) respective beneficiaries’ agencies? In your opinion, is the Project’s theory of change clearly articulated?
4. How was the project planned and developed? (Probe: How the needs of the target groups (recipient government and respective beneficiaries’ agencies) were assessed?)
5. How project’s revisions have been done? Do the problems/needs that gave rise to the Project still exist, have they changed or are there new needs that should be addressed?

Efficiency
6. Is the management structure of KGZT90 enabling an efficient implementation of the project? Describe strengths and weaknesses.
7. In your opinion, how adequate is the funding allocated for KGZT90? Were there any financial constraints (if any) in KGZT90 implementation process?

Effectiveness
8. Could you describe the main achievements of KGZT90 during two and a half years of its implementation? (Probe: To what extent is the Project achieving its stated objectives under each project component?)
9. What factors were crucial for the achievements and/or failures?
10. In your opinion, what project component is the most successful? Please explain your response.

Impact
11. To what extent has the project contributed to improving the capacity of the prison service, police service and forensic service?

Partnerships
12. Please describe the level of your collaboration with partners (beneficiaries’ agencies at national and local level, CSOs, academia, IOs).

Sustainability
13. What practices and behaviours promoted by KGZT90 are/may be sustainable after the Project ends and why?
14. What plans has UNODC put in place to sustain the outcomes of the project (i.e. exit strategy)?
HR & G
1. How human rights and gender perspectives were incorporated/considered in: (1) KGZT90 activities, planning, design, implementation, M&E and (2) during development of legislation and policies?

Lessons Learned
2. What went well?
3. What didn't go well or had unintended consequences?
4. If you had it all to do over again, what would you do differently?
5. What recommendations would you make for future activities and similar projects?

Cross-cutting
6. What recommendations of 2012 evaluation were implemented?

Closing
7. Is there anything more you would like to add?

Interview Guide for project beneficiary agencies and partners

Introduction
1. Please describe your role/involvement with UNODC project (length of time, responsibilities, nature of interactions, etc.).

Relevance
2. How relevant is the UNODC project from your point of view? How well do you think the Project has responded to the needs of your country effort in strengthening rule of law? Overall, what was the primary value of the Project to your country?
3. Have the project revisions met your country needs in improving prison management and social reintegration of offenders, enhancing multi-agency coordination and policy development on crime prevention and criminal justice and strengthening forensic services?
4. Are there any significant changes you would like to see incorporated into the project?

Effectiveness
5. Could you describe the main achievements of your cooperation with KGZT90 during 2012-2015?
   Probe:
   ▪ Have the legislation and policies adopted on crime prevention and criminal justice reform been implemented?
   ▪ Have the multi-agency and international cooperation improved? How?
   ▪ Has the refurbished pilot police stations in the South of Kyrgyzstan and State Forensic Centre led to improvement in work environment? How?
   ▪ Were the technical equipment provided for selected police stations in the South of Kyrgyzstan were useful and effective for your institution? How?
   ▪ Have training activities met the needs of the law enforcement officers and prison staff
   ▪ Have trainings, seminars, and study tours achieved learning outputs and how the acquired knowledge and skills are used
   ▪ Has the physical conditions in prisons improved? How?
- Have the launched prison income generating activities and related professional training courses are still operational and how they facilitated prisoners reintegration?
- Has the State Enterprise under the Prison Service for developing prison production facilities been functioning? Please elaborate.
- Has the National Prison Security Framework been developed?
- Has the new Policy on the Competitive Recruitment of Police Officers met the needs of the law enforcement officers? How
- Has the level of trust to the police changed? How?

6. What factors were crucial for the achievements and/or failures?
7. What Project’s activities were the most useful and why?

**Efficiency**

8. Has the UNODC project management team efficiently supported your agency efforts in this project?
9. Are you aware of any activities that your agency classified as wasteful, excessive, or unnecessary?
10. Have the UNODC project delivered capacity building activities (trainings, seminars, study tours) met the needs of your agency?
11. How could efficiency be further improved in the next years of implementation?

**Impact**

12. To what extent does UNODC project contribute to improving the capacity of the prison service, police service, and forensic service in your country?
   Probe:
   - Based on official statistical reports have protection of the human rights of prisoners and social reintegration of offenders improved a result of this project?
   - How successful was the Project in strengthening public confidence in the authorities, improved compliance with the rule of law, and lower crime rates?
   - How successful was the Project in improving the reliability and objectivity of forensic analysis and testimony in criminal investigations and trials?
13. Have there been any positive or negative unintended outcomes as a result of this project?

**Partnerships**

14. Are you satisfied with the level of collaboration and coordination between UNODC Project and your institution? Please elaborate.
15. Has this UNODC project coordinated both at the bilateral and multilateral level to promote working partnerships?
16. Has this UNODC project coordinated the exchange of project strategy and promoted cooperation with the international community/partners, etc.? (Meetings, workshops)

**HR &G**

17. To what extent did the UNODC project contribute to fulfilment of the National Action Plan on implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security?
18. To what extent are gender considerations and human rights included in the project development and implementation?
19. Is the selection of law enforcement officers, prison staff, and forensic service staff for training events based upon gender?
20. How the results of gender and minorities assessments are used by your agency?

**Sustainability**

21. What practices and behaviours promoted by UNODC project are/may be sustainable after the Project ends and why?
   Probe:
   ▪ What measures are in place to ensure future maintenance and replacement of provided buildings/equipment?
   ▪ Has the training provided by the project become standardized training within your agencies training programs?

**Lessons Learned**

22. As part of the implementing team what have you learned and how can those lessons apply to future implementation?
23. Is the UNODC project management team receptive to implementing new techniques and open to suggestions?
24. What ‘best practices’ could be applied to future project implementation?

**Closing**

25. Is there anything more you would like to add?

**Interview Guide for Donors**

**Introduction**

1. What is the link between the UNODC project and the US INL/UNPB objectives in Kyrgyzstan in the field of the rule of law?

**Relevance**

2. How relevant is the project from your point of view to the needs of (1) recipient government and (2) respective beneficiaries’ agencies? In your opinion, is the Project’s theory of change clearly articulated?

**Efficiency**

3. Is the management structure of UNODC project enabling an efficient implementation of the project? Describe strengths and weaknesses.
4. To what extent are you satisfied with reporting (progress and financial)?

**Effectiveness**

5. Could you describe the main achievements of UNODC project during two and a half years of its implementation? (Probe: To what extent is the Project achieving its stated objectives under each project component?)
6. What factors were crucial for the achievements and/or failures?
7. In your opinion, what project component is the most successful? Please explain your response.

**Impact**

8. To what extent has the project contributed to improving the capacity of the prison service, police service and forensic service in the country?
Partnerships
9. Has this UNODC project coordinated both at the bilateral and multilateral level to promote working partnerships?
10. Has this UNODC project coordinated the exchange of project strategy and promoted cooperation with the international community/partners, etc.? (Meetings, work-shops)

HR & G
11. To what extent are gender considerations and human rights included in the project development and implementation?
12. Is the selection of law enforcement officers, prison staff, and forensic service staff for training events based upon gender?
13. How the results of gender and minorities assessments are used by your agency?

Lessons Learned
14. What are your main lessons learnt and/or best practices that could be applied in the future project’s activities and similar projects?

Closing
15. Is there anything more you would like to add?
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRAINEES

Characteristics of respondent:
☐ Police officer
☐ Lawyer
☐ Representative of civil society organization
☐ Other__________

Gender:
☐ Female   ☐ Male

Region: _______________

1. In which training(s) organized by the UNODC project did you take part? (please list their names and dates)

2. Have you participated in any training for trainers (ToT) organized by the UNODC project?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

3. Have you participated in any on-job training organized by the UNODC project?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

4. Why did you decide to take part in the UNODC training course?

5. How were you selected for participation in this training course?

6. Was the training course necessary/relevant for you?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

7. Did it correspond to your expectations?
   ☐ Yes If yes, how?   ☐ No If no, why?

8. Was the training course sufficient/adequate in terms of course structure and duration?
   ☐ Yes, fully
   ☐ Only partly
   ☐ Not at all

9. Was the pre- and post- knowledge tests conducted?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

10. What did you find the most useful in the training?

11. What was the least useful in the training?

12. What were the major results of the training course for you?

13. Did you have a chance to apply the attained knowledge and skills in your work?
   ☐ Yes If yes, please go to question 14   ☐ No If no, why?
14. How have you used what you learnt in the UNODC training course to improve your day to day work? Please be specific and bring examples.

15. How would you rate the overall quality of the UNODC training course, its training materials and expertise of tutors using a 5 rating scale, where 5 is the highest and 1 is the lowest grade?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>overall quality of the Course</th>
<th>training materials</th>
<th>expertise of tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What are the aspects of the UNODC training(s) need improvement and in which way?

17. In your opinion, should the UNODC training course(s) be continued?
   □ Yes If yes, why?              □ No
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UNODC

1. Are you satisfied with the deliverables which you have under the Project so far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, what is good about it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no, what’s wrong with it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, what is good about it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no, what’s wrong with it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, what is good about it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no, what’s wrong with it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, what is good about it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no, what’s wrong with it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How clearly defined were the initial objectives for the Project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If not well defined, what could have been done differently?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In your opinion, how effective were your Project’s design revisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If not effective, what could have been done differently?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What do you feel where the main risks of this project and how well are they managed?

1. How effective is communication between the project beneficiary agencies and project team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What would you change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Overall, how well did the project partners work together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Quite well</th>
<th>Not well at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. What are/were the main problems in the cooperation? How you addressed them?

4. How effective is communication between the project donor and project team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What would you change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Did you submit timely the reports to the donors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reports</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, please explain the main reasons.
6. Were the donors satisfied with the quality of the submitted reports?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If no, please explain the main reasons*

7. In your view, to what extent is the project management structure effective and allow implementing the set objectives under the project?

- Very
- Somewhat
- Not Very
- Not at all

What would you change?

8. In your opinion, what project’s activities were the most efficient and why?

9. In your opinion, to what extent were/are the human rights and gender considered in the:
   - Project development □ Fully □ Partly □ Not at all
   - Project implementation □ Fully □ Partly □ Not at all

What would you change?

10. What is the degree of implementation of recommendations of previous evaluations?

   - Evaluation of 2012 □ Fully □ Partly □ Not at all
   - Self-Evaluation of 2013 □ Fully □ Partly □ Not at all

11. In your view, will the project have any effects on beneficiaries’ agencies?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

*If yes, please describe these effects______________________________*

12. How would you assess the sustainability of the project?

- Very
- Somewhat
- Not Very
- Not at all

13. In your opinion, which initiatives/practices created by the project are/will be sustainable and why?

14. Please describe major lessons learned by you so far in the course of the project implementation:

- Design
- Relevance
- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Partnerships
I. **UNODC Strategic documents**
   - UNODC Integrated Country Programme of assistance for Kyrgyzstan 2014-2016
   - UNODC Strategic Outline for Central Asia
   - UN Security Council Resolution 1325 and National Action Plan on implementation of
     UN Security Council Resolution 1325
   - National Review of the KR in the framework of the Beijing Declaration and Platform
     for Action
   - UNODC guidance note on Human Rights
   - UNODC guidance note on Gender Mainstreaming

II. **Project Document and Revisions:**
   - Project Document, Initial Project Proposal, December 2009
   - Project Revision KGZT90, June 2011
   - Project Revision KGZT90, October 2012
   - Project Revision KGZT90, June 2013
   - Project Revision KGZT90, July 2013
   - Project Revision KGZT90, February 2014
   - Project Revision KGZT90, January 2015

III. **KGZT90 Project Organigram**

IV. **Project Progress Reports:**
   - Project Progress Report -2010
   - Project Progress Report -2011
   - Project Progress Report -2012
   - Project Progress Report -2013
   - Project Progress Report -2014

V. **Expenditures Reports**

VI. **ROCA Progress Reports:**
   - ROCA monthly project report for January 2015
   - Summary Report for career-oriented work Police Academy of the Kyrgyz Republic
   - UNODC Project half yearly progress update period covered: January – June 2014
- Project: “Strengthening the Capacity of the Kyrgyz State Service for the Execution of Punishments and the Kyrgyz State Service on Drug Control to coordinate criminal intelligence gathering and sharing”. Final Narrative Report UNODC
- Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects. Period covered by the report: 02 Quarter 2013
- Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects. Period covered by the report: 03 Quarter 2013
- Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects. Period covered by the report: 04 Quarter 2013
- Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects. Period covered by the report: 01 Quarter 2014
- Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects. Period covered by the report: 02 Quarter 2014
- Quarterly Reporting Template for US/INL Funded Projects. Period covered by the report: 3rd Quarter 2014
- Annual Interim Narrative Report, 01.012011 -31.03.2011

VII. Monitoring & Evaluation Reports:
- Monitoring Report 16/12/2010
- Monitoring Report 21/10/2011
- Monitoring Report 12/10/2012
- Evaluation Follow-up Plan for the Implementation of Recommendations, 16 November 2012
- EU Terminal Assessment Report 2013
- Mid-term Independent Project Evaluation KGZ/T90 Support to Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic (July 2012). Executive Summary
- Mid-term Independent Project Evaluation KGZ T90 Support to Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic (July 2012). Lessons Learned
- Mid-term Independent Project Evaluation KGZ T90 Support to Prison Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic (July 2012). Summary Matrix of Findings, Evidence and Recommendations
- Participatory Self-Evaluation Report for KGZ T90. 15 May 2013
- Participatory Self-Evaluation Report for KGZ T90, Summary 3 June 2013
- The final report of the Monitoring reform of the Kyrgyz Republic Civil Union "For reform and the result", October 2014 – Bishkek, Navigator reform

VIII. Media Reports:
- UNODC News Briefs, August-September 2014/October-November 2014
- Media Coverage Report Training course “Efficient interaction between police and local communities as the basis for public safety and crime prevention” for police officers 6-8 July 2014, Jalal-Abad
- Media Coverage Report Opening Ceremony for a New Police Building in the City of Jalalabad, 22 January 2015
- UNODC Programme Office in the Kyrgyz Republic - List of Analytical Reports and Publications, 23 January 2015

IX. Statistics:
- SIAR Report Trust Police. REPORT «The results of the survey on security and law enforcement agencies in the cities. Bishkek and Osh», September 22 2013
- The state of crime in closed institutions SPS for the period from 01.01.2010 to 06.01.2014
- Representation of women in the internal affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic, January 01 2014
- Medical support of prisoners in the penal system, 2015
- Preventive measures in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2010-2014
- Representation of ethnic minorities in the police in the Kyrgyz Republic, January 01 2014

X. Assessment reports:
- Victimization Survey in the city of Jalal-Abad, January 2014
- Report a technical assessment mission in the Kyrgyz Republic Mission Report pilot police units
- Report review mission on promoting police reform of the Kyrgyz Republic, 8 - 20 June 2014
- Report to study the situation and make a joint analysis on crime prevention in the city of Jalal-Abad, 2014

XI. Assignment reports:
- Legal expert B.Saparbayev, Assignment Progress Report for the May 2014
- Legal expert B.Saparbayev, Assignment Progress Report for the August 2014
- Legal expert B. Saparbayev, Assignment Progress Report for the September 2014
- Legal expert B. Saparbayev, Assignment Progress Report for the October 2014
- Legal expert B. Saparbayev, Assignment Progress Report for the November 2014
- Legal expert B. Saparbayev, Assignment Progress Report for the December 2014
- Legal expert B. Saparbayev, Progress Legislation Report for the May 2014
- Report on the meeting of the expert working group to develop a new edition of the Criminal Executive Code of the Kyrgyz Republic in May - June 2014

XII. **Mission Reports:**
- Mission Report Jalalabad and Batken provinces, Madina Sarieva, NPO, November 2014
- Mission Report Batken town, Ak-Say and Kok –Tash villages of Ak-Say ayil okmotu, Madina Sarieva, NPO, August 2014
- Mission Report. Meeting of the Council on Judicial Reform under the President of the Kyrgyz Republic in October 2014
- Mission Report Issyk-Kul province, Karakol city, Rakisheva Jypara, NPO, January 2015
- Mission Report Canon City, Colorado, USA, Mission to International Correctional Management Training Centre (ICMTC), November 2014

XIII. **Trainers' reports:**
- Trainer's Report «Gender training» August 2014
- Trainer's Report “Effective communication skills”, July 2014
- Trainer's Report "The intervention in the conflict and mediation", November 2014
- Trainer's Report "Basics of Conflict", November 2014
ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># interviewed</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 people</td>
<td>UNODC Bishkek</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>UNODC Tashkent</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>UNODC Vienna</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 people</td>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>EU, US, Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 people</td>
<td>Project beneficiary agencies in the Kyrgyz Republic (national and local levels)</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 people</td>
<td>NGOs and Academia</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 people</td>
<td>Project final beneficiaries (prisoners)</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX V. RESULTS OF SURVEY

SURVEY AMONG PARTNERS

(Sample=9)

1. Awareness about the UNODC project

2. Coherence of the UNODC project with national policies and targets

3. Year of the start of the collaboration with the UNODC project and area

4. Assessment of the partnership with the UNODC project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability of results</th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of outputs for your organization</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of achievement of goals</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your involvement</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of timing and deadlines</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of cooperation among the partners</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearness of the roles within the partnership</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of partnership</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearness of objectives of the partnership</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Receipt of the UNODC project publications

SURVEY AMONG UNODC
(sample = 8)

1. Level of satisfaction with the Project’s deliverables

2. Clarity of initial objectives of the Project

3. Effectiveness of the Project’s design revisions

4. Effectiveness of communication between the project beneficiary agencies and project team

5. Level of collaboration among project partners

6. Effectiveness of the project management structure
7. Level of effectiveness of the communication between the project donors and project team

8. Effects of the UNODC project on beneficiaries' agencies

9. Timely submission of the reports to the donors and their satisfaction with the reporting

10. Effectiveness of the project management structure

11. Incorporation of human rights and gender into the project design and implementation
3. Degree of implementation of recommendations of previous evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Partly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Partly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Evaluation of 2013

14. Level of sustainability of the project results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legislative reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prison reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forensic services

SURVEY AMONG TRAINEES

Training on skills development (sample=18)

Participation in ToT trainings organized by the UNODC project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>16.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in on-job training organized by the UNODC project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevance of UNODC training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>5.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training correspondence with expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adequacy of training in terms of course structure and duration

- Only partly: 66.7%
- Yes, fully: 33.3%

Conduction of pre- and post- knowledge tests

- No: 27.8%
- Yes: 72.2%

Application of the attained knowledge and skills in the work

- No: 11.1%
- Yes: 88.9%

Necessity for continuation of UNODC trainings

- No: 0.0%
- Yes: 100.0%

Overall assessment of the UNODC training

- Overall quality of the Course: 4.3
- Training materials: 4.4
- Expertise of tutors: 4.1
Training on gender  
(sample=7)

Participation in ToT trainings organized by the UNODC project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in on-job training organized by the UNODC project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevance of UNODC training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training correspondence with expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequacy of training in terms of course structure and duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only partly</th>
<th>Yes, fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conduction of pre- and post- knowledge tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application of the attained knowledge and skills in the work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Necessity for continuation of UNODC trainings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall assessment of the UNODC training

- Overall quality of training materials: 4.4
- Expertise of tutors: 4.3
- Overall quality of the Course: 4.7