

Terminal Evaluation Report

December 2009.

Project TUR/J65

Strengthening of Capacity for the Interdiction of Drugs in Rural Areas

Turkey.

Report of Evaluator

**Dr Ian OLIVER.
(snowbird@ifb.co.uk)**

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME

Vienna.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. ACRONYMS	3
2. SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, SUPPORTING EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
4. INTRODUCTION.....	7
A. Purpose ~ Reasons for Evaluation.....	7
B. Methodology.....	7
5. MAJOR FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....	7
A. Project concept and design	7
B. Objectives	8
C. Outputs, impact and sustainability.....	10
6. LESSONS LEARNED.....	14
7. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
8. ANNEXES	18

1. ACRONYMS

- ◆ **CBT** ~ Computer Based Training
- ◆ **DLO** ~ Drugs Liaison Officer
- ◆ **DNA** ~ Deoxyribonucleic acid
- ◆ **EC** ~ European Commission
- ◆ **EU** ~ European Union
- ◆ **INCB** ~ International Narcotics Control Board
- ◆ **TADOC** ~ Turkish Academy for Drugs & Organised Crime
- ◆ **UNODC** ~ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Disclaimer

Independent Project Evaluations are scheduled and managed by the project managers and conducted by external independent evaluators. The role of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process, but IEU does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IEU to respond to the commitment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in professionalizing the evaluation function and promoting a culture of evaluation within UNODC for the purposes of accountability and continuous learning and improvement.

Due to the disbandment of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) and the shortage of resources following its reinstatement, the IEU has been limited in its capacity to perform these functions for independent project evaluations to the degree anticipated. As a result, some independent evaluation reports posted may not be in full compliance with all IEU or UNEG guidelines. However, in order to support a transparent and learning environment, all evaluations received during this period have been posted and as an on-going process, IEU has begun re-implementing quality assurance processes and instituting guidelines for independent project evaluations as of January 2011.

2. SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, SUPPORTING EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings: problems and issues identified	Supporting evidences	Recommendations
1. The Project was restricted to the Rural Areas but on reflection parties agreed that it would have been better to have limited this to a sub part of a national improvement plan	Nominated by Gendarmerie the agency responsible for the rural areas of Turkey. Most officers consulted agreed that the Project should have been a national one.	Better pre project consultation between all concerned parties.
2. Few written reports were supplied by the law enforcement agencies. No revised training/operational manuals were produced. The Rural Action Plan was not produced	Interviews of all interested parties including EU Representative and UNODC Project Officer.	The Project Document could have been better prepared to stress the importance of written feedback after training and study tours and the compliance with specific requirements such as the production of manuals, training aids and specifically the Rural Action Plan. The objectives should have been more specifically defined as this would have avoided misunderstandings between the UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime) and Agencies which have given rise to apparently wrong perceptions. Indicators of achievement were not sufficiently precise. The relevant institutions should have been brought together at the design phase of the Project to avoid any subsequent allegations that they were not fully consulted.
3. Joint operations and the sharing of intelligence ensure the avoidance of duplication of effort and the waste of valuable resources.	Questioning of officers particularly at the two training academies.	All agencies should seek better ways of cooperating and reducing duplication of effort.
4. The project was intended also to support the Government of Turkey in its efforts to meet the EU regulations in the context of accession of Turkey to the EU	Project Document and interview with EU Officer.	Progress to be evaluated in conjunction with other requirements of the European Union (EU).
5. There is a strong desire from most officers to maintain professional relationships with colleagues from other agencies.	Interviews with officers from each law enforcement agency.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish Joint Operations Unit 2. Set up National Intelligence Bureau 3. Arrange annual Drug Conference involving all agencies and invited guests
6. There are operational advantages for law enforcement agencies to have closer links with the communities that they serve not only in the hope that citizens would be inclined to report their suspicions but also that they would help to avoid any increase in the misuse of drugs. Community, school and family based prevention programmes help to promote proper attitudes about the availability and abuse of illicit drugs and the perception of	International Narcotics Control Board Reports and global law enforcement experience.	Community, school and family based prevention programmes help to promote proper attitudes about the availability and abuse of illicit drugs and the perception of their risks. Also they increase awareness of vulnerability, risk and factors that are closely associated with drug abuse and society's tolerance for drug dealers and those involved in trafficking. Active involvement of appropriately trained law enforcement staff is recommended in a National Law Enforcement Schools Liaison Programme and a widespread Community Relations Programme.

Findings: problems and issues identified	Supporting evidences	Recommendations
their risks. Also they increase awareness of vulnerability, risk and factors that are closely associated with drug abuse and society's tolerance for drug dealers and those involved in trafficking.		

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is evident that the various law enforcement agencies in Turkey have significant knowledge and expertise in drug related problems. This project aimed at ensuring cooperation, coordination and information exchange with law enforcement agencies within the framework of the rural struggle but primarily the Project was designed for the Gendarmerie, which agency is responsible only for the rural areas of Turkey (please see Terms of Reference attached below). It aimed at strengthening Turkey's capacity for Drugs Law Enforcement in Gendarmerie selected Priority Rural Areas through establishing and improving action plans for law enforcement units. These plans should have been designed to be in concert with previously existent Turkish and European Union Drug Strategies. Additionally, in the course of the project, it was planned to enhance and strengthen the Turkish Drug Enforcement Institutional Framework through building up and training specialized police units. An enhancement of national and international cooperation in the field of countering drug trafficking was also an important dimension of the project's objectives. All four law enforcement agencies in Turkey were regarded as project beneficiaries and a common understanding and approach should have been established which could enable further developments compatible with international standards and practices. The expectation was that there would be an enhanced capacity for law enforcement cooperation against crime, organised crime, corruption, drug trafficking, diversion of precursor chemicals and terrorism, especially in rural areas, but while it is reported that there has been a full delivery of the training specified within the project document it appears to the evaluator that perhaps the project intentions and expected outcomes were too ambitious to have been fully achieved in such a relatively short time. It has to be borne in mind, that there was a propensity for each agency to operate independently although certain cooperation existed; some reluctance remains to engage fully with one another.

While all of the requirements of the training were appropriately and professionally delivered by experts, the evaluation revealed that there remains a relevant level of uncertainty about whether all training has yet been fully transformed into operational expertise. Nevertheless, there has been the creation of awareness of what is necessary for future professional development and it is thought that the various agencies have learned enough to realise that they must translate that awareness into greater operational effectiveness. Joint operations and the sharing of intelligence ensure the avoidance of duplication of effort and the waste of valuable resources and most agency personnel interviewed gave assurances, that this was the way forward although some were convinced that independent operations encouraged competition between the agencies which they asserted produced better results. Nevertheless there remains a clear need for significant cooperation rather than isolated initiatives.

No accurate measure of improved operational capacity and its compatibility with International law enforcement standards has been possible to date because there were no statistics provided about the baseline position prior to the commencement of the project although officers expressed confidence that as a result of the Project their agencies were more efficient.

It has been noted that the Gendarmerie in particular has yet to supply written feedback on the value of the training sessions and the study tours and consequently it has not been possible accurately to gauge measurable benefits. However, the explanation given has been that although the Project has been concluded it takes time for such widely dispersed personnel to consolidate their experiences and to supply written and comprehensive feedback reports; it was claimed by Gendarmerie representatives that these matters are in hand and reports will be produced in the not too distant future.

One of the principal aims of the Project was the creation of a Rural Action Plan compatible with the Turkish National and EU Drug Strategies. When asked about the apparent failure to deliver the plan the head of the Anti Smuggling and Organised Crime Department of Gendarmerie General Command stated that it had been agreed at a meeting with the EC Representative on 14.12.09 that the Rural Action Plan should form an additional part of the National Plan (to be renamed "Implementation Plan") and would be produced early in 2010 as the National Plan itself was due for updating for the period 2010-2012. This was confirmed by the EC Sector Manager of the European Commission Delegation to Turkey and the Head of the Narcotics Branch from the Directorate General of Customs Enforcement. Convincing assurances were given that a comprehensive document has been prepared as a result of many lessons learned from the Project training experience and Study Tours. Confidence was also expressed that the newly drafted document is so well prepared that it is hoped that it could serve as model for other countries. National officials corresponded positively to the request that these documents be forwarded to the UNODC National Officer at the earliest point possible.

The project was intended also to support the Government of Turkey in its efforts to meet the EU regulations in the context of accession of Turkey to the EU but it remains for others to judge how far that aim has been achieved.

A list of recommendations for the consideration of all parties is provided at the end of this report (pages 13-15).

4. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose ~ Reasons for Evaluation

The purpose of this report is to evaluate how far the aims of the project have been achieved, how successful the original objectives were in their design and assessment, and to identify any lessons learned to be considered by the agencies and by UNODC when planning future projects. The specific requirements are set out in the Terms of Reference (attached below); these may be summarised as being an assessment to what extent they have contributed to improvement in Turkey's control of illicit drugs, particularly in rural areas.

B. Methodology

The evaluation was conducted for a period of 15 days commencing 7th December including document analysis and field visits in Turkey between 12th and 19th December 2009; a list of those interviewed is provided below together with an indication of the type of questions that were put to many of those officers through meetings and interviews. A review of pertinent documents utilized in both the preparation of the project goals and feedback received from the agencies involved in this project was undertaken. The Evaluation Report in Draft Form was forwarded to the National Officer on 22nd December 2009. Comprehensive discussions/interviews were conducted with personnel arranged by the UNODC National Project Officer. The objectives of this evaluation were to examine the mandate, strategies, objectives, relevance, effectiveness, results, impact, sustainability and added value of UNODC's actions. Based on these assessments and analysis, findings are presented, lessons learned have been noted and recommendations made for the consideration of the EU, UNODC and law enforcement agencies concerned.

5. MAJOR FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

A. Project concept and design

The Project was ambitious given the history of the relationships between the four law enforcement agencies and it embodied some of the most advanced and complicated areas of policing; this in turn begs the question of "How confident can anyone be that the lessons have been fully learned and appropriately implemented?" A thorough evaluation of the translation from training to operational cooperation and effectiveness is necessary but it is too early so soon after the end of the Project to attempt that assessment particularly as no written reports have yet been supplied by the agencies and none of the training manuals have been produced. A period of consolidation is occurring, manuals and plans are reportedly being amended or prepared and the training benefits are said to be in the process of cascading through the various Law Enforcement Agencies.

Alignment of objectives with policy priorities, action plans and UNODC mandates:

The Project has been certified as being fully in accordance with Turkey's National Organised Crime Strategy, and Turkey's and the EU's National Drug Strategies and the EU Action Plan.

The overall objective was to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of relevant law enforcement agencies to enable them better to interdict drugs and disrupt trafficking organisations in rural areas within the context of accession to the EU; to this end it was intended to develop a *Rural Action Plan* compliant with Turkey's National Organised Strategy, and Turkey's and the EU's National Drug Strategies and the EU Action Plan; strengthen the capacity of Law Enforcement agencies in priority rural areas; establish an effective Drug Intelligence Unit and *modus operandi* for collection, analysis and dissemination of information (*it was noted in Interim Report No.1 that this objective had been overtaken by time and a competent Analytical Unit has been created in the Gendarmerie General Command; dedicated teams of analysts have been created in many provincial Gendarmerie Commands, state-of-the-art analytical software has been procured, installed and is being effectively used*); strengthen the capacity for the effective use of Special Investigative Means in rural drug law enforcement operations; establish a drugs law enforcement training curriculum including computer based training (CBT); and enhance National and International Cooperation to combat drug trafficking.

- **Clarity of objectives:** the objectives were briefly defined in the Project Document (attached below) but were vague and could have been more specific highlighting the requirement of Turkish officials to supply progress reports before the end of the Project. This would have made the assessment of progress and effects easier and findings made more credible and representative. A more comprehensive needs assessment should have been prepared with input from all intended beneficiaries but according to the EC Sector Manager there was a problem in bringing all institutions together at the design phase.
- **Monitoring systems** ~ it appears that there were practical difficulties in monitoring anything beyond the delivery of training as no feedback reports have yet been supplied by the Gendarmerie or any other agencies on the effectiveness or operational implementation of the training; to date little or no effective evaluation or monitoring has been possible other than by verbal reports from officers; no written reports on the project or the study tours have been received by UNODC. Quarterly Reports and an Interim Narrative Report were prepared by UNODC based on the experiences of expert contributors etc and these were helpful in the monitoring of the progress of the Project.

B. Objectives

The **overall objective** was “*To increase the efficiency and effectiveness of law enforcement authorities in Turkey to interdict drugs and disrupt trafficking organisations in rural areas within the context of accession to the EU*”.

Comprehensive interviews with senior and operational personnel have indicated that these officers are confident that this objective has been achieved and some reported examples of successful operations and improved operational competence flowing from the training and study tours, and the supply of equipment under the project. It seems that a flaw in this process may have been that no baseline statistics have been prepared and therefore no statistical evaluation has been possible. Additionally, it is too soon after the end of the Project for hard evidence of improved operational capability to be assessed

Project Objectives were defined as follows:

Objective 1: Development of a Rural Action Plan in line with the National Drug Strategy and EU Drug Strategy.

Objective 2: Strengthening the capacity for Drugs Law Enforcement at Priority Rural Areas.

Objective 3: Establishment of an Effective Drugs Intelligence Unit and Modus Operandi for the collection, analysis and dissemination of Information.

Objective 4: Strengthening the capacity for the effective use of Special Investigative Means in Rural Drug Law Enforcement Operations

Objective 5: Establishment of a Drugs Law Enforcement Training Curriculum including the use of Computer Based Training (CBT)

Objective 6: Enhanced National and International Cooperation against Drug Trafficking.

To what extent have the objectives been achieved?

Overall Objective: It must be assumed that professional officers have benefitted from the information supplied during training sessions based on what was said during interviews with some of those who had undergone training and to that extent it has to be said that the officers should be more efficient and effective than they were before the project was implemented.

Objective 1: Neither UNODC nor the evaluator have been shown a Rural Action Plan and as this was one of the primary purposes of the Project it cannot be said that this objective has been achieved in the terms of the Project Document. It has been agreed by all parties that the Rural Action Plan should form an additional part of the National Plan (to be renamed “Implementation Plan”) and should be produced early in 2010 as the National Plan itself is due for updating for the period 2010-2012. This was confirmed by the EC Sector Manager of the European Commission Delegation to Turkey and the Head of the Narcotics Branch from the Directorate General of Customs Enforcement.

Objective 2: It is asserted that this objective has been achieved not only because of the improved training that has come about from the Project but also because of the operational equipment supplied in the form of, for example, specially equipped training vehicles and sniffer dogs and their handlers.

Objective 3: it was noted in Interim Report No.1 that this objective had been overtaken by time and that a competent Analytical Unit has been created in the Gendarmerie General Command; dedicated teams of analysts have been

established in many provincial Gendarmerie Commands, state-of-the-art analytical software has been procured, installed and is being effectively used. More operational cooperation in intelligence matters, despite the fact that other agencies have their own systems, was also an often reported goal.

Objective 4: it was claimed by the Head of the Gendarmerie that this objective has been achieved in that 5 Regional Command Units have received specialist training in sophisticated matters such as undercover agents, the handling of informants, controlled deliveries and the necessary conduct at clandestine laboratories.

Objective 5: it was claimed by the Gendarmerie that this objective has been achieved by the preparation of updated or new training manuals and electronic facilities including a dedicated website and inter-active programmes. During a period of consolidation after the Project end new ideas and developments are reported as being pursued in the furtherance of improved operational competence. No manuals were produced for examination but oral statements as to their existence were supplied.

Objective 6: much verbal evidence was supplied to demonstrate how much this matter has been taken to heart. In October an International Workshop was held in Ankara at which representatives from ten countries and five International Organisations were present. National issues were discussed as well as the way forward for greater international cooperation in counter narcotics matters. Additionally four National Workshops were organised with invited international experts and the ways in which much more active cooperation with the 38 International Drugs Liaison Officers (DLOs) was planned. Every 3 months there are regular DLO meetings. It was also claimed that there has been a very good history of International operational activities in which information has been passed to, for example, Ukraine and Bulgaria; it was asserted that Turkey has not operated in isolation and has cooperated internationally whenever possible. According to the UNODC and INCB Reports approximately one ton of heroin was seized in Azerbaijan and Ukraine in 2007/08 with the help of intelligence from the Turkish narcotics police. Thus it was claimed that this objective has been successfully achieved.

C. Outputs, impact and sustainability

Project Outputs were defined as follows:

1. A Rural Action Plan is adopted by the Gendarmerie on Drug Trafficking in compliance with the National Drug Strategy, the National Organised Crime Strategy to conform to the EU Drugs Strategy and Action Plan. The Action Plan will include recommendations on restructuring if required.
2. Equipment and training is provided in 5 priority Gendarmerie regions.
3. A functioning system of drugs intelligence collection, analysis and dissemination is established to support proactive operations in rural areas.
4. The increased understanding and use of special investigative means to drive and support operational activity in rural areas.
5. Training programmes and curriculum are developed for law enforcement staff dealing with fight against drug trafficking in rural areas.
6. Cooperation between National Law Enforcement bodies is strengthened.

Have the expected Outputs been achieved?

- a) All agencies have insisted that all of the predicted Outputs have been successfully achieved but this is based on verbal statements and loosely defined objectives.
- b) Overall implementation process:** target groups were identified but it has not been possible to make precise measurements of outcomes; this was a risk that could have been identified in the original Project Document as it is difficult to identify with certainty that lessons learned resulted directly in an increase in seizures of drugs or arrests. It is a matter of professional judgement that operational efficiency has been improved.
- c) Institutional and Management arrangements** ~ there is every indication that appropriate support has been given in the furtherance of the aims of this Project by the Programme Coordinator for South Eastern Europe and the National Project Officer. However there were initial problems with a delay in appointing the International Project Coordinator which in turn held back commencement. Subsequently the appointee left early and the National Project Officer was obliged to take on both roles which she achieved satisfactorily but inevitable delays occurred as a result. Further there were some delays in mobilising some experts, particularly the Dog Training Expert, according to the EC sector manager, European Commission Delegation to Turkey. The Production of the Rural Action Plan was delayed because it has been renamed the 'Implementation Plan' as part of the National Drug Strategy Plan. Naturally there were a few logistical problems that were overcome but these were not insurmountable difficulties that had a significant or negative impact on the overall success of the project. The National Project Officer has kept a close watch on the administration process and was fully in touch with participating agencies and contributors. It has been reported from the Agencies concerned that after initial difficulties there has been good cooperation between parties throughout the project. Generally speaking the administrative process of the project has been assessed as very good by the EC Sector Manager and representatives of each agency.
- d) Outcome** ~ the outcome of this project should be that enhanced professionalism throughout the country, particularly the rural areas, will result in direct operational benefits in combating the drug trade; it is also anticipated that there will be international benefits. Some of the officers undergoing the training will be leaders and managers of the future and the increased professional awareness will be hugely beneficial particularly as participating agencies see distinct advantages in maintaining trained officers in the field and in building upon the foundations laid during such courses; there is a clear desire to invest the lessons learned into the institutional memory of Turkish law enforcement agencies. It is claimed that greater efficiency is already evolving within the region from this training programme but there is room for refinement that will produce further professional benefits. Cultural change will be necessary in strictly disciplined and hierarchical agencies in order to accept the necessity of joint operations and to facilitate joint intelligence led policing becoming the norm. Agencies must not

continue to operate in isolation and independently of one another and the clear way forward is collaboration.

e) Sustainability ~ it is apparent from all interviews that agencies are keen to raise the professional standards of their counter-narcotics officers and there is a commitment from all that although they are adamant that the UNODC contribution in this field is essential they are equally determined to develop their own training capacities. Clearly the seeds sown by this Project and the enthusiasm generated amongst participating agencies amount to a positive endorsement of sustainability but the commitment to joint operations is not yet fully apparent. Assurances have been given by the Gendarmerie, Police, Coast Guard and Customs that the training and study tour benefits are becoming a significant part of the institutional memory which will be passed on to all existing and future staff. There was frequent mention of the fact that the Project would have been better designed if all interested parties had been involved at the outset but according to the EC Sector Manager there were difficulties in achieving this.

f) Findings : ~ In addition to the fact that the Project is claimed to have been a success by all participants the following points became apparent during the evaluation:

- There is a strong desire from most officers to maintain professional relationships with colleagues from other agencies. To this end there was support for all activities that would enhance this relationship and keep officers up to date with developments. Officers were keen to participate in regular training updates with colleagues from other agencies and Drug Liaison Officers, specialist seminars and an annual National Drug Conference for operational officers from all four agencies with a specific theme and provision for specialist workshops, with the results being published in a Conference Report which could be distributed widely for the benefit of those who could not attend the conference. Invitations could be extended to International Drug Liaison Officers, Specialist Experts and representatives of appropriate International Organisations. Such activities are strongly recommended as they would enhance the networking and trust between professional colleagues and reinforce joint initiatives.
- It is important that information should be given to all officers that places regional counter-narcotic activities into a global context emphasising the impact that drug trafficking has on ~
 - ³/₄ **Public health** – with the spread of AIDS/HIV, Hepatitis C and other blood-borne diseases being classed by the World Health Organisation (WHO) as global pandemics which are outpacing the ability to deal with them;
 - ³/₄ **Organised and domestic crime** – including, for example international human trafficking, arms smuggling and money-laundering; while many national police forces claim that between

50-70% of domestic crimes are in some way drug related, including housebreaking, robbery and violent offences

- ³/₄ **International Terrorism** ~ there are only few terrorist groups that do not receive at least some of their funding from drug trafficking.

In regard to Public Health issues it should be stressed that personal safety of officers is important particularly in situations where they are likely to deal with dangerous and volatile substances in clandestine laboratories, contaminated injecting equipment and prisoners who may be infected with serious blood-borne diseases. It is also relevant to mention that many prisons are little better than incubators for disease and great care is necessary in dealing with prisoners who are capable of intentionally spreading infections. This essential information should form part of the required professional competencies and drug awareness of officers working in counter-narcotics activities. Some information has been given concerning operational safety but the above issues do not appear to have been covered comprehensively and this is recommended.

- It may be helpful to make available to members of judiciary and prosecution training concerning the special procedural and evidentiary requirements of major cases involving trafficking. Such training could deal with, for example, guidelines for the evaluation of chemical tests of controlled substances, reports and analyses for cases involving money laundering; and managing cases involving complex organised criminal groups where there may be guilt by association or vicarious liability for criminal acts. This could also be a useful forum in which to discuss the necessary changes in legislation that may become apparent.
- Although there was a great deal of confidence in a high degree of professionalism and the ability of counter narcotic personnel to address the problem of drug trafficking, particularly in the rural areas, and there is said to be regional inter-agency cooperation leading to the interdiction of major traffickers, nevertheless there is an apparent need for training leading to better intelligence led operations. A degree of over-confidence because of Turkey's relatively high seizure rate was detected and care needs to be taken to avoid complacency.
- Corruption is a serious problem wherever drug trafficking is involved; thus it is important to ensure absolute reliability within the law enforcement agencies by determined Integrity Testing.
- There is some evidence of regular joint investigations against major traffickers. Nevertheless the importance of these issues has been emphasised and there is gradual progress towards the interdiction of some although there is little evidence of the interception of precursor chemicals and greater attention to this is necessary by ensuring that officers are able to identify chemicals and understand shipping documents regarding them. This is regarded as a special responsibility of Customs Officers but there are advantages in spreading that expertise to all agencies.

- The trafficking of drugs through maritime routes presents problems and as a means of tackling this, land based interdiction should be complemented by measures to prevent illicit trafficking by sea as provided for in article 17 of the 1988 Convention. UNODC reports small volumes of drugs (2-3 tons) being shipped to Ukraine across the Black Sea; additionally small amounts are reportedly shipped directly from Turkey to Italy, The Netherlands and Greece. Specialist training may be necessary to ensure that law enforcement officers are able and equipped for boarding and searching vessels. Special measures should be taken to enlist the assistance of other mariners and port staff in reporting the suspicious movement of vessels.
- It seems that more attention could be given to the involvement of the community in defining awareness of the drug problem and encouraging the disclosure of information or suspicions about trafficking. Similarly a greater involvement of law enforcement agencies in schools liaison programmes would be a valuable tool in diminishing the prospect of greater drug abuse in Turkey.
- Practical training was preferred to theoretical work and all officers were keen to benefit from “hands on” experience. However an element of over-dependence on donors was detected in that officers requested that mobile X-ray equipment is donated when it is possible for the agencies to make their own financial arrangements to acquire this as necessary.
- There are at least two excellent training academies in operation, one run by the Gendarmerie which offers very sophisticated facilities, and another which is affiliated with the Turkish Academy for Drugs and Organised Crime (TADOC) and has a high international reputation for the quality of its training. With the benefits that accrue from joint operations it might be worthwhile examining if there is any duplication that could be eliminated. There is no reason why specific training programmes e.g. for the rural areas could not be given at either academy. There may be grounds for reducing any unnecessary duplication of effort brought about by the existence of two academies devoted to drugs and organised crime.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

- The Project Document could have been better prepared to stress the importance of written feedback after training and study tours and the compliance with specific requirements such as the production of manuals, training aids and specifically the Rural Action Plan. The objectives should have been more specifically defined as this would have avoided misunderstandings between the UNODC and Agencies which have given rise to apparently wrong perceptions. Indicators of achievement were not sufficiently precise. The relevant institutions should have been brought together at the design phase of the Project to avoid any subsequent allegations that they were not fully consulted.

- The intentions of the Project were ambitious given that it addressed some of the most complicated aspects of policing but they were achievable and although some difficulties and misunderstandings arose the benefits accruing appear to be significant. Improved operational efficiency and greater emphasis on intelligence led policing has yet to be fully evaluated.
- Some of the expert contributions may have been too sophisticated for some of the trainees and further training to consolidate the lessons may prove to be necessary; this needs to be assessed within the agencies who should report their findings to the National Project Officer.
- There should have been a written assessment of operational activities by all agencies before the commencement of the Project to provide a baseline against which future progress could be assessed; without that information evaluation is little better than anecdote and guesswork.
- A general observation was made by several representatives that on reflection it may have been better to design a more comprehensive Project that was not only primarily concerned with the Rural Area. This seems to have been accepted implicitly by virtue of the fact that the proposed Rural Action Plan is now an Implementation Plan as an extension of the National Plan for the whole of Turkey. Drug Trafficking is a National problem and it is perhaps unnecessary to try to compartmentalise responses to it.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Pre Project Donor/Recipient Consultation:** This was the first experience of a grant by the European Commission Delegation to Turkey to the UNODC and there were implementation problems and avoidable delays because of misunderstanding by both parties. It is recommended that in the case of any future grants that all expectations by the donor and the recipient be clearly defined. In the case of this Project there was a delay in appointing the International Project Coordinator until the grant had been formally agreed. The EC position was that once the grant had been approved then all measures for the implementation of the Project should be taken before the commencement date to allow for immediate action.
- **Joint Operations/Intelligence Unit:** immediate consideration should be given to the establishment of a unit comprising staff from all relevant agencies to gather analyse and disseminate intelligence and to promulgate appropriate intelligence led operations against drug trafficking and organised crime groups throughout Turkey and the region.
- **National Criminal Intelligence Bureau:** There would be immense benefit if a National Intelligence Bureau could be established in Turkey for all crime related matters and not just those associated with Drug Trafficking. Not only would this avoid duplication of effort but also a waste of valuable resources. Clearly there would also be operational advantages

to law enforcement agencies if such a Bureau could be combined with a National Criminal Records Bureau and a Fingerprint/DNA Records Office.

- **Annual Drug Conference:** It is apparent that there are plenty of conferences held in Turkey that address the problems associated with organised crime and drug trafficking but in order to encourage the idea of closer working relationships between the law enforcement agencies it is suggested that an Annual Drug Conference for operational officers in all law enforcement agencies in Turkey should be held with a specific theme and specialist workshops that would provide an opportunity for updating, professional networking and forward planning. A conference report should be published for wide distribution throughout the country for the benefit of those unable to attend.
- **Community Involvement:** It is apparent that the relevant authorities are engaged with informing the general public about the problems associated with drugs and that schools are visited in order to try to limit any likelihood of a growth in the misuse of drugs. However, there are operational advantages for law enforcement agencies to have closer links with the communities that they serve not only in the hope that citizens would be inclined to report their suspicions but also that they would help to avoid any increase in the misuse of drugs. Community, school and family based prevention programmes help to promote proper attitudes about the availability and abuse of illicit drugs and the perception of their risks. Also they increase awareness of vulnerability, risk and factors that are closely associated with drug abuse and society's tolerance for drug dealers and those involved in trafficking. To this end active involvement of appropriately trained law enforcement staff is recommended in a National Law Enforcement Schools Liaison Programme and a widespread Community Relations Programme. Experience has shown that in most transit countries increased domestic drug abuse problems arise as spill over is a common phenomenon. Local drug trafficking groups which assist in transit operations are often paid in kind, and they sell their share of illicit drugs in order to generate income. As these groups do not have access to foreign markets they sell the drugs locally giving rise to abuse and dependency. Turkish law enforcement agencies all claim that they are aware of this risk but should take stronger measures to diminish it. There were indications of over-confidence about the control of this problem because of the relatively high rate of drug seizures in Turkey. However, the amount of drugs seized represents only between 10 - 15% of the UNODC estimated amount of opiates transiting the country and there should be no room for complacency.
- **Corruption/Integrity Testing:** because of the high risk of corruption associated with organised crime and particularly drug trafficking, special measures should be taken in all law enforcement agencies to ensure the absolute integrity of officers and to give them a measure of protection.
- **Enhanced Border Controls:** It is reported by UNODC that a substantial amount of drugs transiting Turkey leaves via Bulgaria's

borders with Romania, Serbia and Greece. This was recognised by officers from the Gendarmerie and thus it would seem to be wise to concentrate greater efforts in training law enforcement officers at all borders in search techniques in particular and in encouraging greater cooperation with international colleagues particularly as seizures of drugs trafficked into surrounding countries are remarkably and unacceptably low.

Ian OLIVER January 2010.

8. ANNEXES

NB: UNODC Turkey to attach Project Document, Terms of Reference and list people met/interviewed and locations visited.

Questionnaires: (these were produced as an indication of the types of questions that could be directed at participants) ~

- **Questionnaire for Trainees:**

1. Was the training that you received of a standard that enabled you to improve your professional/operational competence?
2. How have you benefited personally from your training? In what ways?
3. Has your agency as a whole benefited substantially from the training of its officers? If so describe how this has occurred.
4. Have you been able to share with/pass on to others the lessons/skills that you have learned?
5. Were you provided with adequate materials from the training course that have enabled you to refresh your memory of what was learned and to consolidate the training received?
6. Do you require refresher training?
7. Were you fully aware of your agencies policies and counter narcotics strategies before you attended the training course?
8. Have you been able to establish a network of contacts from other agencies that have enhanced your operational abilities? If so give examples of this.
9. How would you rate the standard of training given? Was it excellent, good, mediocre or poor?
10. Was the method of instruction helpful to you or were there difficulties/problems with it?
11. Were there other areas of training that you thought was necessary? Is there further training that you would like?
12. Did you feel that your professional abilities matched or exceeded/fell short of your colleagues from other agencies?
13. Describe the training needs for your agency that you have identified as a result of attending this course.
14. Were the training materials adequate for the purpose?
15. Have you been able to consolidate and update your training through CBT material, manuals or contact with a designated training officer?
16. Do you think that your professionalism has been raised and are you content that you are able to impact drug trafficking organisations in the Rural areas?
17. Do you have any examples of how there has been enhanced National and International cooperation as a result of this project?
18. What more would you like to see to improve the competence of your agency in dealing with drug problems? Is a further Project necessary?
19. Preparation of local training manuals?
20. Do you obtain any information from members of the public about drug trafficking? If so how is this recorded, analysed and shared?

- **Questionnaire for Project Officer and Training Officers (where relevant):**

1. Are you satisfied that the Project Document addressed the perceived need for counter-narcotic training in Turkey? If not what should have been included? Have you made any significant changes to the original requirements?
2. Are you confident that the aims and objectives have been fully achieved to date? How did you assess/measure this? If not, what more needs to be done and what changes are necessary?
3. Were all participants in the training questioned about the nature and value of the training and were the results/answers recorded?
4. What measures did you take to satisfy yourself that the training was relevant to and understood fully by the trainees? Were they tested/ examined on their training and were the participants given a certificate to show that they had achieved an acceptable standard after this?
5. What measures are in place to assess retention of the knowledge imparted to trainees? For example is the Country Officer responsible for training assessing/monitoring this and giving feedback?
6. How have you been able to assess that the training has resulted in improvement in professionalism and operational results achieved?
7. Has there been regular liaison between you and a designated officer responsible for training in each agency?
8. Have any joint training meetings occurred or are they planned to enable assessment of the training and recommendations for future action in this field?
9. Are you aware of improved inter-agency co-operation in whole or in part? If so describe this briefly. Identify any problem areas and recommend action to remedy these.
10. Are you satisfied that UNODC has offered the maximum support for these training exercises? If not say why and suggest what more could have been done? Were there adequate staff members available to achieve the project aims?
11. Do you think that the Project is on-track to achieve its aims/objectives? If not how has it fallen short and what should be done to overcome the shortfall.
12. What lessons have you learned from this exercise and do you think that further and/or advanced training is necessary? Have enough officers received adequate training for the demands placed on their agencies or should more officers receive the same or different training?
13. Is there any way that the training delivery could be improved for example by Computer Aided Delivery for refresher training or distance learning packages for those not able to attend?
14. Were there any difficulties in delivering the training such as inappropriate officers sent for training etc?
15. Are you aware of any problems about professional continuity by which I mean that officers sent for training no longer continue in the field of counter narcotics once they return to their country?
16. Did any officers who underwent training identify any difficulties that would inhibit their professional ability to carry out the work for which they were being trained? If so please describe these.

17. Was there a common standard of professional competence amongst all officers trained or were there significant professional differences between officers from different agencies? If so please describe these differences.
18. What evidence is available to demonstrate enhanced International cooperation?
19. What records are available before and after the implementation of the Project that could demonstrate improvement?
20. Why is there no mention of community involvement in this Project and why has no attention been given to schools liaison schemes designed to counter potential drug abuse?
21. What are the next required steps for further development?
22. What has been done about “training the trainers”?