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### Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation or Acronym</th>
<th>Full name/word</th>
<th>Abbreviation or Acronym</th>
<th>Full name/word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCBC</td>
<td>Department of Community-Based Corrections</td>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-survey</td>
<td>Electronic survey</td>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMCP</td>
<td>Global Maritime Crime Programme</td>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQI+</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender, queer/questioning, intersex</td>
<td>UNODC HQ</td>
<td>UNODC Headquarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>UNODC ROSA</td>
<td>UNODC Regional Office South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIMS</td>
<td>Offender Information Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendations\(^1\)  Management Response\(^2\)

1. **RECOMMENDATION 1 – AWARENESS RAISING**: UNODC Programme Office in Colombo to ensure participating stakeholders are fully aware of all the output documents prepared within the framework of the project by, amongst others, convening a meeting with key national stakeholders and donors, to present project results and outline priorities for the future.  
   - Accepted

2. **RECOMMENDATION 2 – ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOME**: To enable the project beneficiary institutions to benefit from the momentum built up during project implementation to move towards achieving the outcome, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo, in cooperation with Justice Section at UNODC HQ and UNODC Regional Office South Asia (ROSA), should make efforts to receive funding for an extension of this project/2nd phase of the project, with adequate implementation time and budget.  
   - Accepted

3. **RECOMMENDATION 3 – CAPACITY BUILDING**: UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should work together with the DCBC to ensure that the new recruits benefit from training content, including from project outputs, in a possible continuation/2nd phase of this project.  
   - Accepted

4. **RECOMMENDATION 4 – GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND**: UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should ensure appropriate inclusion of gender and marginalized/vulnerable groups in the project activities and output reports, and explore collaboration with relevant institutions, for example, State Ministry of Women and Child Development.  
   - Accepted

5. **RECOMMENDATION 5 – SYNERGIES**: To make use of possible synergies and enhance efficiency, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should ensure collaborative approach with activities of other UNODC projects/programs, for example, on prisoner classification.  
   - Accepted

---

\(^1\) This is just a short synopsis of the recommendation, please refer to the respective chapter in the main body of the report for the full recommendation.

\(^2\) Accepted/partially accepted or rejected for each recommendation. For any recommendation that is partially accepted or rejected, a short justification is to be added.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations¹</th>
<th>Management Response²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. RECOMMENDATION 6 – SUSTAINABILITY AND IMPACT:</strong> To maximize benefits from current interest and commitment of in-country stakeholders, contribute to sustainability and make an impact, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo, in cooperation with Justice Section at UNODC HQ and ROSA, could discuss with national stakeholders and introduce a larger program, including drug-rehabilitation.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION
PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

In several countries, pre-trial and post-conviction alternatives to imprisonment are under-used; this contributes to prison overcrowding, leading to conditions contrary to the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, and the UN’s Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Despite the existence of enabling legislation in Sri Lanka, alternatives to imprisonment are little used and prisons are overcrowded. The objective of the project is “to promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based corrections, in Sri Lanka”, which contributes to Expected Accomplishment 5(b) “Crime prevention and criminal justice system reform initiatives within UNODC’s mandate are developed and implemented in accordance with international standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice”.

The project is related to the Subprogramme 5 “Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice under the Regional Programme for South Asia (2018-2022).” The project envisions to achieve its objective by carrying out Gap Analysis of alternatives to imprisonment, awareness raising and capacity building through training and technical assistance.

The project was implemented under the overall guidance of UNODC Regional Office South Asia (ROSA), based in New Delhi, India, which was the Executing Agency. The project commenced in April 2020 and is planned to be completed on 31 December 2021. The agreed funding for the project was USD 410,000 from the Government of Germany. Day-to-day project management and coordination was carried out by a National Programme Coordinator (NPC), based in Colombo, Sri Lanka, working under the direct supervision of the Head of UNODC Programme Office in Colombo, Sri Lanka, and the UNODC Regional Representative at ROSA. Further, a Crime Prevention & Criminal Justice Officer, based at Justice Section, UNODC Headquarters (HQ) in Vienna, Austria, and a Criminal Justice Expert at ROSA, provided advice and guidance to the project. An International Legal Expert and four National Experts were recruited for various activities, including preparing assessment reports and the Strategic Plan.

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

The findings of the final independent project evaluation of the project “Promoting the Use of Non-Custodial Measures in Sri Lanka” [project number SLKAB8] are presented in this report. The final evaluation took place from 15 September – 20 December 2021. It was conducted by an evaluation team comprising an evaluation expert, Ms. Suman Lederer, and a substantive expert, Mr. Paul English. The final evaluation covered the time period from project commencement in April 2020 – 18 November 2021, the end of data collection. According to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the final evaluation, the purpose of the final evaluation is “to inform the future development of the project or similar projects, for organizational learning, and to assess the success and areas of improvement of the project.”

This Independent Project Evaluation was further a pilot for adapted evaluation processes at UNODC under the supervision of the Independent Evaluation Section.

The evaluation applied a mixed-methods approach, including quantitative and qualitative analyses to reach the findings and conclusions. The evaluation team consulted different sources for triangulation, to enhance validity, reliability and credibility of the findings. Data collection was based on review of documents, an e-survey and semi-structured interviews.

The UNEG guiding ethical principles for evaluation were adhered to by the evaluation team, which also made efforts to apply the do-no-harm-approach.

* Official name is Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, hereafter referred to as ‘Sri Lanka’ in the report.
MAIN FINDINGS

RELEVANCE: Project outputs, outcome and objective are highly relevant in the context of the country, as prison overcrowding is recognized as a challenge. The project outputs, with the Drivers and Assumptions holding true, can be expected to lead to the achievement of project outcome and objective.

COHERENCE: Project is completely in alignment with the objectives, work and priorities of, and has successfully established effective contact with, the national stakeholder institutions pertinent to non-custodial sentencing. It is also in complete alignment with the Regional Programme for South Asia. UNODC is a highly appreciated partner by the national authorities involved in the project.

EFFECTIVENESS: The three outputs, outcome and objective are partially achieved; reasons for partial achievement are the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the short duration to the project and the scope of awareness-raising and capacity building that did not reach all relevant stakeholders. Contextually, the lack of adequate drug-rehabilitation centres hinders full progress. At the same time, it is accentuated that the project has achieved several activities in an outstanding manner, for example, conducting nine capacity-building workshops with physical presence, taking COVID-19 restrictions also into consideration, preparation of a comprehensive Gaps and Needs Assessment report on non-custodial measures, a training module for the Judges’ Institute, Guidelines (Standard Operating Procedure) and an Offender Information Management System for the Department of Community-Based Corrections which has already been approved for usage.

EFFICIENCY: Notwithstanding the challenges posed by COVID-19, the project has made use of existing web-based possibilities and carried out its activities in a timely and efficient manner and delivered its results according to the needs of the stakeholders. It has conducted two webinars, and prepared relevant assessments and documents remotely. In line with the identified requirement and request of the Department of Community-Based Corrections, it has also supported the preparation of the Offender Information Management System and was in the process of supporting a prisoners’ classification. Contributing factors have been the persistent efforts of the National Programme Coordinator, the project facilitating and responding to a needs-based approach, thus further enhancing the willingness and commitment of the stakeholders, as well as a favourable interest of the stakeholder institutions towards enhancing non-custodial measures in sentencing.

SUSTAINABILITY: The Offender Information Management System and the Strategic Plan (draft) for the Department of Community-Based Corrections as well as the Training Module for the Judges’ Institute (yet to receive final approval) contribute to continuation of results supported by the project, even after project completion. Integration of knowledge and information prepared within the framework of the project in the training of future Officers of the Department of Community-Based Corrections is envisaged.

HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY, DISABILITY INCLUSION AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND: The project is based on strong foundations of human rights and leaving-no-one-behind and has been successful in integrating the established principles of human rights into its activities, namely, the Tokyo Rules, the Nelson Mandela Rules and the Bangkok Rules. At the same time, although project has encouraged participation of both genders in all its activities, it has integrated gender and marginalized/vulnerable groups, including juveniles, in its assessments, reports and activities to a limited extent.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Project outcome and objective are highly relevant in the context of the country; project had planned appropriate activities, outputs and outcome, which taken together, can be expected to lead to the envisaged project objective, the drivers and assumptions holding true. It is fully in alignment with the work, priorities and objectives of relevant national stakeholder institutions. The project outputs and outcome are partially achieved, due to different reasons, amongst others, short time frame of the project and limited financial capacity. Nonetheless, it has successfully carried out capacity-building activities in different provinces, and
prepared relevant assessments and reports, as well as a much-needed and requested Offender Information Management System for the Department of Community-Based Corrections, which also directly contributes to sustainability of project results. It is considered to be on the right path towards achieving its outcome and objective, should there be a possibility to continue with adequate resources and time. Contributing factors have been the continued efforts of the National Programme Coordinator the good mix of expertise, the engagement and commitment of the stakeholders, as well as the interest in the country favourable to the enhancement of non-custodial measures. Albeit faced with unexpected challenges that arose due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the project adapted well and worked in an efficient and timely manner. Project is in alignment with established international practices for treatment of prisoners, namely, the Tokyo Rules, the Nelson Mandela Rules and the Bangkok Rules. It has high potential for integration of gender and marginalized/vulnerable groups, including juveniles, in its activities. UNODC is a much-appreciated partner by national stakeholders and, there is potential for implementing further work, that builds upon this project and extends to drug rehabilitation.

MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

Six main recommendations have been formulated, which are included in the corresponding section of the report; these are mentioned, in short, as follows:

**Recommendation 1 - Awareness raising:** UNODC Programme Office in Colombo to ensure participating stakeholders are fully aware of all the output documents prepared within the framework of the project by, amongst others, convening a meeting with key national stakeholders and donors, to present project results and outline priorities for the future.

**Recommendation 2 – Achievement of outcome:** To enable the project beneficiary institutions to benefit from the momentum built up during project implementation to move towards achieving the outcome, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo, in cooperation with Justice Section at UNODC HQ and ROSA, should make efforts to receive funding for an extension of this project/2nd phase of the project, with adequate implementation time and budget.

**Recommendation 3 – Capacity building:** UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should work together with the DCBC to ensure that the new recruits benefit from training content, including from project outputs, in a possible continuation/2nd phase of this project.

**Recommendation 4 – Gender mainstreaming and leaving-no-one-behind:** UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should ensure appropriate inclusion of gender and marginalized/vulnerable groups in the project activities and output reports, and explore collaboration with relevant institutions, for example, State Ministry of Women and Child Development.

**Recommendation 5 – Synergies:** To make use of possible synergies and enhance efficiency, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should ensure collaborative approach with activities of other UNODC projects/programs, for example, on prisoner classification.

**Recommendation 6 – Sustainability and Impact:** To maximize benefits from current interest and commitment of in-country stakeholders, contribute to sustainability and make an impact, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo, in cooperation with Justice Section at UNODC HQ and ROSA, could discuss with national stakeholders and introduce a larger program, including drug-rehabilitation.

MAIN LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICE

Three lessons learned and four best practices have been identified and included in the corresponding section of the report. Key ones are mentioned as follows:

**LESSONS LEARNED**

1: While it is necessary to formulate the project document to include the envisaged outcome and project objective, they might be too ambitious for the provided time duration and budget.
2: Ownership and commitment by the main stakeholder institutions contributes greatly to effective project implementation, and possibly to sustainability of project results.

BEST PRACTICES

1. Project has drawn from a mix of expertise, namely, the Crime and Justice Officer in Vienna, UNODC ROSA, the Crime and Justice Expert in New Delhi, the NPC, as well as the National and International Experts and expertise from beneficiary institutions that consolidated relevance and informed familiarity into the inputs and outputs.

2. The OIMS prepared under the project is a very good instrument for maintaining much-needed data on offenders with non-custodial sentences. It was identified as a need of the DCBC and provided by the project. Thus, the project has responded effectively to need and request of key stakeholder institution, based on a collaborative approach.
I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

OVERALL CONCEPT AND DESIGN: Prison overcrowding hinders good prison management, effective criminal justice policy, crime prevention and undermines adherence to prisoners’ rights which are enshrined in the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, as well as in the UN’s Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Countries need support for enhancing the usage of non-custodial measures, including in legal and policy frameworks and knowledge and awareness raising about the usage and benefits of non-custodial measures, for general public, and persons working in different branches of the respective justice systems.

The project was implemented under the overall guidance of UNODC Regional Office South Asia (ROSA), based in New Delhi, India, which was the Executing Agency. The foreseen duration for the project is 21 months. It commenced in April 2020 and is planned to be completed on 31 December 2021. The agreed funding for the project was USD 410,000 from the Government of Germany. Day-to-day project management and coordination was carried out by a National Programme Coordinator (NPC), based in Colombo, Sri Lanka, working under the direct supervision of the Head of UNODC Programme Office in Colombo, Sri Lanka, and the UNODC Regional Representative at ROSA. Further, a Crime Prevention & Criminal Justice Officer, based at Justice Section, UNODC Headquarters (HQ) in Vienna, Austria, and a Criminal Justice Expert at ROSA, provided advice and guidance to the project. An International Legal Expert and four National Experts were recruited for various activities, including preparing assessment reports and the Strategic Plan.

According to the project logical framework in the project document, the objective of the project is “to promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based corrections, in Sri Lanka”. The project objective contributes to the Expected Accomplishment 5(b) “Crime prevention and criminal justice system reform initiatives within UNODC’s mandate are developed and implemented in accordance with international standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice”. The project is related to the Subprogramme 5 “Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice under the Regional Programme for South Asia (2018-2022).

To achieve the above project objective, the project entails three Outputs, under one Outcome – Sri Lanka decrease the resort to imprisonment, namely, review of Sri Lanka’s existing legal framework on alternatives to imprisonment, capacity building and awareness-raising via a national forum. Project objective is fully aligned with the National Action Plan for the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights (2017-2021)\(^4\). Although the project document does not specifically mention the ‘do-no-harm’ approach, it is integrated de facto in project activities. To illustrate the logic behind the intervention in a simplified manner, the evaluation team has re-constructed a Theory of Change (TOC), which is included in Annex VI.

CONTEXT: Sri Lanka\(^5\) is an island country in the Indian Ocean, located south of the Indian peninsula. It is a presidential republic and has a population of over 23 million, with almost 19% of the population living in urban

\(^4\) Objective 2.4. To strengthen protection of persons held in prisons including those held in remand custody

Activity 2.4.3. Appoint a committee to study the value and feasibility of incorporating the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and the UN Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-Custodial Measures for Women Offenders, otherwise known as the ‘Bangkok Rules’, as part of official government policy on the treatment of prisoners

\(^5\) CIA World Factbook. 
areas. Sinhala is one of the two official languages of the country, Tamil being the other and English also being used frequently as the link language. The country is divided into nine administrative divisions/Provinces.

The legal background or the Rule of Law of the country is housed at the Ministry of Justice, which also entails the Attorney General’s Department as well as the Judges’ Institute. One of its branches for protecting the Rule of Law is the State Ministry of Prison Management and Prisoners Rehabilitation Affairs, which deals with the thematic areas of, as the name suggests, prison reforms and prisoners’ rehabilitation. For the implementation of its work, it entails, amongst other departments, the Department of Prisons and the DCBC. These Departments and Institutions have been made aware of the project and are participating in the project in different roles.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE: The findings of the final independent project evaluation of the project “Promoting the Use of Non-Custodial Measures in Sri Lanka” [project number SLKAB8] are presented in this report. The final evaluation took place from 15 September – 20 December 2021. According to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the final evaluation, the purpose of the final evaluation is “to inform the future development of the project or similar projects; for organizational learning; and assess the success and areas of improvement of the project.” The final evaluation also serves the purpose of informing on the progress of project activities and ownership by government and stakeholders as well as accountability to all stakeholders. Main intended users of the evaluation results are national beneficiary and stakeholder institutions and donor, as well as UNODC senior management, programme management and UNODC Regional Office in South Asia.

This Independent Project Evaluation was further a pilot for adapted evaluation processes at UNODC under the supervision of the Independent Evaluation Section.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM: The external independent evaluation team consisted of one evaluation expert, also leading the evaluation, Ms. Suman Lederer, and one substantive expert, Mr. Paul English. The evaluation team is well balanced in terms of gender (50/50) and geographic (North-South) representation. Both the members of the evaluation team have several years of work experience in different cultural contexts, including Asia, and have proven their ability to be culturally sensitive.

The evaluation expert has been working in the field of evaluation for over 10 years, and has conducted evaluations in Africa, Asia, Caucasus, Central Asia, South-Pacific, Southeast Europe. The substantive expert has been working in the field of international criminal justice reform for 25 years and has also supported several evaluations in the sector.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The final evaluation was conducted in compliance with the UNODC evaluation policy, norms, standards, guidelines for evaluations and for gender-responsive evaluations and templates and the terms of reference (TOR) for the final evaluation; it also adhered to the UNEG Norms and Standards, UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations (2014).

---

6 Official name is Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, hereafter referred to as ‘Sri Lanka’ in the report.  
9 UNODC (2018): Gender-Responsive Evaluations in the Work of UNODC.  
10 Templates for the Inception report and Evaluation report were provided by UNODC IES.  
11 IPE_SLKAB8_TOR_Final approved_13Aug2021.  
It covered almost the full duration of the project from 1 April 2020 till 18 November 2021, the end of data collection\textsuperscript{14}; official end of the project is 31 December 2021.

The final evaluation included the following phases - Inception, Data collection and analysis, Report writing, Submission of draft evaluation report and receiving feedback, and Finalization of evaluation report and submission.

Based on the criteria and main evaluation questions mentioned in the TOR, an evaluation framework matrix was prepared, which is included in Annex II. The evaluation was carried out based on a participatory approach. Stakeholders had been identified during the Inception Phase, which included UNODC staff, UNODC field staff, NPC, national stakeholder institutions. The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach, whereby both quantitative (e-survey) and qualitative analyses (semi-structured interviews) of responses received and document review were used to reach the findings and conclusions.

**Triangulation** was carried out by consulting different sources, to the maximum extent realistic and possible, to ensure reliability of information and increase validity and credibility of findings and conclusions. The evaluation team checked all information provided across data sources and collection methods used.

The findings of the final evaluation are based on the following data collection methods:

**Review of documents:** The evaluation team has reviewed all documents (20 UNODC-internal and 15 external documents) made available to them and researched, including, but not limited to, project document, output documents produced within the framework of the project, workshop/ progress/ annual/ reports, UNODC strategic documents, etc. A list of documents is provided in Annex III.

**E-Survey:** An electronic survey/e-survey was conducted at the outset of the data collection phase. The e-survey was sent to 15 stakeholders (6 female, 9 male persons), including stakeholder institutions and national and international experts. 13 responses (86.6%) were received (4 female, 9 male persons). The e-survey entailed closed questions and enabled a quantitative analysis of the responses received and provided the evaluation team with overall perception of the stakeholders on the key evaluation criteria mentioned in the TOR. The evaluation team took the responses into consideration during the semi-structured interviews, whereby further information was requested from the interviewees. The questions for the e-survey are included in Annex II; a table illustrating summaries of anonymized responses is included in Annex V.

**Semi-structured interviews:** The evaluation team made equal efforts to contact both male and female stakeholders, and conducted the interviews for both genders without any bias, and adapted empathy and cultural sensitiveness appropriately, depending on the interviewee, as necessary. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key stakeholders and representatives of participating institutions, via Zoom; interviewees included representatives of national stakeholder institutions, UNODC staff, national and international experts. 17 persons were interviewed altogether, 8 female, 9 male. List of stakeholders interviewed/consulted is included in Annex IV. All the interviews were conducted in English language; no lingual issues arose or were faced during the interviews. Questions for the semi-structured interviews were open-ended and are included in Annex II. A qualitative content analysis of the responses was carried out.

**Ethics in Evaluation:** The evaluation team followed the UNEG guiding ethical principles for evaluation, to ensure honesty and truthfulness, professionalism, independence, impartiality, incorruptibility, transparency, responsiveness, taking responsibility, accountability, maximum engagement, fair treatment, fair representation, consideration of risks and benefits, doing no harm and making evaluation an overall positive contribution. The survey and all the interviews were conducted remotely; no evaluation mission took place, thus not contributing to the environment in any adverse manner. [Note of the evaluation team: although this is a positive factor for this evaluation, this is not a general recommendation for all evaluations.]

\textsuperscript{14} Information received on activities achieved after 18\textsuperscript{th} November has also been considered and included in the report.
## LIMITATIONS TO THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations to the evaluation</th>
<th>Mitigations measures, as applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evaluation mission was planned or took place due to Covid-19. Therefore, stakeholders could not be met in person, no face-to-face meetings with physical presence could take place, the evaluation team could not gather evidence on the situation and surrounding factors and circumstances on the ground.</td>
<td>An e-survey was planned and conducted to capture initial feedback of the stakeholders. Individual interviews were conducted with as many stakeholders as possible, via Zoom, and where possible with webcam. Further, documents were reviewed to validate the information and findings to the maximum extent possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the workshop agendas, presentations and promotional material, produced under the project are in the local language.</td>
<td>The NPC explained to the evaluation team the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor reporting schedule meant cumulative records and accounts of activities as well as proper finance report for 2021 were not available.</td>
<td>Although reports were not available, the evaluation team ensured maximum data collection via the e-survey, interviews, research and document review. Via the interviews as well as by searching for and putting together external reference documents, the evaluation team was able to receive related information and data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the evaluation team cannot ensure full confidentiality and taking the do-no-harm approach into consideration, the evaluation team decided not to interview any vulnerable groups/persons with experience of non-custodial measures.</td>
<td>The evaluation relied on information provided by the implementing and partner organizations and presented questions in such a manner so as to reduce bias to the maximum extent possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

RELEVANCE

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

*To what extent are the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project relevant to achieving its objective?*

The project concept was prepared in the second half of 2019, and approved by the donor, Government of Germany. The project document is clearly formulated in terms of activities and is completely aligned with UNODC’s strategies and priorities, as well as the practical application of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures, and the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), specifically SDG 16.15

To illustrate the logic behind the intervention, or “cause and effect relationship between an intervention’s activities and its intended results” [UNODC, 2017], to gain an “understanding of different results in the change pathway” [UNODC, 2018], albeit in a simplified manner, the evaluation re-constructed a TOC; the TOC is included in Annex VI. There is one major change in the reconstructed TOC, when compared with the project logical framework. According to the evaluation team,

‘Sri Lanka decrease the resort to imprisonment’ is at a higher achievement level than ‘To promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based initiatives, in Sri Lanka’.

That is, according to the evaluation team, and as illustrated in the reconstructed TOC, Outcome 1 should read: ‘To promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based initiatives, in Sri Lanka’; and the Project Objective should read: ‘Sri Lanka decrease the resort to imprisonment’.

Both Drivers and Assumptions are external to the project. Based on the reconstructed TOC, the Outputs can be expected to lead to the Outcome and the Outcome to the Objective, the Drivers and Assumptions holding true.

‘Radicalisation’ in places of detention is notoriously difficult to research, though incidents, anecdotes and some research indicate the risks existing inside prisons.16 One of the key approaches, consistent with upholding the Mandela Rules, is good management of prisons as safe and orderly environments.17 A major constraint to this is prison overcrowding. Prison overcrowding is a big issue in Sri Lanka, with prisons at 184.59% of capacity. According to official data,18 almost 50% are in prison for drug consumption or drug-related issues, and all the interviewed stakeholders confirmed the high importance of implementing non-custodial measures as an important contribution to reduce overcrowding. The strengthening of DCBC for the increased use of non-custodial options is identified as one of the four main strategies in the 5-year plan for Prison Reform (2012 – 2025), Department of Prisons, which the project envisages via capacity-building of DCBC Officers.

As mentioned under ‘Limitations of the evaluation’, the evaluation team did not speak with persons having experienced or experiencing non-imprisonment sentences/non-custodial measures. Nonetheless,

---

15 Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

16 See for example from Kings College, Prisons and Terrorism Radicalisation and De-radicalisation in 15 Countries


Interviewees from national stakeholder institutions mentioned that non-custodial measures are very much appreciated by offenders, as they have the opportunity to be with their families, are not faced with social stigma related to imprisonment and because they still see a chance for themselves to remain integrated in their communities.

Based on different data collection methods, it was noted that there are key measures that can catalyse the reform process and some of these have been part of the project (analysis, awareness capacity building, tools for application of community corrections such as the database and correction officer guidelines) however the systemic, legislative and socio-economic changes that support fullest achievement, are longer processes. Project activities and outputs are based on internationally-recommended practices for reducing overcrowding in prisons, for example in Compendium of Good Practices in the Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Violent Extremist Offenders, Global Centre on Cooperative Security and Radicalisation and de-radicalisation in prison – what should we do with violent extremist offenders? Penal Reform International. Reducing pre-trial detention and alternatives to imprisonment (non-custodial sanctions) are identified as two highly important approaches to be implemented as part of prison overcrowding reduction strategies. The Dhaka Declaration on Reducing Overcrowding in Prisons in South Asia, 2010 also emphasises the role of pre-trial options (bail) and alternatives to imprisonment. Essential lessons for the development, and promotion of, non-custodial options have been researched and established. The project is based on, though contextualised, these lessons.

### SUMMARY – RELEVANCE

1. Prison overcrowding is recognized as a challenge in the justice system in Sri Lanka; almost 50% of the prisoners are in prison for drug consumption or drug-related issues.
2. High relevance of the project Outputs, Outcome and Project Objective for Sri Lanka, was reiterated by all interviewed stakeholders.
3. Project Outputs, with a continuation of the Drivers and Assumptions holding true, can be expected to lead to achieving the project outcome and project objective.

### COHERENCE

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

To what extent has the project established and maintained appropriate relationship with stakeholders?

The project has established contact with the Ministry of Justice, which provides the legal background for the country and the Rule of Law. The Attorney General’s Department and the Judges’ Institute are under the Ministry of Justice, and reported to have been invited to, and having participated in, capacity-building trainings, as resource persons. Moreover, a Module had been drafted ‘Bail and Non-Custodial Measures in Sri Lanka’, for the Sri Lanka Judges’ Institute. The State Ministry of Prison Management and Prisoners Rehabilitation Affairs is responsible for prison reforms and prisoners’ rehabilitation. Its vision is “A law-abiding society across rehabilitation”. Similar to the Ministry of Justice, it has been invited to, and has participated in, capacity building trainings as resource persons. It entails, amongst others, the Department of Prisons and the

---

20 107 delegates from five South Asian Countries (SAARC) met on 6-7 October 2010 in Dhaka, Bangladesh to discuss overcrowding in prisons in the region, prison legislation and legal aid services in the criminal justice systems in South Asia. (Penal Reform International)
DCBC. The DCBC is reported to be present in all 9 Provinces. Therefore, the project had planned to hold one training in each Province, thus enabling as many DCBC Officers as possible to participate in the trainings, as the project had identified, after initial discussions with relevant stakeholder institutions, that project activities could fulfill the most pressing needs of the DCBC officials implementing the legislative provisions relating to community corrections. Therefore, considering this need, it was decided to provide them with relevant skill and knowledge as per the topics in the Agenda.

The project is fully aligned with the objectives, work and priorities of the above-mentioned stakeholder institutions, and this was also confirmed by the interviewed stakeholders. All the interviewed stakeholders expressed explicitly their appreciation for the work of UNODC, the project and the coordination and work of the NPC in the country. They acknowledged the cordial, regular and effective communication and collaboration the NPC had established with their respective institutions. DCBC also emphasised the importance and value of the ongoing consultative based approach of the Project, that ensured activities responded to directly identified and key needs of the Department.

Relevant stakeholders involved in the sentencing process are the police, the lawyers, the magistrate/Court judges and the DCBC. During the interviews, some of the stakeholders mentioned that, besides the resource persons of their respective institutions, other persons were not a part of the capacity-building activities, for example, persons from the Ministry of Justice, State Ministry of Prison Management and Prisoners Rehabilitation, lawyers, Judges’ Institute, Police, with the exception of the DCBC, whereby a number of Corrections Officers in each Province could participate in the trainings. The interviewees were of the view that broader participant inclusion in some of the activities would have been beneficial.

The level of involvement of the surveyed stakeholders in the project varies between strongly involved (38%) and somewhat involved (46%). Most of the survey respondents feel very well informed about the project (61%); a few of them somewhat informed (23%).

The project is in alignment with Outcome 1 ‘Member States implement crime prevention policies and programs in line with international standards and decrease the resort to imprisonment’, Output 1.3 ‘Member States’ legal frameworks and practitioners’ knowledge on the use of non-custodial measures enhanced.’ of UNODC’s GLOZ85 Global Prison Challenges Programme.

It is also in line with the UNODC’s Regional Programme for South Asia (2018-2021), Sub-programme 5: ‘Crime prevention and criminal justice’ and Sub-programme 4: ‘Terrorism prevention’.

Moreover, the project complements very well other UNODC efforts in the country, for example, the EU-funded ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’, which is being implemented by the UNODC GMCP and INTERPOL. One of the components of the Programme aims towards preventing radicalization to violence in prisons and entails an Output on vocational training and rehabilitation of prisoners.

**SUMMARY – COHERENCE**

4. Project is fully aligned with the objectives, work and priorities of the national stakeholder institutions.
5. Project, via the persistent efforts by the NPC has established good and effective contact with relevant national stakeholder institutions, involved in the sentencing process.
6. Project is fully aligned with the Regional Programme for South Asia and UNODC’s other efforts, including in the country; UNODC’s work is very much appreciated by the (interviewed) national stakeholder institutions.

**EFFECTIVENESS**

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective?
The following assessment takes departure from the TOC reconstructed by the evaluation team.

**Achievement of Outputs:**

**Output 1.1** ‘Enhanced understanding of Sri Lanka’s legal framework, policies and practices’ is considered to be **partially achieved**. A comprehensive report on ‘Gaps and Needs Assessment of Alternatives to Imprisonment in Sri Lanka’ has been prepared within the framework of the project by an International Expert, which goes into the current tendency in favour of imprisonment during investigation and trial periods, thus leading to overcrowding in prisons. It reviews legislative framework pertinent to non-custodial measures and the current usage of non-custodial measures in Sri Lanka. Based on identified gaps and needs in the implementation of non-custodial measures, it makes recommendations for reducing overcrowding in prisons, and enhancing the usage of non-custodial measures. The recommendations validate the activities already planned in the project and have informed the additional activities that are implemented and were in the process of being implemented, in agreement with authorities, and made possible with the funding received in 2021. Moreover, several recommendations fall under the responsibility of the country’s judiciary and related institutions and some of them go beyond the time period of the project. It remains to be seen, if and to what extent other recommendations from the report are implemented.

In March 2021, the report was presented to 20 senior-level policy making officials from the Ministry of Justice, Department of Prisons, Police, DCBC, Academia and lawyers of the private bar. Hard copies were sent to senior officials at policy-making level. However, during the individual evaluation meetings with stakeholders, it was mentioned by a few interviewees that they were not aware of this report. A reason for this may be the remote-working modus currently in practice due to the COVID-19-related situation.

**Outputs 1.2** ‘Increased knowledge and capacity of Sri Lanka’s criminal justice actors to apply alternatives to imprisonment, for example community-based corrections, in appropriate cases’ **and 1.3** ‘Raised awareness of benefits of alternatives to imprisonment by Sri Lankan criminal justice actors’ are considered to be **partially achieved**. As mentioned under Output 1.1, the report on Gaps and Needs Assessment has been prepared, but not all stakeholders have knowledge of the report. Since Sri Lanka is divided into 9 administrative regions/Provinces, one capacity-building workshop has been planned to take place in each Province. All Provinces have already been covered, with physical presence of stakeholders, taking, as reported to the evaluation by several stakeholders, COVID-19 precautionary measures into consideration. However, focus of participant selection has been on the DCBC Officers, justified by the implementation of non-custodial measures by them. Other relevant stakeholder institutions have been invited to the capacity-building workshops as resource persons; but further representatives of their respective institutions have not participated in the workshops, thus limiting knowledge and awareness about the project, its activities, the benefits of alternatives to imprisonment and the efforts to enhance non-custodial measures in Sri Lanka. Participants’ feedback during the evaluation noted the significant benefit of the content delivered in the workshops and the additional benefits of sharing experiences that enabled them to address some of their challenges in the implementation of community correction orders. The participants also benefited from materials that they can use after the workshops, being two core UNODC guides, the Handbook of basic principles and promising practices on Alternatives to Imprisonment, and the Handbook on strategies to reduce overcrowding in prison. The operationalisation of the offender management database for the DCBC developed through the support of the project will represent significant progress in the effectiveness of community-based corrections.

**Achievement of Outcome:**

The **Outcome ‘Enhanced use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based initiatives, in Sri Lanka’ is not (yet) achieved.**

The project commenced in April 2020, after the outbreak of the **COVID-19 pandemic** in March 2020. Despite the restrictions and limitations which unexpectedly arose due to the pandemic, the project has made efforts to carry out as many activities as possible, taking COVID-19 related precautionary measures into consideration. All the planned 9 training workshops have taken place with physical presence of participants; 2 web-based trainings have taken place; the Gaps and Needs Assessment report has been prepared; a Module
for the Judges Institute had been drafted and was being reviewed during the terminal evaluation, a Strategic Plan (draft) for the DCBC and assessments related to ‘prisoner classification’ and ‘non-custodial measures in post sentencing stage’ have been prepared. Nonetheless, it was pointed out and highlighted by several interviewed stakeholders, that despite the continued and persistent efforts of UNODC, in the absence of the pandemic, even more would have been possible by the project. It is important to note that one consequence of the pandemic reported to the evaluation is a much-reduced use of non-custodial sentences, in 2020 decreasing to about a quarter of previous years.

Another main reason for not (yet) achieving the Outcome is the longevity of the project. So far, the common practice for sentencing, and for pre-trial, has been imprisonment. However, sentencing reforms take time and depend upon, amongst others, systemic and behavioural change. During the interviews, all the stakeholders expressed their willingness for a change towards increased use of non-custodial measures, enhancing effectiveness of the DCBC, and emphasized that adequate awareness needs to be created amongst all related to the sentencing process, starting from police, then lawyers and then magistrates. Several stakeholders pointed out the short time duration of project implementation; they expressed their concern that it may not be possible to achieve the desired project outcome of enhancing non-custodial sentences in the given time.

As mentioned earlier, project carried out one capacity-building workshop in every Province enabling the DCBC Officers in each of the nine Provinces to participate. A few representatives of the relevant institutions, for example, representatives of the Ministry of Justice, State Ministry of Prison Management and Prisoners Rehabilitation, Department of Prisons, High Court Judge representing Judicial Service Commission have participated as resource persons; however, other staff of these institutions have not (yet) participated in the capacity-building workshops.

A lack of awareness and understanding in the participating institutions, and above all, also in wider population, of the options and benefits of non-custodial measures was emphasized by almost all the interviewees. Moreover, they also pointed out a lack of coordinated discussion and approach between the DCBC Officers and the magistrates responsible for issuing the sentences.

Another noteworthy issue pointed out and emphasized by all the interviewed stakeholders, and the same was also seen in the Prison Statistics of Sri Lanka, is that of drug users in prisons. A little under 50% of the prisoners are drug-related minor offenders. As mentioned by the interviewed stakeholders, should these persons not receive an imprisonment sentence, at present there is lack of capacity of drug-rehabilitation centres for their appropriate treatment, which is considered by all interviewed stakeholders not to be a criminal issue, but rather a health and social issue.

**Achievement of Project Objective:**

The **Project Objective** ‘Sri Lanka decreases the resort to imprisonment’ is **not (yet) achieved**.

Despite the Outputs being partially achieved and the Expected Outcome and Project Objective not (yet) being achieved, the outlook for the project and its results is not considered to be bleak. On the contrary, all the interviewed stakeholders expressed explicitly their willingness, enthusiasm, support and commitment to a shift towards non-custodial measures, as they consider it to be beneficial for the society.

It is considered to be realistic to expect that the achievement of the Outcome, and the Drivers and Assumptions holding true, would lead to an achievement of the Project Objective, which in turn, can be expected to contribute to the expected Impact ‘Overcrowding in prisons reduced; Conditions in prisons improved; Preventing and countering radicalization and violent extremism’.

---

22 Agencies/NGOs in Sri Lanka are reported to work with persons related to substance-abuse, but that was not a focus of this project.
SUMMARY – EFFECTIVENESS

7. All the three Outputs are partially achieved, the main reasons being the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and the short lifespan of the project.
8. Expected Outcome and Project Objective are not (yet) achieved; the main reasons being outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, short lifespan of the project, capacity building limited to mostly DCBC Officers, lack of awareness-raising activities, lack of coordinated approach between DCBC officers and magistrates, and a lack of (capacity of) drug-rehabilitation centres.

EFFICIENCY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?
To what extent has the project delivered results as per stakeholder needs?

The following relates to the first evaluation question:

Project commenced in April 2020, right after the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020. Project duration is 21 months and is foreseen to end on 31 December 2021. Funding, initially amounting to USD 410,000, had been agreed upon with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

An indicative costed workplan with key activities for both years, 2020 and 2021, together with the planned costs, is included in the project document. The project commenced right after the COVID-19 outbreak, which resulted in restrictions and the project had to unexpectedly adapt to a different mode of implementation, namely, conduct group activities and meetings in web-based modus; prioritise activities that did not require gathering, for example translation, production of posters and undertook the gaps and needs analysis through remote interviews and questionnaires. The project implementation further had to be adapted by working only remotely with other personnel in ROSA and Vienna who would have ordinarily travelled to Sri Lanka as part of the project. The project demonstrated a high degree of efficiency through adapting in these ways while maintaining a good rate of activities done to a high standard.

The Gaps and Needs Assessment Report was finalized in December 2020, ahead of the foreseen time of 2nd Quarter 2021. One to two-day capacity-building workshops were planned to have been carried out by 3rd Quarter 2021; 9 training workshops have been conducted, with physical presence of the stakeholders, and taking COVID-19 restrictions into consideration. Moreover, 2 webinars have also been conducted which alone enabled the project to reach 100 beneficiaries. A national workshop to bring together all relevant stakeholders has been held on 23 March 2021; due to the existing pandemic situation, the lead consultant presented remotely. The duration of the workshops – one to two days – was reported to be adequate for the discussed topics. The evaluation team has taken the outbreak of COVID-19 and its implications on project implementation into consideration while assessing any delays, as the pandemic is outside the influence of the project. Moreover, some activities were still ongoing at the time of the final evaluation.

The total budget, USD 402,159 after deducting the programme support costs, was split into around USD 270,000 and USD 132,000 for the two years, 2020 and 2021, respectively. A first tranche of payment amounting to USD 200,000 was received by UNODC in 2020. As reported to the evaluation, in line with the donor agreement, UNODC had to submit a report of activities conducted, and request the second tranche of payment within the year. As the activities were delayed due to COVID-19, UNODC did not submit the request

---

23 Including 13% Programme Support Costs.
for the second tranche, amounting to around USD 68,635. In 2021, a remaining amount of USD 133,524 was received from the donor, thus bringing the total funds provided by Germany to USD 295,154.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USD</th>
<th>2020 updated</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds received</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>133,524</td>
<td>333,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 13%</td>
<td>23,009</td>
<td>15,361</td>
<td>38,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176,991</td>
<td>118,163</td>
<td>295,154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project document; Revised costed workplan May 2021.

According to the financial (2020) and expenditure (2021) reports received by the evaluation, project is being implemented with the above-mentioned available budget of USD 295,154.

Responses of stakeholders to the e-survey reflect that the majority (77%) perceive project activities have been carried out in a timely and efficient manner.

In response to the second evaluation question,

The different reports prepared and guidelines translated within the framework of the project provide information about, amongst others, legislative framework in Sri Lanka pertinent to non-custodial measures, the international framework related to bail and well-established existing resources, including UNODC guides that provide good practice related to The Tokyo Rules and The Bangkok Rules relevant to the enhancement of non-custodial sentences and measures. The Gaps and Needs Assessment report was entailed in the project document; all the other documents, for example, the Training Module for the Judges’ Institute, as well as the translation of two UNODC guides, were based on requirements identified together with partnering institutions, and requested, during project implementation.

For the capacity building workshops, training needs were identified by stakeholders in consultation with the project team. The training, with a highly appropriate needs-based content was confirmed by beneficiaries as highly relevant and an efficient use of time and resources. During the capacity building workshops, persons from key stakeholder institutions were asked to deliver some sessions further enhancing relevance and representing an efficient use of resources, as opposed to depending solely upon contracted external consultants. Thus, project has made efforts to provide information to the stakeholder institutions, in line with their work and needs. Additional outputs have been produced by the project, upon the request of the DCBC, namely, the OIMS, and the strategic plan This was also confirmed by all interviewed stakeholders.

A potential overlap was identified by the evaluation team; the project being evaluated envisages to provide further support to national stakeholder institutions by preparing a prisoners’ classification; ‘introduction to a classification system for prisoners’ is also included in Outcome 4 of the ongoing EU-supported UNODC Global Maritime Crime Program in Sri Lanka.
SUMMARY – EFFICIENCY

9. Despite the unexpected and unfavourable situation posed by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the project has conducted its activities in a timely and efficient manner, the main contributing factors being the tremendous efforts by the NPC and the interest, willingness and commitment of the stakeholders.

10. Project has delivered results as per stakeholder needs; stakeholders have requested further outputs according to their identified needs, and these have been additionally provided by the project; one forthcoming activity might have a potential overlap with an activity of the GMCP program.

SUSTAINABILITY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after it ends?

To what extent has local ownership by beneficiaries and national and/or regional stakeholders been achieved?

Key actors, who can influence the enhancement of non-custodial sentences, have been brought on board and brought together. Relevant stakeholder institutions, namely, Ministry of Justice, State Ministry of Prison Management and Prisoners’ Rehabilitation, Department of Prisons, DCBC, Attorney General’s Office, Judges’ Institute and Private Lawyers’ Bar, have participated in the trainings, also in the role of resource persons, thus ensuring that they are aware of the project and its objectives and have contributed to the project implementation and outcomes. This level and range of involvement of official stakeholders provides a good platform for the future enhancement of non-custodial measures.

Knowledge regarding the relevant international legal frameworks as well as existing national framework pertinent to non-custodial measures has been collated and/or created, especially the Gaps and Needs Assessment report. During the capacity-building workshops, knowledge and information about the practice of non-custodial measures has been transferred. The DCBC is the main beneficiary of the project, as it is the organization responsible for implementing, supervising and supporting offenders with community-based corrections orders. During the interviews, the evaluation team was informed that the DCBC is planning to introduce a master’s degree Course for Community-Based Corrections and has already initiated discussions with a university in one of the provinces; as well as a Diploma Course for officers working directly with offenders and their families which indicates growing institutional commitment to strengthening the implementation of non-custodial measures beyond the duration of the project. The evaluation team would like to note that this may not completely be as a result of the project.

A ‘Module on Bail and Non-Custodial Measures in Sri Lanka for the Judges’ Institute has been drafted. The draft training module was being reviewed by the Judges’ Institute, which is expected to incorporate it in its training courses for judges. The use of this training module will increase awareness and understanding within judiciary of non-custodial options beyond the duration of the project.

Two UNODC Handbooks, ‘Handbook of basic principles and promising practices on Alternatives to Imprisonment’ and ‘Handbook on strategies to reduce overcrowding in prisons’ have been translated into the widely spoken Sinhala language, and are reported to have been distributed to relevant stakeholder institutions, and to DCBC Officers, and are reported to be useful for their work.

The project has also provided the DCBC with an ‘Offender Information Management System (OIMS)’, which contains relevant information about offenders with a community-based correction order. This is reported to enable the DCBC to, amongst others, identify offenders with a running order in a different province if the same offender appears before the DCBC in another province, and to follow-up on them. The OIMS was
approved by the Information and Communication Technology Agency of Sri Lanka and Computer Emergency Response Team of Sri Lanka as per the regulations and was expected to ‘go-live’ within 2021, under the ownership of the DCBC, which has also agreed to take up the costs for maintenance etc. after project completion. A Strategic Plan (draft) supported by the project for the DCBC was prepared, which provides a roadmap for the development of the DCBC and its work in implementing community-based corrections orders. The analysis of gaps and needs, and high-level forum to discuss the analysis, the increased knowledge of stakeholders involved in delivery of, and participation in, capacity building activities, will contribute to the sustained consequence of the strategic plan. The DCBC is reported to have adequate human resources to be able to take up additional work, that is, supervise and support a much larger number of offenders with community-based corrections orders, than it is doing currently. However, one issue which was pointed out by almost all interviewed stakeholders is that the DCBC might not be the institution best equipped with financial resources and its personnel require more thorough training for fulfilment of their duties.

During the 8th meeting of the Ministerial Consultative Committee on Justice24, the ‘Draft Report on Community-Based Correction System in Sri Lanka’ was planned to be provided to all Parliamentarians with the purpose of receiving suggestions for further development, which illustrated a willingness and interest to take up the issue of community-based corrections at a high political level and reducing imprisonment sentences.

**SUMMARY – SUSTAINABILITY**

11. The knowledge and increased skills of the current DCBC personnel can continue to be deployed after the duration of the project and this is augmented by the provision of printed technical materials; the integration of produced content in the training of future officers was not (yet) confirmed.

12. The OIMS and strategic plan provide a platform for potentially enhanced operations of DCBC following the end of the project.

13. The training module for the Judges’ Institute, after approval, would also ensure a continuation of training on bail and non-custodial measures for the judges, even after project completion.

**HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY, DISABILITY INCLUSION AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND**

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

*To what extent has the project design and implementation fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalised groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities?*

The project has a very strong foundation of promoting human rights within the criminal justice system and in doing so, seeks to reach those who face significant disadvantage - prisoners, other offenders and their families. Project’s Outcome ‘Enhanced use of alternative to imprisonment, including community-based initiatives, in Sri Lanka’ stems from main principles of human rights as laid out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [UN, 1948] and specifically key international legal frameworks, mainly the ‘United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures’ (The Tokyo Rules, 1990), the ‘United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-Custodial Measures for Women Offenders’ (The Bangkok Rules, 2010) and the ‘United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners’ (The Nelson Mandela Rules, 2015). The expected impact of the Project Objective ‘Sri Lanka decrease the resort to imprisonment’ is, amongst others, a reduction in prison overcrowding; prison overcrowding is considered to be contradictory.

---

to the principles of human rights, in particular to “... recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family...”.

The project document has a sub-section on ‘Gender and Human Rights’ which emphasizes the inclusion of human rights in UNODC’s work in the thematic area of ‘crime prevention and criminal justice’ and aims to adhere specifically to the observance of human rights and the principle of ‘leaving no one behind’. It has not included any specific activities directly focusing on children.

The ‘Gaps and Needs Assessment of Alternatives to Imprisonment’ report has a comprehensive human rights framework, for example, each issue it covered was associated with Human Rights standards and norms. The inputs to the high-level forum for the launch of the Gaps and Needs Assessment had a significant emphasis on human rights standards and promotion. It is the same with the Module on Bail and Non-Custodial Measures in Sri Lanka, prepared for the Judges’ Institute, which includes references to the Tokyo Rules. Additionally, technical assistance draws upon established UNODC resources including the Handbook of basic principles and promising practices on Alternatives to Imprisonment and the Handbook on strategies to reduce overcrowding in prisons, both are based on international human rights standards and norms. These have been translated into Sinhala language for wider usage and understanding.

Under 4% of the ‘convicted prisoners’ during the past 5 years were women, with female representation being under 2% in the year 2020. Female representation was slightly higher in ‘unconvicted prisoners’ with an average of slightly over 5% during the last 5 years, and under 5% in the year 2020. The interim report makes no mention of gender. The output report ‘Gaps and Needs Assessment of Alternatives to Imprisonment’ has a section on ‘Women offenders’ in its findings, with some detail related to women in prison and women serving non-custodial measures. None of the 29 items in the conclusion and recommendations section mention gender or women offenders. The report notes some issues related to children but does not make any specific conclusions or recommendations. The draft Module prepared for the Judges’ Institute has included gender in that it entails reference to, and information from, the United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders – the Bangkok Rules, and highlights selected features of the Bangkok Rules. The Bangkok Rules have also been included in the presentations of the NPC during the capacity-building workshops.

Other vulnerable/marginalised groups, including LGBTQI+, juveniles and/or people with disabilities have not been addressed. At the same time, it was mentioned to the evaluation by a few interviewed stakeholders, that LGBTQI+ issues have not been identified in the prisons so far. Moreover, juveniles were not taken into consideration, as community-based process does not include juveniles. The OIMS, the current version, which is not yet live, has no question asking if the offender has any disability. Almost 50% of the offenders are in prison due to drug-related offences. The project has further highlighted the need for a review of drugs and crime policy that contributes to a shift from punitive to harm reduction.

---

**SUMMARY – HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY, DISABILITY INCLUSION AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND**

14. The project (design) has a very strong foundation of promoting human rights and leaving-no-one-behind within the criminal justice system.

15. The project has diligently and consistently promoted core human rights approaches in the criminal justice system and sought to protect prisoners’ rights, in accordance with the Mandela Rules through reducing overcrowding in prisons.

16. Project has integrated gender and marginalized/vulnerable groups in project output reports as well as in project activities to a limited extent; juveniles have not been taken into consideration, as community-based process does not include juveniles.

---

III. CONCLUSIONS

C1. RELEVANCE: Project Activities, Outputs and Outcome, taken together, are highly relevant to achieving its objective. Project Outputs, with a continuation of the Drivers and Assumptions holding true, can be expected to lead to achieving the project outcome and project objective. (Findings 1, 2, 3): According to the TOC reconstructed by the evaluation team, the Outcome ‘Sri Lanka decrease the resort to imprisonment’ is at a higher achievement level than the Project Objective ‘To promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based initiatives, in Sri Lanka’. The project has selected the right mix of Outputs to achieve the project Outcome, which, the Drivers and Assumptions holding true, can be expected to lead to the expected Objective.

C2. COHERENCE: The project has identified relevant stakeholder institutions in the country pertinent to the thematic area of the project and established and maintained effective and engaging relationship with the stakeholders. (Findings 4, 5, 6): A main contributing factor has been the continued efforts of the NPC; further, stakeholders also came together for the capacity-building workshops conducted for the DCBC Officers in all the nine Provinces of the country, with the involvement of experienced persons from other stakeholder institutions. UNODC has played a key role in the sector and is highly appreciated by stakeholders; the consultative and needs response approach of the project has been highly regarded and contributed to positive perception of UNODC.

C3. EFFECTIVENESS: The project has partially achieved the envisaged outputs and not (yet) achieved its intended outcome and objective; however, it is considered to be on the right track. (Findings 7, 8): All project outputs have been well received by the relevant stakeholder institutions, especially the DCBC. However, not all interviewed stakeholders were aware about the Gaps and Needs Assessment Report. Moreover, capacity-building workshops have been conducted for Corrections Officers of the DCBC, but significant gaps in knowledge and awareness in relevant stakeholder institutions still remain. The objective was highly ambitious for the project duration and scope and further hindered by the COVID-19 pandemic.

C4. EFFICIENCY: Despite the unexpected and unfavourable situation posed by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the project has conducted its activities in a timely and efficient manner and delivered results as per stakeholder needs; one forthcoming activity might have a potential overlap with an activity of the GMCP project. (Findings 9, 10): The project has conducted activities remotely in an effective and efficient manner. As conditions permitted, the project prioritised scheduling of activities that enabled it to meet additional beneficiary needs and expectations. The activities efficiently drew upon knowledge and expertise from within the project team, ROSA, UNODC HQ, contracted experts and the beneficiary institutions. A potential overlap with one activity of the GMCP project is on a prisoners’ classification for the prisons in Sri Lanka.

C5. SUSTAINABILITY: Project results contribute to a continuation of enhanced knowledge on non-custodial measures in the country, even after project completion. (Findings 11, 12, 13): Project results, such as the OIMS, the strategic plan (draft) and the training module for the Judges’ Institute, as well as the increased knowledge and skills of the serving DCBC officers, also via the provision of two UNODC Guidelines in Sinhala language contribute to a continuation of knowledge results following the end of the project.

C6. HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY, DISABILITY INCLUSION AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND: The project has diligently and consistently promoted core human rights approaches in the criminal justice system, however, integrated gender and marginalized/vulnerable groups in the produced reports and activities to a limited extent. (Findings 14, 15, 16): Project document has a very strong foundation of and has taken fully into consideration the promotion of human rights and leaving-no-one-behind within the criminal justice system of Sri Lanka. The project has negotiated the complex context within which there are high levels of sensitivity to external intervention related to human rights and worked in such a way that dialogue and cooperation have remained viable and progressive. Via its different output reports, it provides information and knowledge on existing relevant international frameworks. However, the output reports produced within the framework of the project have not really identified the gender aspect or marginalized/vulnerable groups’ needs, and this to some extent reflects stakeholders’ perceptions of contextual sensitivities.
RECOMMENDATION 1 – AWARENESS RAISING

(Conclusions 1, 2, 3, Findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8) To ensure participating stakeholders are fully aware of contemporary legislation and regulation pertinent to non-custodial measures, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should firstly, provide all output reports to all stakeholder institutions and persons participating in the project; secondly, convene a meeting with key national stakeholders and donors, to present project results and outline priorities for the future that are made possible by the project results; thirdly, in future projects/2nd phase of this project, expand the participants of future workshops to include further persons from the stakeholder institution; fourthly, consider mechanisms, messages and messaging for increasing community awareness related to non-custodial options; and lastly, highlight and provide information during awareness raising about the difference between community service and community-based corrections orders.

RECOMMENDATION 2 – ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOME

(Conclusions 3, 9, Findings 8, 9) UNODC Programme Office in Colombo, in cooperation with Justice Section at UNODC HQ and UNODC ROSA should make efforts to negotiate with the donor an extension of the project/second phase of the project, if possible, with a longer period of implementation and corresponding adequate budget, to enable the project to make a step towards achieving the project Outcome.

UNODC Programme Office in Colombo and/or UNODC ROSA could consider supporting a continuation of the efforts and focus of the UNODC Programme Office on non-custodial options by exploring ways to provide bridging funds to the UNODC Programme Office, also to maintain momentum and optimise outputs in advance of further donor support.

RECOMMENDATION 3 – CAPACITY BUILDING

(Conclusions 3, 4, 5, Findings 7, 8, 11, 12, 13) For future projects – continuation/2nd phase of this project – to ensure a continuation of knowledge transfer to current and future DCBC Officers, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should firstly, work with DCBC staff training institute on their curriculum and training content to ensure all new recruits benefit from enhanced training, using adapted project outputs; secondly, support the formation of a national interagency team to cascade training further for DCBC officers and others from key justice institution and thirdly, provide opportunities/forum for DCBC officers and magistrates to convene to identify common obstacles to implementation and mutually agreed and appreciated solutions.

RECOMMENDATION 4 – GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

(Conclusion 6, Findings 14, 15, 16) For stronger alignment with its priorities of inclusion of gender and marginalized/vulnerable groups and leaving-no-one-behind, the future project/2nd phase of this project, via UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should, firstly, identify with key stakeholders selected key needs and issues related to gender and/or marginalised groups to promote pilot activities that leverage discreet opportunities for dialogue and reform; secondly, explore options for utilising existing initiatives within, for example, State Ministry of Women and Child Development, that can enhance focus and interagency support for activities relevant to vulnerable groups; and thirdly, include gender and marginalized/vulnerable groups in the project activities, and ensure inclusion in the output reports.

RECOMMENDATION 5 – SYNERGIES

(Conclusion 4, Finding 10) To make use of possible synergies, which would benefit the project stakeholders and enhance efficiency, UNODC Programme Office in Colombo should, firstly, cross-reference and ensure shared approach with other UNODC projects/programs planning similar activities, for example, on prisoner
classification; secondly, consider creating an inter-project forum, where consultants with related TOR can convene and ensure coherence and mutually supportive outputs.

**RECOMMENDATION 6 – SUSTAINABILITY AND IMPACT**

(Conclusions 1, 2, 3, Findings 1, 6, 8) For harnessing the current interest and commitment of the stakeholders in the country contributing to sustainability and even make an impact, **UNODC Programme Office in Colombo, in cooperation with Justice Section at UNODC HQ and UNODC ROSA**, could identify, discuss with national stakeholders and introduce a larger programme to include drug-rehabilitation, keeping the high number of drug users in prisons and the lack of drug rehabilitation centres and personnel in mind, also possibly entailing establishment of drug-rehabilitation, which would be in line with UNODC’s strategies and priorities.

Secondly, **UNODC Programme Office in Colombo** could, in alliance with other UN entities where mandate aligns, support emerging fora or fostering a new forum, for example a High-Level Panel or Working Group, to leverage project outputs (e.g., gaps analysis and strategic plan) and current stakeholder interest to lead an interagency approach to the promotion and implementation of non-custodial options in the criminal justice system.
V. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

LESSONS LEARNED

Lesson 1: The coordination of the project by an NPC, who has the background and expertise of the thematic area or related area under implementation, makes communication with stakeholders/stakeholder institutions more effective, as the person can also contribute to the content and discussion on the thematic area.

Lesson 2: Ownership and commitment by the main stakeholder institutions contributes greatly to effective project implementation, and possibly to sustainability of project results. In the said project being evaluated, the stakeholder institutions, above all, the DCBC has not only strongly expressed its commitment to the project, but also identified its needs and requested further outputs from the project according to its needs. Further, a continuation of project results would be possible via the DCBC, if properly supported/equipped.

Lesson 3: While it is necessary to formulate the envisaged outcome and project objective in the project document, they might be too ambitious for the provided time duration and budget, that is, it may not be realistic to achieve them within the time frame and budget available to the project; moreover, besides the longer duration, also wider engagement of stakeholders might be necessary.

GOOD PRACTICES

1. Project has drawn from a mix of expertise, which has proven to be beneficial to the project, that is, the Crime and Justice Officer in Vienna, the UNODC ROSA, the Crime and Justice Expert in New Delhi, the NPC, as well as the IE who prepared the Gaps and Needs Assessment report, the national experts who prepared the Training Module for the Judges’ Institute, Strategic Plan for the DCBC, Assessments on Prisoner Classification System and Post-Conviction Non-Custodial Measures and integrated experts and expertise from beneficiary institutions that consolidated relevance and informed familiarity into the inputs and outputs.

2. The OIMS prepared under the project is a very good instrument for maintaining much-needed data on offenders with non-custodial sentences. It was identified as a need of the DCBC and provided by the project. Thus, the project has responded effectively to need and request of key stakeholder institution.

3. The project combined a variety of approaches and activities in its efforts to reach outcomes and objectives, including analysis and establishing baselines, advocacy through convening meetings and the preparation and dissemination of relevant materials and messages, building professional knowledge and skills in the short term through training and contributing to changes in training practice in institution, direct material assistance in the OIMS. This multifaceted approach responded to a range of needs and did not depend solely on one reform approach.

4. The assessment tool for the gap and needs analysis combined international and national reference points being standards, legislation and regulation, empirical data and experience and opinion from a broad range of policy makers and practitioners. This comprehensive framework provided valid findings and informed viable recommendations.

5. To ensure geographical coverage, project conducted one capacity building workshop in each of its nine provinces. This has enabled knowledge transfer to DCBC officers in other regions of Sri Lanka, beyond the capital, Colombo.
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Note: This Independent Project Evaluation is a pilot for adapted evaluation processes at UNODC under the supervision of the Independent Evaluation Section. Therefore, changes may occur at certain stages of the process.
### I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

| **Project duration (dd/mm/yyyy-dd/mm/yyyy):** | 1 April 2020 – 31 December 2021 |
| **Location:** | Sri Lanka |
| **Linkages to Country, Regional and Thematic Programmes & UNODC Strategy 2021-2025:** | Regional Programme for South Asia (2018-2021)  
Sub programme 5: Justice |
| **Linkages to the SDG targets to which the project contributes:** | Goal 16- “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels” |
| **Executing Agency (UNODC office/section/unit):** | UNODC Programme Office in Sri Lanka (POLKA) |
| **Partner Organizations:** | |
| **Total Approved Budget (USD):** | USD 510,000 |
| **Total Overall Budget (USD):** | USD 510,000 |
| **Total Expenditure by date of initiation of evaluation (USD):** | USD 410,000 |
| **Donor(s):** | Government of Germany |
| **Name and title of Project/Programme Manager and UNODC office/section/unit:** | Anusha Munasinghe, National Programme Officer, POLKA |
| **Time frame of evaluation: (planned start and end date of the evaluation process):** | 15 September 2021 - 13 December 2021 |
| **Budget for this evaluation in USD\(^{26}\):** | 20,402 |
| **Number of independent evaluators planned for this evaluation\(^{27}\):** | 02 |
| **Type and year of past evaluations (if any):** | NA |

\(^{26}\) Including fees for evaluation team, travel, printing, editing, translation, interpretation, etc.

\(^{27}\) Please note that if the budget available for the evaluation allows, the recommendation for any UNODC evaluation is at least two independent evaluators, i.e. one Evaluation Expert and one Substantive Expert in the subject area of the project to be evaluated.
Project overview

The project aims to promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based corrections, in Sri Lanka. The project will be implemented in close consultation with the Government of Sri Lanka, in particular the Department of Prisons and Attorney General’s Department under the Ministry of Justice and Prison Reforms. Broadly, this project will bolster the work of UNODC in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice reform, ensuring a coordinated approach to its technical assistance provision and focusing on three strategic areas (i) strengthening community rehabilitation (ii) strengthening prison management; and (iii) promoting the resort to non-custodial measures in suitable cases.

The main outcome of the project includes Sri Lanka decrease the resort to imprisonment by promoting the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based initiatives. To achieve the outcome the following activities have been delivered with the collaboration of relevant stakeholders (1) conducted a detailed stocktaking exercise to review and assess relevant national laws, policies and practices in Sri Lanka to gain an evidence base on the current legal and policy framework on alternatives to imprisonment as well as to identify the main gaps and obstacles in applying alternatives in appropriate cases; (2) Organize national level workshops bringing together all relevant stakeholders (e.g. legislators, policymakers, prosecutors, judges, judicial officers, prison and community-based correctional officers, etc.) to review the findings of the stocktaking exercise, exchange experiences and collectively identify priorities for reform; (3) print and disseminated training modules and tools; and (3) provided advisory services/trainings to requesting Sri Lankan authorities on the basis of existing UNODC technical assistance tools on alternatives to imprisonment, including through legislative, policy support and capacity-building missions.

The beneficiaries of the project are criminal justice authorities, prisoners deprived of liberty as well as the community. The general public is protected from crime, including from violent extremism, when prisoners, including violent extremist prisoners, are managed safely, securely and humanely, if offenders are treated fairly, and if recidivism rates are reduced. The main criminal justice actors who received benefits are Ministry of Justice and Prison Reforms, Department of Prisons, Ministry of Prisons, Department of Community Based Corrections.

In the area of gender and human rights UNODC’s technical assistance related to crime prevention and criminal justice takes into account the comprehensive and detailed international legal framework for ensuring respect for human rights. All interventions under this project, whether they are related to legislative and policy advise or capacity-building and training, will be designed and implemented following a human rights-based approach and will include human rights elements and modules. More specifically, the body of international standards and norms related to the treatment of prisoners and the management of prisons and related areas, very much reflects the respect for fundamental human rights. The project components have incorporated a strong gender perspective ensuring women’s representation.

The project’s Objective from the logframe/project document:
To promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based initiatives, in Sri Lanka.
II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Planned utilisation of the evaluation results\(^{28}\):

To inform the future development of the project or similar projects, for organizational learning, assess the success and areas of improvement of the project etc. The evaluation is intended to offer information on the progress made and buy in received from the government and stakeholders; and accountability to beneficiaries. The evaluation results will be shared with key interlocutors and will be used to build a larger programme in this area of work. The other most significant benefit is organizational learning since this project has been implemented jointly by UNODC Regional Office for South Asia (Subprogramme 5 of its Regional Programme for South Asia (2018-2021) and the Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC (as part of its Global Programme on Addressing Prison Challenges (GLOZ85)).

Main users of the evaluation results\(^{29}\):

The main users of the evaluation results would be senior management, programme management, stakeholders, beneficiaries, donors etc.

Unit of analysis (full projects/segment/etc.):

Full Project

Time period covered by the evaluation:

1 April 2020 – 22 October 2021 (end of data collection)

Geographical coverage of the evaluation:

Sri Lanka

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation will be conducted based on the below DAC criteria\(^{30}\). All evaluations must include gender, human rights, disability and no one left behind. Ideally these are mainstreamed within the evaluation questions. The evaluation questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team in the drafting of the Inception Report.

\(^{28}\) e.g. inform the future development of the project or similar projects, for organizational learning, assess the success and areas of improvement of the project etc.

\(^{29}\) e.g. senior management, programme management, stakeholders, beneficiaries, donors etc

\(^{30}\) [https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm](https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm)
### Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?</td>
<td>To what extent are the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project relevant to achieving its objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?</td>
<td>To what extent has the project established and maintained appropriate relationship with stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency: How well are resources being used?</td>
<td>To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project delivered results as per stakeholder needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?</td>
<td>To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability: Will the benefits last?</td>
<td>To what extent are the benefits of the projects likely to continue after it ends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has local ownership by beneficiaries and national and/or regional stakeholders been achieved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind: Has the intervention been inclusive and human rights based?</td>
<td>To what extent has the project design and implementation fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalised groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the evaluation needs to identify lessons learned and good practices.

31 Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

32 The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institution

33 The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

34 The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

35 The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

36 The extent to which the project/programme has mainstreamed human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups, including those with disabilities.

37 Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/programme.
IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

All evaluations of the United Nations system are guided by the principles of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind. Gender-sensitive and disability inclusive evaluation methods and gender-sensitive and disability inclusive data collection techniques are therefore essential in order to identify key gender issues, address marginalized, disability, hard-to-reach and vulnerable population, as well as to define strategies for developing appropriate data bases for better gender analysis in future project planning.

The methods used to collect and analyse data

While the evaluation team shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods is mandatory due to its appropriateness to ensure a gender-sensitive, inclusive, respectful and participatory approach and methodology to capture disability and gender equality issues, as well as voices and opinions of both men, women and other marginalised groups, ensuring gender related and disaggregated data (e.g. age, sex, countries etc.). Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. The limitations to the evaluation need to be identified and discussed by the evaluation team in the Inception Report, e.g. data constraints (such as missing baseline and monitoring data). Potential limitations as well as the chosen mitigating measures should be discussed. The evaluation team will be asked to present a dedicated methodology in the Inception Report outlining the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards as well as the UNODC Evaluation Policy, Norms and Standards. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys and/or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties identified as the stakeholders of the project/ programme.

The final evaluation report will be externally independently assessed (facilitated by IES) and the final rating will be included in the report. Based on this assessment, the report may not be published if it does not meet minimum quality standards.

All tools, norms and templates to be mandatorily used in the evaluation process can be found on the IES website: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/guidelines-and-templates.html

V. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

Please ensure that the full evaluation process is managed through Unite Evaluations (evaluations.unodc.org)38.

[38 The Unite Evaluations user manual for Project Managers is available here.]
### Evaluation Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation stage</th>
<th>Start date&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt; (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>End date&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt; (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>Subsumed tasks, roles</th>
<th>Guidance / Process description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment (3-4 weeks)</td>
<td>01/08/2021</td>
<td>14/09/2021</td>
<td>Consult with IES and propose evaluators; manage full recruitment process&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Review and approve proposed evaluators before recruitment can be initiated by PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report, incl. desk review (2 weeks)</td>
<td>15/09/2021</td>
<td>29/09/2021</td>
<td>Desk review by evaluators; Draft IR; Review by IES; Final IR</td>
<td>Includes 1 week for review by IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection (incl. field missions) (3-4 weeks)&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>04/10/2021</td>
<td>22/10/2021</td>
<td>Field missions; observation; interviews; etc.</td>
<td>Coordination of data collection dates and logistics with PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and draft report (3-4 weeks)</td>
<td>25/10/2021</td>
<td>05/11/2021</td>
<td>Data analysis and drafting of report by evaluators</td>
<td>Includes 1 week for review by IES, 1 week by PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report for CLP comments (1 week)</td>
<td>08/11/2021</td>
<td>18/11/2021</td>
<td>Review by IES; review by PM; revision of draft</td>
<td>Comments will be shared by IES with evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report, PowerPoint slides, and External Quality Assessment (1-2 weeks)</td>
<td>19/11/2021</td>
<td>26/11/2021</td>
<td>Compilation of comments by IES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (1 day)</td>
<td>29/11/2021</td>
<td>10/12/2021</td>
<td>Revision by eval; external assessment of report; completion of MR and EFP by PM</td>
<td>Evaluation report and slides are finalised. Includes 1 week for the external quality assessment facilitated by IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13/12/2021</td>
<td>13/12/2021</td>
<td>Presentation organised</td>
<td>Date of presentation of final results to be agreed with PM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UNODC Independent Evaluation Section may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation process.

### VI. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

<sup>39</sup> Required preparations before the start: completed ToR; 2 weeks review of ToR by the Core Learning Partners; finalised ToR based upon comments received; clearance by IES; assessment of qualified evaluation team candidates; clearance by IES; recruitment (Vienna HR for international consultants requiring a minimum of 2 weeks; UNDP for national consultants which may take up to several weeks); desk review materials compiled.

<sup>40</sup> Please follow the official recruitment process for international, regional or national consultants at UNODC.

<sup>41</sup> Data collection is currently likely to take longer than usual due to competing priorities of stakeholders and beneficiaries due to COVID-19. Data collection phase may imply on-line interviews, surveys etc instead of travel/face-to-face interviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of consultants(^{42}) (national/international)</th>
<th>Specific expertise required(^{43})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Expert</td>
<td>1 (international/national consultant)</td>
<td>Evaluation methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Expert</td>
<td>1 (international/national consultant)</td>
<td>Expertise in alternatives to imprisonment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial and 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. Furthermore, the evaluation team shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner. The qualifications and responsibilities for each evaluation team member are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1). The evaluation team will report exclusively to the Chief or Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section, who are the exclusive clearing entity for all evaluation deliverables and products.

The evaluation team will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. The payment will be made by deliverable and only once cleared by IES. Deliverables which do not meet UNODC and UNEG evaluation norms and standards will not be cleared by IES. IES is the sole entity to request payments to be released in relation to evaluation. Project/Programme Management must fulfil any such request within 5 working days to ensure the independence of this evaluation process. Non-compliance by Project/Programme Management may result in the decision to discontinue the evaluation by IES.

\(^{42}\) Please note that an evaluation team needs to consist of at least 1 independent evaluator – the Evaluation Expert – and ideally one Substantive Expert.

\(^{43}\) Please add the specific technical expertise needed (e.g. expertise in anti-corruption; counter terrorism; etc.) – please note that at least one evaluation team member needs to have expertise in human rights and gender equality.
## VII. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation stage</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>IES</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>Managing, administrative and logistical support to the evaluation process</td>
<td>Backstopping, quality assurance as well as review and approval of all deliverables.</td>
<td>Submission of deliverables on time and meeting UNODC and UNEG quality standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ToR</strong></td>
<td>Drafting &amp; finalising</td>
<td>1 round of comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying stakeholders and CLPs</td>
<td>Share ToR with CLPs for comments (1 week)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compiling the desk review material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify potential evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>Propose evaluators and experts after consultation with IES</td>
<td>Review &amp; clear proposed evaluation team before recruitment-process starts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative process and recruitment (in line with organisational rules and regulations for consultants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalise the compilation of the desk review material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception Report</strong></td>
<td>Engage with the evaluation team and provide all required information, documents, stakeholder lists, etc.</td>
<td>Review draft Inception Report in line with UNODC and UNEG norms and standards</td>
<td>Draft Inception Report in line with UNODC templates and guidelines[^44]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Release payment once requested by IES</td>
<td>Clear Draft Inception Report before any data collection can start</td>
<td>Provide final IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection and analysis</strong></td>
<td>All logistical arrangements for the evaluators (including travel arrangements, set-up of interviews as requested, note verbales, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct an independent, participatory and high quality data collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Draft report

- **Timely travel arrangements, payments of DSAs, etc.**
  - Implement the methods and tools developed in the Inception Report.
- **Participate in de-briefings, as necessary**
  - Engage with Project Management to request further information and assistance as required.
- **Provide further data, documents, stakeholders, etc. as requested by the evaluation team.**
  - Conduct a thorough analysis to ensure triangulation of evidence.
- **Provide further information to evaluators as requested**
  - Provide a high-quality draft report, in line with UNODC and UNEG N&S
- **1 review of the draft report for factual errors, once cleared by IES**
  - Review of the draft report
  - Incorporate comments of IES and consider those of PM
- **Release payment, once cleared by IES**
  - Initial clearance or rejection of draft report
  - Share draft report with CLPs (1 week)

### Final report

- **Prepare Management Response and Evaluation Follow-up Plan**
  - Facilitation of external quality assessment of the report before publication
  - Based on the external assessment, finalise the report and presentation
- **Arrange for a presentation of the results to internal and external stakeholders**
  - Final review by IES and either 1) clearance for publication or 2) non-clearance for publication if it does not meet UNODC & UNEG norms and standards
  - Present the results as agreed with Project Management and as cleared by IES
- **Release all outstanding payments, as requested by IES**
  - Clear all deliverables for payment
- **In case the report is not cleared by IES, use it exclusively for internal reporting (NOT for dissemination)**

### Follow-up

- **Report on the implementation of recommendations at least every year**
  - Report on implementation of recommendations to Member States and the Executive Director on an annual basis
## Evaluation Tools: Questionnaires and Interview Guides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Indicators/sub-questions</th>
<th>Data collection method(s)</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Data analysis methods &amp; triangulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong>(^{49}): Is the intervention doing the right thing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To what extent are the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project relevant to achieving its objective?</em></td>
<td><em>Does the achievement of Activities, Outputs and Outcome contribute to achieving the project Objective?</em>&lt;br&gt;(^{45})</td>
<td><em>Document/literature review&lt;br&gt;Face-to-face web-based interviews&lt;br&gt;Questionnaire/E-Survey</em></td>
<td><em>Project document&lt;br&gt;Reports/Case studies on non-custodial measures&lt;br&gt;PM, NPM, key national stakeholders</em></td>
<td><em>Theory Of Change (TOC)&lt;br&gt;Content analysis of documents&lt;br&gt;Quantitative analysis of e-survey/questionnaire&lt;br&gt;Content analysis of semi-structured interview notes</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Coherence\(^{50}\): How well does the intervention fit? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|

---

\(^{45}\) Please state all.

\(^{46}\) Please state the sub-questions and indicators that will guide your data collection to respond to the evaluation question.

\(^{47}\) Please state the data collection methods that will be used to answer the respective evaluation question and the respective data sources.

\(^{48}\) How will the data be analysed to ensure triangulated evidence for the respective indicator and evaluation question?

\(^{49}\) *Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.*

\(^{50}\) The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institution.
### To what extent has the project established and maintained appropriate relationship with stakeholders?

- To what extent were the in-country stakeholders involved in the project?
- How (well) informed are the in-country stakeholders about the project activities and outputs?

### Efficiency:

**Efficiency**

How well are resources being used?

**To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?**

- Have there been any delays in the project? If so, what are the reasons for the delay(s)?
- Could the project have carried out the project Activities or processes in a more efficient manner, for example, in terms of costs or other resources?

**To what extent has the project delivered results as per stakeholder needs?**

- To what extent does the project fulfill the requirements in the Needs Assessment?
- To what extent are the project results useful for the in-country stakeholders?

### Evaluation Tools: Questionnaires and Interview Guides

- Face-to-face web-based interviews
- Questionnaire/E-Survey

PM, NPM, key national stakeholders

- Content analysis of semi-structured interview notes
- Quantitative analysis of questionnaire/survey responses

---

51 The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.
### Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?[^52]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Have the Outcomes been achieved? If not, what are the reasons for it? What would have been additionally necessary to achieve the Outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the Project Objective been achieved? If not, what are the reasons for it? What would have been additionally necessary to achieve the Objective?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Face-to-face virtual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questionnaire/Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Project document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Output report(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PM, NPM, key national stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Content analysis of semi-structured interview notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quantitative analysis of questionnaire/survey responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability[^53]: Will the benefits last?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after it ends?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Has any national and/or local (district-level, city-level) budget been planned for a continuation of activities after project completion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the project results been integrated into national and/or regional institutions/future workplans/strategies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after it ends?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Face-to-face virtual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questionnaire/Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after it ends?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Project document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future workplan and/or strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PM, NPM, key national stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after it ends?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Content analysis of semi-structured interview notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quantitative analysis of questionnaire/survey responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^52]: The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

[^53]: The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.
### To what extent has local ownership by beneficiaries and national and/or regional stakeholders been achieved?

- Have the project results been integrated into national and/or regional institutions/workplans/strategies?
- In which manner have the beneficiaries and national and/or regional stakeholders contributed to the project?

### Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind

Has the intervention been inclusive and human rights based?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent has the project design and implementation fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalized groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does the project document take into consideration/integrate human rights, gender and marginalized groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities in project activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have these groups been involved in project activities or Outputs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Face-to-face virtual interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire/Survey</td>
<td>National and/or regional plans and/or strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM, NPM, key national stakeholders</td>
<td>Content analysis of semi-structured interview notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output report(s)</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis of questionnaire/survey responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

54 The extent to which the project/programme has mainstreamed human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups, including those with disabilities.
**Ethics in Evaluation:** The evaluation team made efforts to contact all stakeholders and involve them in the evaluation process, to receive different opinions and perspectives for the evaluation. The evaluation team members adhered to professional standards while communicating with the national stakeholders. They explained the evaluation process to the stakeholders at the outset of the interviews. The electronic survey included an introductory text at the beginning to explain the same to the stakeholders. Communication was open and stakeholders were requested to ask questions at any time. The evaluation team ensured participation of stakeholders, irrespective of the office they held, or irrespective of any other factors, and did not ask questions about factors such as religion, ethnicity, and LGBTQ status. The evaluation team took 'doing-no-harm' approach into consideration, the team explained and confirmed at the outset of the interview, the interview will only take place if there are reasonable assurances of absence of harm. The evaluation report has been written in an anonymized manner, making sure that the facts or findings mentioned herein cannot be retraced back to any individual person.

**Online survey:** An e-survey was sent to selected stakeholders to capture their inputs via close-ended questions, to enable a quantitative analysis of the responses. The link to the survey was sent via e-mail. This provided the evaluation team with some information about how the project and its results are perceived. During the semi-structured interviews, the evaluation team enhanced the depth of data collection.

Dear [Name],

UNODC has been implementing the project “Promoting the use of non-custodial measures in Sri Lanka” since April 2020. The objective of the project is to “promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based corrections, in Sri Lanka.” As foreseen in the project document, as well as in line with UNODC’s evaluation policy, a final evaluation is being carried out to inform the future development of similar projects, for organizational learning, assess the success and areas of improvement of the project, offer information on the progress made and buy in received from the government and stakeholders; and accountability to beneficiaries.

The evaluation is carried out by a team of external independent evaluators, consisting of an Evaluation Expert, Ms. Suman Lederer and a Substantive Expert, Mr. Paul English.

As a stakeholder of the project, your feedback would be very important for the evaluation process. All the information provided will be kept confidential.

You will need about 5-7 minutes to respond to the questions. We request you to kindly complete the survey by [Date] [1 week]. In case of any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Ms Suman Lederer at [E-mail address].

Thank you very much for your valuable time and feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>I don’t want to answer this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Please select your gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Please write your nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Please write your age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Please state the type of your organization</td>
<td>Govt, Development Agency, Donor, Civil Society, Academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In your opinion, how relevant are the project’s Outputs to promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment in Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Highly relevant</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Not so relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Identification of the main gaps and obstacles in relevant national laws and policies in applying alternatives in appropriate cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Raising awareness of relevant judiciary and legal offices (legislators, policymakers, prosecutors, judges, judicial officers, prison and community-based correctional officers etc.) to enhance understanding of potential advantages of non-custodial measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Training of relevant judiciary and legal offices (legislators, policymakers, prosecutors, judges, judicial officers, prison and community-based correctional officers etc.) in implementing alternatives to imprisonment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Have you attended one or more training(s)/workshop(s) conducted by the project?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If yes, How useful was/were the training/s you attended for the thematic area of non-custodial measures?</td>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>Less Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How would you best describe the level of your involvement in project activities?</td>
<td>Very well informed</td>
<td>Somewhat informed</td>
<td>Not so informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To what extent were you informed about project activities and results?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Have the project Activities been carried out in a timely manner?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Have the project Activities been carried out in an efficient manner?</td>
<td>Highly Likely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How likely is it that further non-custodial measures will be implemented / use of non-custodial measures enhanced after the project?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is your institution planning further trainings on non-custodial measures in for example 2022?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To what extent did the project activities take into consideration the following aspects?:</td>
<td>Through-out</td>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Marginalised groups (including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-structured interview guides

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the stakeholders involved in the project to deepen the understanding as well as receive further in-depth information from the stakeholders, in addition to the e-survey. Before commencing with the interviews, the National Project Manager was requested to inform all stakeholders about the evaluation and the interviews. Questions were adapted depending on the stakeholder, for example, different questions were selected for donors and for implementing partner/beneficiary institutions.

Introduction via Evaluation Team:

The Independent Evaluation Section of United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is in the process of conducting a Final Independent Project Evaluation of UNODC’s project “Promoting the use of non-custodial measures in Sri Lanka” Project. The evaluation is undertaken in line with UNODC and UNEG norms and standards for evaluation.

The purpose of the evaluation is to inform the future development of similar projects, for organizational learning and accountability and for assessing the success and areas of improvement of the project.

The evaluation is carried out by a team of external independent evaluators, consisting of an Evaluation Expert, Ms. Suman Lederer and a Substantive Expert, Mr. Paul English.

Please let us know if you think or feel that responding to the questions of the evaluation, or speaking with the evaluation, has the potential to harm you in any way, either immediately or in the long-term.

Confidentiality: The interview is entirely confidential with all information received being aggregated and anonymised. No individual will be quoted nor will the organization they represent be identified. All information supplied will be deleted upon final clearance of the report.

General questions
1. Name
2. Gender
3. Organization
4. Position
5. Location
6. Since when are you involved in the project and what was your role?
7. Were you involved or consulted during project preparation?

Specific questions depending on role of stakeholder in the project

Relevance
8. To what extent were/are the project Activities useful? To what extent did they contribute to the project Objective “to promote ...”?  
9. To achieve the project objective, “to promote ... “, besides the Activities included in the project, in your opinion, are there any other Activities which should also have been considered to achieve the project Objective?
10. Is there any Activity that, in your opinion, went really well and should be considered in other similar projects? Which activity of the project would you describe as the success of the project?

11. Does the use of non-custodial measures have an effect on the prison system? Why?

Coherence

12. Is the project consistent with the priorities of your organisation?

13. In your opinion, were all stakeholders, who are relevant to non-custodial sentences, non-custodial measures and implementation of such measures in Sri Lanka, involved in the project activities?

14. Are there any stakeholders/institutions (national, civil society, international etc) who should also have been involved? Please elaborate.

15. How would you describe your contribution to the project Activities?

16. In which manner did the interactions amongst all the project stakeholders affect the implementation of project activities and the achievement of project Objective?

Efficiency

18. Have the project Activities and processes involved been carried out in a timely manner? Please elaborate.

19. Could any of the project Activities or processes have been carried out in a more timely manner? By using other resources to reduce cost? What could have been done differently to reduce time or cost or make better use of any other available resources Please elaborate.

Effectiveness

20. In your opinion, have the project Outcome “…” and project Objective “…” been achieved? Why? Why not?

21. If not, what would have been (additionally) necessary to achieve the Outcome and/or Objective?

22. Does the project assist stakeholders involved in non-custodial measures to do their work effectively? Please elaborate.

23. Has the project enabled you to do your work more effectively? How?

Sustainability

24. Are there any policy changes regarding non-custodial measures planned after the project? Or any trainings by local actors regarding non-custodial measures?

25. Are you aware of any city- or court-level plan/strategy and/or budget to enhance non-custodial measures in sentences in, for example, 2022 or later?

26. What would you suggest to be done differently, or included additionally, in similar future projects, to enhance usage of non-custodial measures?

27. In your opinion, which project Activities or results achieved by the project will continue after the project is completed?

Human rights, gender equality

28. How were aspects related to human rights, gender equality and marginalised groups – including LGBTQI+, and people with disabilities considered in the project Activities?

29. In your opinion, is there something else that could have been additionally done or done differently with respect to gender, human rights and marginalized groups?

30. Any other comments or feedback?
ANNEX III: DESK REVIEW LIST

UNODC DOCUMENTS

- Project document SLKAB8
- Full ToR for the evaluation
- Interim Progress Report, September 2020
- Financial report 2020
- Gaps and Needs Assessment of Alternatives to Imprisonment in Sri Lanka, UNODC, 2020
- Reports and list of participants of workshops
- Training Module Bail and Non-Custodial Measures
- Regional Programme for South Asia (2018-2021)
- Strategy 2021-2025
- Strategic Programme Framework 2018-2019
- Handbook on the Management of Violent Extremist Prisoners and the Prevention of Radicalization to Violence in Prisons
- Handbook of Basic Principles and Promising Practices on Alternatives to Imprisonment
- Handbook on Restorative Justice Programmes
- Handbook on Strategies to Reduce Overcrowding in Prisons
- Project or Programme document of Global Programme on Addressing Prison Challenges GLOZ85Interim Progress Reports: 2020
- UNODC Handbook – Results-based Management and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development 2018
- UNODC Evaluation Handbook 2017
- Evaluation Guidance Documents and Templates

EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS

- The Bangkok Rules - United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (Custodian – UNODC)
- Community-based Corrections Act of 1999, Sri Lanka
- Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism, Annex I, EU. 2019
- Prison Statistics of Sri Lanka 2020, Statistics Division, Prisons Headquarters
- Prison Statistics of Sri Lanka 2021, Statistics Division, Prisons Headquarters
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UN.
- UNSDF 2018-2022
- UN Agenda 2030 – SDGs
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## ANNEX IV: STAKEHOLDERS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Number of stakeholders</th>
<th>Type of stakeholder (see note below)</th>
<th>Sex disaggregated data</th>
<th>Country(ies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Executing Agency</td>
<td>Male: 03 Female: 03</td>
<td>Austria, India, Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Male: 01 Female: 01</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice, State Ministry of Prison Management and Prisoners’ Rehabilitation, Department of Community-Based Corrections</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Government recipient/Participating Organization</td>
<td>Male: 04 Female: 02</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Expert/Consultant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>National and International Experts</td>
<td>Male: 02 Female: 02</td>
<td>India, Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Male: 09 Female: 08</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A stakeholder could be a Civil Society Organisation; Project/Programme implementer; Government recipient; Donor; Academia/Research institute; etc.*
ANNEX V: SURVEY RESPONSES

Respondents (out of 15):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1. In your opinion, how relevant are the project’s Outputs to promote the use of alternatives to imprisonment in Sri Lanka?

a. Output 1: Identification of the main gaps and obstacles in relevant national laws and policies in applying alternatives in appropriate cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly relevant</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Output 2: Raising awareness of relevant judiciary and legal offices (legislators, policymakers, prosecutors, judges, judicial officers, prison and community-based correctional officers etc.) to enhance understanding of potential advantages of non-custodial measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly relevant</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Output 3: Training of relevant judiciary and legal offices (legislators, policymakers, prosecutors, judges, judicial officers, prison and community-based correctional officers etc.) in implementing alternatives to imprisonment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly relevant</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Have you attended one or more training(s)/workshop(s) conducted by the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. If yes, how useful was/were the training/s you attended for the thematic area of non-custodial measures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Useful</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. How would you best describe the level of your involvement in project activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly involved</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved at all</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot answer this question</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. To what extent were you (kept) informed about project activities and results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well informed</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat informed</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so informed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot answer this question</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Have the project Activities been carried out in a timely manner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6b. Have the project Activities been carried out in an efficient manner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. How likely is it that further non-custodial measures will be implemented / use of non-custodial measures enhanced after the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly likely</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so likely</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot answer this question</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. Is your institution planning further trainings on non-custodial measures in, for example, 2022 or later?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9. To what extent did the project activities take the following aspects into consideration?

a. Gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot answer this question</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Human Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot answer this question</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Marginalised groups (including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot answer this question</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX VI: THEORY OF CHANGE

Reconstructed TOC

1.1 Conduct a detailed stocktaking exercise to review and assess relevant national laws, policies and practices in Sri Lanka to gain an evidence base on the current legal and policy framework on alternatives to imprisonment as well as to identify the main gaps and obstacles in applying alternatives in appropriate cases.

1.2 Organize a national workshop in Sri Lanka, bringing together all relevant stakeholders (e.g. legislators, policymakers, prosecutors, judges, judicial officers, prison and community-based correctional officers, etc.) to review the findings of the stocktaking exercise, exchange experiences and collectively identify priorities for reform and technical assistance needs.

1.3 Provide advisory services/trainings to requesting Sri Lankan authorities on the basis of existing UNODC technical assistance tools on alternatives to imprisonment, including through legislative, policy support and capacity-building sessions.

1.4 Print relevant IEC and tools for wide dissemination.

Direct Outcome

Enhanced use of alternatives to imprisonment, including community-based initiatives, in Sri Lanka.

Project Outcome

Sri Lanka decreases the resort to imprisonment.

Impact

Overcrowding in prisons reduced; Conditions in prisons improved; Preventing and countering radicalization and violent extremism.

Assumptions (from Outputs to Project Outcome)

- Government, stakeholder institutions understand the benefits of non-custodial measures
- Stakeholder institutions explain to offenders the benefits of non-custodial measures
- Offenders and wider population understand the need and benefits of non-custodial measures
- There is a cordial environment between government and other stakeholders (community organizations, judiciary, etc.)
- New staff joining relevant institutions are trained on the implementation and benefits of non-custodial measures.

Assumptions (from Direct Outcome to Project Outcome)

- Government’s continued interest and commitment, to non-custodial measures
- Continuation of awareness-raising and capacity-building activities, within and outside stakeholder institutions

Drivers (from Outputs to Outcomes)

- Government and relevant stakeholder institutions support the implementation of non-custodial measures
- Project outputs provide stakeholders with relevant knowledge, information and tools for implementation of non-custodial measures

Drivers (from Direct Outcome to Project Outcome)

- Government’s continued interest and commitment, to non-custodial measures
- Continuation of awareness-raising and capacity-building activities, within and outside stakeholder institutions