



RESEARCH REPORT

Monitoring and evaluation arrangements for the Support to Security Sector Reform Programme in Albania: a case study

By Sean DeBliock

January 2009

1. Introduction

This report assesses the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) arrangements for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) project entitled 'Support to the Security Sector Reform (SSSR) programme in Albania'. Research for this project was carried out in Tirana in May 2008.

It is one of five case studies carried out as part of the Saferworld project, 'Evaluating for Security: Developing specific guidance on monitoring and evaluating Security Sector Reform interventions'.¹ Together with a wider desk review and supplementary research into the broader M&E systems used by the major SSR donors, the case studies provide an evidence base from which specific guidance on monitoring and evaluating SSR can be developed.

This report consists of eight sections, each sub-divided when necessary to highlight issues relevant to the study of M&E. The M&E terminology used throughout is consistent with that of UNDP. Footnotes have been used to elaborate some specific terms in more detail.

2. Background

The SSSR programme was a grassroots community based policing (CBP) initiative run by the UNDP in Albania between May 2003 and June 2008. The programme aimed to improve public order at the local level, strengthen police capacities, promote a positive police image and the role of the police as a provider of public services, as well as to enhance mutual trust in social cohesion.²

The programme aimed to address three key objectives:³

- Greater awareness among citizens and youth of safety issues, and the post-communist police-public relationship. This involved public awareness media campaigns and a schools awareness project.

¹ Other case studies include the Irish/Dutch-backed *Justice, Law and Order Sector* in Uganda, the Australian-backed Law and Justice Programme in Papua New Guinea, the SDC backed *Implementation of Community-Based Policing in Bosnia Herzegovina* and UNDP backed *Support to the Security Sector Reform Programme* in Albania.

² See project description on UNDP Albania website <http://www.undp.org.al/index.php?page=projects/project&id=38>.

³ Taken from Ryan, Barry, *An Evaluation of the UNDP Support to Security Sector Reform in the Republic of Albania*, UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, 2006. pp 3-4. Note this programme description is from the opinion of UNDP.

- Enhanced professional capacity of the police – provision of training to police and the construction of more customer-friendly reception halls in pilot site police stations. This included the undertaking of public surveys to measure the community policing initiative.
- Increased co-operation between the public and the police through the establishment of Community Problem Solving Groups (CPSGs) at ‘common premises’ located in newly (re)constructed Police Public Order Inspector offices. These groups were designed to co-operate with the Public Order Inspector and local government to identify and resolve issues affecting their community’s safety. They were also expected to provide some assistance – financially or through expertise – to local construction projects, co-funded by SSSR and the local municipality, to enhance community safety.

In 2004, Saferworld, under contract from UNDP Albania, produced an Operational Document to support the introduction of community policing in Albania. It examined the project’s goals and objectives and produced a very useful and country-specific framework that was followed closely during the programme’s implementation. The document clarified that the UNDP would not work at the national level, but would instead operate at the local level only.⁴ This was linked to the theory of CBP that suggests that a bottom-up approach will lead to success; it also reflected the fact that other international actors were already involved in reforming the Albanian State Police (ASP) at the policy level, as well as providing training and materials.

The SSSR Programme aimed to build on the UNDP Small Arms and Light Weapons Control (SALWC) project, which was completed in 2003 and had by this time evolved into a programme that had begun, in-part, to focus on community safety and security. The programme took over the SALWC components on weapons collection and control and also adopted new components on community-based policing, strengthening police public relations capacity and police-media relations.

The SSSR was built on three pillars.⁵

- 1) To build police transparency and accountability by changing the image of the police in the eyes of the public, through the building of modern public reception halls in police commissariats, the conducting of effective public awareness campaigns, and the provision of appropriate training to police officers who come in daily contact with the public.
- 2) Promoting CBP activities in targeted communities to support the establishment of a representative community group called Community Problem Solving Group (CPSG) and the appointment of a Police Inspector dedicated to that community. Furthermore, the creation of open meeting spaces where CPSG members could identify, discuss and solve their security related problems.
- 3) A massive Awareness Education programme in Schools, whereby the police and subject area experts (for example human trafficking victims, NGO staff who worked on trafficking/drugs issues) were brought directly into the classroom to educate on the dangers that surround them. Subject areas included, weapons in the home, drugs and drug trafficking, prostitution, human trafficking, alcohol and tobacco abuse, traffic rules, etc. This component was implemented entirely by local NGOs and was enhanced by the production of posters, leaflets, public programmes and media involvement.⁶

The SSSR Programme established CPSGs in ten neighbourhoods of between 2,000 and 6,000 people in various districts across Albania including Kukës, Shkoder, Lezhe, Tirana, and Vlora. The

⁴ Ryan, Barry (2006), *An Evaluation of the UNDP Support to Security Sector Reform in the Republic of Albania*, UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, pp 3-4. Note this programme description is from the opinion of UNDP.

⁵ Taken from *ibid*. Note this programme description is from the opinion of UNDP.

⁶ See Barry, R, *op cit*, for a thorough description of the background and context of the SSSR Programme.

programme was directly managed and implemented by the UNDP and the total cost of the programme was \$4.25–5m.⁷

Programme partners included the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Public Order, local authorities, the Ministry of Education and Science, targeted communities, education departments situated in the programme areas and civil society involved in CBP, conflict resolution and public awareness. International partners included the police programmes from OSCE, the US Government through International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance programme (ICITAP), Police Assistance Mission of the European Community to Albania (PAMECA) and the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA).⁸ In particular, the CPSGs worked with the police and local authorities to identify and resolve a particular local security or development issue – supported by grants of up to \$50,000 from the SSSR Programme.

The SSSR Programme had four distinct phases, summarised in the matrix below:

PHASE	DESCRIPTION	DATES
Transition	SSSR created from unexpected conclusion of UNDP SALWC project.	May 2003 – Mar 2004
Piloting	Field offices established in Kukes, Shkodra, Lehze, and Vlora. Key activities ⁹ of SSSR piloted in the cities of Shkodra and Vlora.	Apr 2004 – Dec 2004
Expansion	Key SSSR activities expanded in the cities of Kukes, Lehze, Kamze, Tirana, and Sarande.	Jan 2005 – Dec 2007
Exit	Closure of field offices and activities focused on ensuring the sustainability of community groups established by the programme.	Jan 2007 – Jun 2008

At least thirteen evaluations have been undertaken of the SSSR programme since 2002 (including an impact assessment of SALWC in its final stage).¹⁰ A review of the websites of other national and international security sector reformers operating in Albania during this time suggests that the SSSR programme was not typical, with SSSR conducting a larger number and wider variety of publicly available evaluations than its counterparts.¹¹ SSSR evaluations also analysed activities, impact and outputs, in contrast and apparently without exception, its counterparts' evaluations were simply descriptions of activities, and not a comprehensive evaluation.

Types of Evaluations¹²

The thirteen evaluations and related studies conducted for (and sometimes by) the SSSR programme fell into two general types. Some were focused on tactical and strategic aspects of programming, essentially reviewing what should be done and how best to do it. Others were more results focussed, attempting to measure the outcome or impact of programme activities.

⁷ Through the end of 2006, the SSSR Programme spent \$3,885,426. During 2007, it planned to spend \$358,922 Source: UNDP Albania (October 2007), *SSSR Project Document*. It is not clear how much was spent in 2008, but the Cluster Manager for the project estimated the total for five years to be less than \$5 million. Source: Interview with UNDP Official, 21 May 2008 and UNDP website, <http://www.undp.org.al/index.php?page=projects/project&id=38>.

⁸ See project description on UNDP Albania website <http://www.undp.org.al/index.php?page=projects/project&id=38>.

⁹ Establishment of community problem solving groups in Shkodra and Vlora. The other offices did not establish groups, they ran awareness education activities in local schools.

¹⁰ See annex one.

¹¹ For organisation websites reviewed see annex three

¹² UNDP defines 'evaluation' as 'a time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and completed programmes and projects'. See <http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/mec1-3.htm>.

The evaluations in the first category were commissioned and conducted by SSSR staff or affiliates through qualitative interviews with local, national, and international stakeholders¹³. The evaluations in the second category were also commissioned by SSSR, but conducted by independent consultants. These included a quantitative national survey supported by interviews and available statistics and a qualitative survey of SSSR stakeholders supported by a document review.

This case study will focus on assessing the approach taken in two evaluations conducted at the end of the expansion and implementation of the programme: specifically a quantitative evaluation conducted by the Centre for Rural Studies (the CRS study) and a qualitative study conducted by Barry Ryan (the Ryan study), both published in 2006. All thirteen of the SSSR programme-related evaluations are summarised in annex one.

Linkages with Other Actors and Activities

The SSSR evaluations – and activities – were not formally linked with other interventions, nor tied to other frameworks, such as the development of the Albanian State Police's (ASP) seven-year strategy for CBP. Some interviewees felt that this reflected the decision taken in the design phase not to work at the policy level as PAMECA was already leading the police reform effort in Albania. It also reflected a lack of experience in working on national police issues. This decision was perceived by one interviewee to be a significant failing of the SSSR programme.¹⁴ Furthermore, a number of interviewees felt that SSSR evaluations had failed to determine whether the judgement of the programme designers –regarding the decision not to work at the policy level – was correct in political and procedural terms. One interviewee felt that, in order to address this challenge, the evaluators should have interviewed the programme designer(s) to ensure that proper evaluation judgements could have been made.

Despite being available through the ASP and on the Institute of Statistics (INSTAT), few of the SSSR evaluations¹⁵ contained statistics regarding police activities, the justice sector or crime. Moreover, there is no evidence that the programme used police or crime statistics to monitor or report on the programme. One interviewee felt that this was largely linked to the knowledge of one of the programme managers, who it was felt, was not a specialist in policing. None of the evaluations cited research conducted by the UNDP country office in 2003 and 2004, which focused on security levels in Albania. Similarly, despite the relevance and potential utility of this information, there is no evidence that the SSSR programme used the information from these UNDP sources in the monitoring of its activities.¹⁶ One interviewee linked this to the fact that the SSSR Programme was born out of the UNDP SALWC project, and that the M&E practices employed in that small arms programme were simply carried over to the community policing project, without considering the effectiveness or relevance of those practices given the new programme type.¹⁷

Though SSSR shared its evaluations publicly (within the UNDP and with national and international partners), the findings were never presented to the important local officials that could use the information. Furthermore, the senior ASP official in charge of community based policing was not aware of any SSSR evaluations but he was aware of those done by the Institute for Democracy

¹³ For example, the author was hosted by the SSSR Programme office while conducting independent research in 2007-2008, and while not officially SSSR Programme staff, conducted two evaluations for the programme during that time.

¹⁴ Interview with UNDP official, 21 May 2008.

¹⁵ The two known evaluations conducted by the Centre for Rural Studies said that they reviewed INSTAT statistics.

¹⁶ Rakipi, Albert, Enika Abazi, *et al*, (April 2004), *Early Warning Report: Human Security in Albania with a Case Study on the Energy Crisis*, Albanian Institute for International Studies, UNDP Albania, especially pp 21-22, and Hoxha, Artan, Sckelzen Marku, *et al*, (November 2003), *Human Security in Albania*, Institute for Contemporary Studies and Centre for Rural Studies, UNDP, especially pp 40-50.

¹⁷ Interview with member of review team for this project, 21 November 2008.

and Mediation (IDM) and PAMECA.¹⁸ It is likely that the IDM and PAMECA had built stronger relationships with the ASP and were more proactive in sharing their evaluations. As for activities, the SSSR programme was expressly created to work in an area where other international actors were not operating: at the grassroots community level. An evaluation in 2006 pointed out that SSSR had national ambitions, but was expressly not participating at that level.¹⁹ One interviewee stated that had the SSSR programme been more active at the policy level, it might have been more successful.²⁰ This suggests that some of the decisions made at the design phase of the programme had a detrimental impact on the initiative.

Monitoring²¹

In theory, monitoring of the SSSR programme was done through regular field visits and discussions between field offices and programme managers in Headquarters. In reality the evaluators and SSSR staff identified a number of cases where monitoring was not done, or done badly.²² For example, site visits appear to have been an inaccurate means of monitoring the programme; a former SSSR staff member stated that reports were not submitted on a regular enough basis and that field offices made sure that only positive results were shown during field visits.²³

Reporting was one key aspect of monitoring. According to SSSR programme managers, field offices submitted weekly reports to the SSSR office in Tirana that contained a list of activities completed and activities planned.²⁴ However, evaluators pointed out that simple data, such as attendance at CPSG meetings and group activities, was not collected or reported on, and even in the exit stage of the project recommended that the project document specify the indicators necessary to manage and measure the project.²⁵ One interviewee linked this to poor communication between SSSR and UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR).²⁶

3. Scope, Method and Approach

Scope and focus of the selected evaluations

The Ryan study and CRS study were both conducted at the end of the expansion and implementation stages of the SSSR Programme and published in the autumn of 2006. The purposes and indicators used in these studies are presented in the table below:

	RYAN STUDY	CRS STUDY
Purpose	How to consolidate the gains	Find out (i) public satisfaction with

¹⁸ Interview with representative from Community Policing Sector and Services to Third Parties Branch, Albanian State Police, 21 May 2008. Author's note: It is not clear what evaluations were being referred to here. IDM showed me an Albanian-language version of a statistical survey of police-public relations in 2007, but it does not appear to be available online. PAMECA has published descriptions of its activities, but there do not appear to be any evaluations related to PAMECA's community policing work.

¹⁹ Ryan, Barry, *op cit*, pp 13-14.

²⁰ Interview with member of review team for this project, 21 November 2008.

²¹ According to UNDP policy, 'monitoring' is defined as 'a continuing function that aims primarily to provide project management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing programme or project with early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of programme or project objectives. See <http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/mec1-3.htm>.

²² It appears that the semi-structured monitoring system employed by SSSR (ie weekly reports and field visits) was recommended by Saferworld in 2003. Mathias, et al (2004), *Operational Document Supporting Community Based Policing In Albania*, Saferworld, p 44.

²³ Interview with National Community Based Policing Expert, UNDP Albania, 21 May 2008.

²⁴ Interview with member of review team for this project, 21 November 2008.

²⁵ Ryan, Barry, *op cit*, p 12, and Russell, Judith Kallick (2008), *From Security to Development: An Evaluation of the Support to Security Sector Reform Project*, SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, p 24.

²⁶ Interview with member of review team for this project, 21 November 2008.

	already made by established projects and how to develop the programme further in order to improve its contribution to community based policing in the Republic of Albania. ²⁷	services delivered by the police; and (ii) perceptions of the police themselves about the services they deliver to the public...[in order to] identify the level of relationship and gaps that exist between the police and their communities so that the SSSR can assist and recommend to different institutions in developing interventions/activities to address these gaps. ²⁸
Key Indicators	Relationships between local police and community groups; level of service provided by police to public; anecdotes about changes in safety perceptions	Public perceptions of crime trends; public ratings of the types of improvements needed by the different police forces; comparisons of public and police perceptions of threats to community safety

The CRS study was similar in scope to the initial survey conducted during the programme design phase.

The Ryan study was primarily focused on SSSR work with CPSPs and towards the refurbishment of police reception areas. It also looked at the impact that these activities had on the sustainability of the programme; specifically:

- a. Is the programme positively affecting community safety and security in pilot sites in the long term?
- b. Is the programme positively affecting the levels of police transparency and accountability in pilot sites in the long term?
- c. Will the relationships between participating community members, local authorities and the police persist in the absence of the UNDP SSSR programme?
- d. Is the model proving the benefits of CBP to the Albanian State Police? In other words, will the model, or any of the components of the SSSR approach to community-based policing, be incorporated into a national policing reform strategy?²⁹

The CRS study served as a progress report, to measure the SSSR programme against a baseline community-police survey conducted at the start of the initiative and against an identical study conducted by CRS in 2005.³⁰ The SSSR programme was conducting an unsuccessful attempt to attract donor funds when the 2006 CRS study was published, subsequently the CRS study became the *de facto* impact assessment of the SSSR Programme.

Methods

The Ryan study collected data from interviews with project stakeholders at the local and national levels and a review of documents relating to police reform in Albania. SSSR programme managers suggested that the method (interviews with stakeholders) was chosen because it would lead to ideas for new project activities. There is no evidence to suggest that preparations, such as the collection of existing baseline data for use during the evaluation or information management, were made by SSSR to support the evaluation exercise.

²⁷ Ryan, Barry, *op cit*.

²⁸ Centre for Rural Studies & Sustainable Development (November 2006), *Survey on Public Assessment and Customer Satisfaction*, UNDP Albania, pp 9-10.

²⁹ Ryan, Barry, *op cit*, p 7.

³⁰ The author requested this report on 31 May but as of 06 June had not received it.

This basic step undoubtedly weakened the evaluation, as the information could have made for a more robust, systematic and relevant analysis. Mr Ryan pointed out that the documentation of CPSG and Public Order Inspector activities, with the exception of one project area, was generally lacking.³¹ However, one stakeholder felt that the evaluator could have compared the CRS survey undertaken in 2005 with the findings from the survey undertaken during the design phase of the programme (the programme baseline data), which could have provided baseline and programme performance data for the evaluation.

The CRS study collected data from a nationwide survey, interviews in the prefectures where the SSSR programme operated, and a review of statistics from the Government of Albania. The data was collected in the autumn of 2006, and findings were published soon after. The focus was on the impact of the SSSR programme, not its process; therefore, on the relationship between the police and the public. A review of SSSR documents suggests that the methods were selected because they matched those previously used by CRS in its other surveys for the programme. SSSR programme managers also believed that this type of study illustrated the successes of the programme.³²

Gender

The managers stated that the programme did not ask for the Ryan study to look at gender issues. Nevertheless, the evaluation did point out that there were no female police officers involved in the programme, and that only one of the 33 female CPSG members was available for interview.³³

The CRS study did not address gender issues in any way. This was due to the design of the survey. CRS administered the survey by speaking to the head of households, and spoke to whomever claimed the title of 'head,' male or female, at the time of contact. The gender of the respondents was not collected, and therefore not analysed.

4. Inputs

The Ryan report was completed by Barry Ryan of the University of Limerick, who was contracted through the UNDP BCPR in New York. According to the University of Limerick website, he has experience in evaluating police reform in Northern Ireland, Montenegro, and Serbia.³⁴ For his evaluation, Mr Ryan was supported by SSSR programme staff: field site managers arranged interviews and the programme manager and police specialist at the main SSSR office in Tirana provided comments on drafts of his report.³⁵ Mr Ryan appears to have had full access to public SSSR documents, and commented on areas where documentation was missing.

The CRS has wide-ranging experience conducting statistical surveys for the UNDP in Albania, and it also conducted surveys for the SSSR programme in 2003 and 2005, and its predecessor the SALWC in 2002. SSSR had little interaction with CRS for during the evaluation, though its researchers appear to have had access to SSSR documents, and may have been aided by programme staff in selecting people for interview.³⁶ However, it should be noted that although CRS may have substantial experience in conducting surveys, their SSSR-related products generally demonstrate a weakness in designing and analysing results. This emphasises the importance of hiring organisations with a capacity to design and analyse surveys, or at the very least building the capacity of the organisation to do so.

³¹ Ryan, Barry, *op cit*, p 12.

³² Interview with Project Managers, 20 May 2008.

³³ Ryan, Barry, *op cit*, p 9 and p 17.

³⁴ <http://www.ul.ie/ppa/Politics/ryan.htm> accessed 26 May 2008.

³⁵ Ryan, Barry, *op cit*.

³⁶ Centre for Rural Studies & Sustainable Development, *op cit*, pp 9-10.

5. Participation and information sharing

The Ryan study involved the CPSG members, police inspectors, and officials in Albanian State Police, but was fully owned by the SSSR Programme and UNDP. The Ryan report's 14 recommendations were for the UNDP, the Albanian Government, international donors, and SSSR, and was published in both English and Albanian. One interviewee thought that the underlying purpose of the Ryan study was to appeal to donors for more programme funding.³⁷ It called on UNDP to replicate the SSSR programme in other countries and for additional support from international donors and the Albanian Ministry of Interior. The remaining ten recommendations are specific to SSSR activities.³⁸ According to SSSR managers, the Ryan study was not shared with participants except to explain changes in activities. The evaluation was sent to donors and shared within UNDP.³⁹

Input into the CRS study largely came from the people who participated in the household survey and from interviews in the project areas. The interviews were with:

'Experts and representatives of several institutions that are linked directly or indirectly with the programme such as police, schools, districts and prefecture representatives, municipality/commune and village representatives, local NGOs and associations, development projects/programmes, businesses, and other local and central public structures/institutions.'⁴⁰

Like the Ryan study, the CRS study was not restricted or widely disseminated – as some interviewees felt it should have been – though it was published in both English and Albanian.

6. Outputs and application

At the time of the publication of the Ryan and CRS studies, the SSSR programme was hoping to attract international support to continue operating the programme as it had done in the implementation stage, but it was also considering an exit strategy. Both studies shared a common purpose: to encourage prospective donors to contribute funds to the programme. For example, one of The CRS study's more clearly articulated recommendations was:

'The project has had significant results in improving police performance and citizens' perception. In spite of this, we believe that there is still a strong need for further support in order to sustain these results and the progress made so far and to expand this experience to other prefectures.'⁴¹

This donor focus raises questions around the credibility of the evaluations. Some stakeholders felt that the purpose of the evaluations should have been more explicitly focused on assessing the impact of the programme on the beneficiaries and identifying ways to strengthen this impact as opposed to raising additional funds.

The Ryan study also aided SSSR in developing specific activities which were intended to ensure that its efforts sustainable. According to programme managers, the Ryan study was one of the most useful evaluations as it served as the basis for all the programme activities during the final 18 months of its existence.⁴² Another manager pointed out that the Ryan study identified some of the weaknesses of the initiative, such as its reliance on physical infrastructure and CPSGs.

³⁷ Interview with member of review team for this project, 21 November 2008.

³⁸ Ryan, Barry, *op cit*, pp 18-19.

³⁹ Interview with Project Managers, 20 May 2008; Interview with UNDP Official, 21 May 2008.

⁴⁰ Centre for Rural Studies & Sustainable Development, *op cit*, pp 5-8.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, pp 39-40.

⁴² Interview with UNDP Official, 20 May 2008.

According to the manager, the Ryan report gave a more realistic perspective about the prospects for the programme's success.⁴³

According to SSSR programme managers, the CRS study proved that the initiative was making great improvements to police-public relations in Albania.⁴⁴ Although it had some recommendations specific to SSSR Programme activities, such as improving the performance of the traffic police and reducing the risks associated with travelling at night, these do not appear to have been acted on.⁴⁵

7. Challenges

The challenges in this section reflect the views of the author.

The SSSR programme managers largely did not follow the recommendations of the Ryan study or the CRS study evaluations. There is no evidence to suggest that SSSR complied with any of the recommendations in the CRS study, nor with some of the key recommendations of the Ryan study, such as consolidating its work in Tirana and using its model in a problematic quarter of the city. It also did not actively pursue recommendations to become more involved in the development of national policing policy. However, one interviewee felt that the failure of the programme to apply this specific recommendation was more directly related to its feasibility within the political context - where UNDP would have been involved in policy work that the EU, OSCE, and US Government had already claimed ownership over.⁴⁶

In all likelihood, SSSR decided against Ryan's recommendation for consolidation as it wanted to maintain a presence throughout Albania in case it received funding to return to a normal implementation stage, and was wary of trying out its model in an area where it would have a small chance of success – such as a high-crime area in Tirana. Also, there was little likelihood of success in the application of the Ryan study recommendation to have the Minister of Interior declare CBP as a priority, as it did not reflect the actual political situation in the country (with SSSR not operating at the policy level).

The SSSR Programme did make a concerted effort to conduct activities to make the CPSGs more sustainable – as recommended – such as hosting a national CPSG conference, and it did conduct an evaluation of its Awareness Education activities.⁴⁷ Interestingly, UNDP country office knew what issues the SSSR Programme would face in creating grassroots civil society groups, but does not appear to have shared information with the SSSR Programme about those concerns, nor strategies for dealing with challenges.⁴⁸ A number of stakeholders attributed this to friction between UNDP Tirana and SSSR programme managers.

The CRS study was not fully understood by SSSR programme managers who claimed that it demonstrated the success of the project. In fact, the CRS study did see some positive changes in prefectures where SSSR Programme was operating, it did not establish a relationship between the project and positive statistics, such as increased respect for the police. The CRS study's methodology made such a claim impossible; the data in the household survey was collected across the entire country, and was proportionally collected from all of Albania's prefectures. While the sample collected data from the prefectures where SSSR Programme had a presence, there is no evidence that the sample included data from the neighbourhoods where the initiative was

⁴³ Interview with UNDP Official, 21 May 2008.

⁴⁴ Interview with Representatives from SSSR, 20 May 2008.

⁴⁵ Centre for Rural Studies & Sustainable Development, *op cit*, pp 39-40.

⁴⁶ Interview with member of review team for this project, 21 November 2008.

⁴⁷ A 2008 evaluation commended the SSSR Programme on its CPSG-related activities, but suggested that measuring the sustainability of the activities should be taken as a next step. Russel, Judith Kallick, *op cit*, p 10.

⁴⁸ Interview with UNDP Official, 21 May 2008.

actually performing activities. Linked to this, some stakeholders felt that the methodology for the CRS study was flawed as the purpose of the survey was to tease out the relationship between the programme and the perception of the public towards the police, yet failed to do this.

The CRS study also came to conclusions, which proved inconsistent with subsequent findings from other evaluations and the perceptions of SSSR programme managers, which raises questions about the credibility of its findings. For example, the CRS study highlighted the case of Shkodra as a place where the SSSR Programme was weakest.⁴⁹ However, an evaluation (based on testimonial evidence with CPSG members and local police officers) a few months later found that Shkodra had serious issues relating to sustainability, but was no more problematic than most of the SSSR Programme areas.⁵⁰ Moreover, in interviews conducted in 2008, programme managers cited Shkodra as particularly successful because the CPSG concept had the (verbal) backing of the mayor, who had articulated plans to replicate the CPSGs across the city.⁵¹ The reason behind the mayor's support is unclear as he was not interviewed as part of this project, but it may be linked to the support that his office perceived the SSSR would give to the city's infrastructure. Here, the evaluations that relied on testimonial evidence were more reliable than the quantitative survey. This does not mean that quantitative methods are not appropriate, but that there were serious weaknesses in the design of the CRS study.

Another issue was funding constraints. This raises questions about the knowledge that the evaluator possessed when developing recommendations for the Ryan study – specifically, knowledge about the political dynamics surrounding the international efforts to reform the ASP, and the financial health of the programme. This brings to light the issue of hiring evaluators with sound understanding of the political context, or in the absence of such experts, providing expert evaluators with the information that they need to analyse the situation and develop feasible recommendations, with the support of the SSR programme staff (SSSR in this case).

8. Lessons

The lessons raised in this section reflect the perceptions of the author.

From the interviews and document review, it is clear that the M&E of the SSSR Programme could have been improved by the following:

Regularly using the publicly available crime and police activity statistics in reporting, monitoring, and evaluation exercises: INSTAT and ASP publish this information on a regular basis on their websites. In the interviews conducted for this study, both ASP and the OSCE had figures readily available. SSSR could have and should have used these figures. Some stakeholders attributed this failure to limited capacity of programme managers – an issue that it was felt should have been better explored in the evaluations.

Tying indicators to statistics used by the ASP: The ASP monitors its activities by crime statistics (such as numbers of arrests) and the number of calls to the emergency hotline. SSSR activities could have been monitored against some of these indicators (for example, did calls to police increase or decrease in areas where SSSR was operating?). Assuming that the programme was having a positive impact on the police-public relationship, and these indicators are legitimate, linking the programme and the police would also have made the programme a priority of the ASP.

Creating a systematic format for monitoring the programme: The project relied on infrequent and informal systems, and never developed a sound methodology for assessing its performance. It

⁴⁹ Centre for Rural Studies, *op cit*, p 40.

⁵⁰ DeBlicek, Sean (May 2007), *Representation, Relevance and Interest: An Assessment of the SSSR Programme's Community Problem Solving Groups*, UNDP Albania, p 8.

⁵¹ Interview with representatives from SSSR, 2008.

did not require its CPSGs to record their activities or outputs. It did not monitor news reports regarding crime in the areas where it operated. The project appears to have been monitored largely by anecdote or the national surveys conducted by CRS.

Conducting evaluations that are insulated from funding concerns: SSSR resisted some activities because it was hoping to attract funds from donors.

Conducting evaluations before expansion: SSSR did not conduct an impact assessment or independent evaluation after its pilot phase in 2004. Internally, it commissioned a study of the best practices of the two pilot sites, but subsequent evaluations showed that key recommendations, such as making the CPSGs more representative (including youth and women) and focusing public awareness activities in the neighbourhoods where the project was being run, were not followed.⁵² Evaluations in 2006, 2007, and 2008 pointed to the lack of women and youth in the CPSGs.⁵³ Another evaluation in 2006, which surveyed neighbourhoods that had been targeted by the SSSR programme, found little awareness of the presence of UNDP in general or SSSR in particular, even after three years of activities.⁵⁴

Youth and women memberships were not expanded because of the reluctance of the SSSR programme to challenge traditional gender roles, and the fact that women and young people generally have less free time to participate in CPSGs than male pensioners. Public awareness was generally low because the SSSR Programme did not have a coherent public awareness strategy.

Co-ordination within the organisation: The SSSR programme did not benefit from the UNDP Albania's experience in creating civil society groups, nor from country office surveys that measured levels of crime and perceptions of security. This disconnect was likely the result of the relationships (or lack thereof) between SSSR and other initiatives run through the UNDP country office.

Understanding the limits of research methods used in evaluations: The national surveys are interesting, but could not be used to ascertain the impact of the project because they did not collect information from the neighbourhoods where SSSR activities were concentrated. The qualitative surveys were also important, but generally based on the short-term observations of a foreigner with little experience in the country. Better support from UNDP BCPR and UNDP Tirana would have allowed for more effective research methods to have been used. A more comprehensive evaluation, which combined qualitative and quantitative methods, would have been an appropriate means to judge the impact of SSSR programming. One interviewee felt that the SSSR should have been better at communicating the situation to the evaluator to mitigate this challenge.⁵⁵

Increasing the sources of information: On the quantitative side, statistics concerning crime and security from various sources – CRS surveys, INSTAT, UNDP, and the ASP – were readily available and could have been subjected to comparative analysis. The extent to which this data complement each other is not known. On the qualitative side, the perspectives of ordinary people in the quarters where the SSSR Programme was operating were conspicuously absent. In both monitoring and evaluation, their voices should have been heard.

⁵² DeBlieck, Sean, *op cit.*

⁵³ *Ibid*; Ryan, Barry, *op cit.*; and Russel, *op cit.*

⁵⁴ Nurellari, Adri (2006), *Public Awareness and Information Evaluation Report*, UNDP Albania.

⁵⁵ Interview with member of review team for this project, 21 November 2008.

A stronger evaluation focus on the competency of the programme's management, as individuals and as a structural system: This case study highlights the importance of programme management and the cultivating of relationships between programme managers and other key stakeholders (UNDP Tirana in this case) to the success of the programme and M&E.

Annex 1: Thirteen key documents, evaluations and public perception surveys related to the SSSR Programme, 2002-2008

YEAR	REPORT	PURPOSE	METHOD	KEY FINDINGS	ACTION
2002	Centre for Rural Studies (2002), <i>SALWC Project: Socio-economic Analysis and Impact Assessment</i> , UNDP Albania.	Assess security levels in seven prefectures; impact of the project; ideas for project adjustment	External. Document review; randomly selected sample in seven prefectures (n= 569); interviews with key informants (n=175)	Improved intra-community social and economic relations (p 33)	
2003	Faltas, Sami and Wolf-Christian Paes, <i>'You Have Removed the Devil From Our Door': An Assessment of the UNDP Small Arms and Light Weapons Control (SALWC) Project in Albania</i> , Bonn International Centre for Conversion, South Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, UNDP, October 30, 2003.	Independent Analysis/Final Evaluation of SALWC	External. Document review, cost-benefit analysis, key informant interviews	Network of communities established during SALWC could be used as a base to form CPSGs and run CBP	Supported creation of SSSR Programme
	Graham Mathias, David Kendrick, Gordon Peake and Hesta Groenewald, <i>Philosophy and Principles of Community Based Policing</i> , Saferworld, South Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, UNDP, September 15, 2003.	Definition of CBP and what it could be expected to achieve	External. Case studies and literature review	Lists key challenges and methods for overcoming them.	Supported creation of SSSR Programme SSSR did not address key issues listed on P14!
2004	Mathias, Graham, David Kendrick, Gordon Peake and Hesta Groenewald, <i>Operational Document Supporting Community Based Policing In Albania</i> ,	Operational document for piloting SSSR Programme	External. Key informant interviews with UNDP staff, the Albanian Police, representatives of international and Albanian institutions	Examined the existing national framework for police reform as well as the ways in which the SSSR	Supported creation of pilot site activities for SSSR Programme. p24 says women should be included. P34 says they should monitor function and achievements of

	Saferworld, January 2004.			could work with other SSR actors. key challenges, opportunities and recommendations for implementing, capacity building, as well as monitoring and evaluation.	the groups . p44- deals with monitoring and evaluation. Recommends use of informal methods of monitoring (not done) Annual reports, lists possible indicators
	Kenney, Dennis Jay, <i>Public Perceptions of the Police in Albania</i> , SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, January 1, 2004.	Baseline Survey	External. Nationwide survey of 3,000 randomly selected citizens and 1,200 ASP	Public support police efforts are being met by current law enforcement activities, opportunities for collaboration exist. Police support community involvement in a variety of problems (p3) CPSGs facilitators should monitor and evaluate the activities of the CPSGs (p39)	Supported creation of SSSR Programme
	DeBlicek, Sean, <i>Community Based Policing: Best Practices for Programme Extension</i> . SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, August 2004. Not published.	Best practices to support expansion of the program outside of target areas	Internal. Key informant interviews, Tirana, Shkodra and Vlora	SSSR should develop trainings and awareness campaigns that fit the Albanian context.	
2006	Ryan, Barry, <i>An Evaluation of the UNDP Support to Security Sector Reform in the Republic of Albania</i> , UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery,	Evaluation of outcomes of the SSSR Programme and its sustainability	External. Document review and key informant interviews with project partners, participants, implementers, and random	SSSR is "simple, effective although rather costly" (p15). Sustainability of CPSGs is in	Now seen as final evaluation of the implementation phase of the SSSR Programme Used to develop some project activities

	2006.		people in the target quarters	question.	
	Nurellari, Adri, <i>Public Awareness and Information Evaluation Report</i> , SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, August 2006.	Impact assessment of the awareness activities of the SSSR Programme	External. Non representative random sample of 357 people in four project areas.	Infrastructure needs to be accompanied by training for the police so that police services improve. Low understanding of infrastructure rationale. Low understanding of UNDP or SSSR. (p2)	
	Centre for Rural Studies & Sustainable Development, <i>Survey on Public Assessment and Customer Satisfaction</i> , UNDP Albania, November 2006.	Impact assessment, levels of public support for police and police views on the public. compared to 2004 study.	External. Random sample of 849 police (stratified by type of police service) and 2,352 citizens (stratified prefecture and ratio of urban/rural residents).	Police contact and service have improved, especially in prefectures with SSSR activities.	Shows changes occurring at prefecture level and suggests some project activities.
2007	DeBlicek, Sean, <i>The Critical Link: Community Policing Practices in Southeastern Europe</i> . UNDP Albania, February 2007.	Comparative Analysis of regional CBP programs to find ideas to address sustainability issue	Internal. Key informant interviews and document review	SSSR's approach is unique in the region, and it could probably benefit from following the examples of others.	Shows methods that could be utilised to improve the project
	DeBlicek, Sean, <i>Representation, Relevance and Interest: An Assessment of the SSSR Programme's Community Problem Solving Groups</i> , SSSR Programme, UNDP	Assessment of levels of commitment in project areas	Internal. Key informant interviews, 52 individuals, in all six CBP project areas.	Levels of commitment vary by CPSG; should do more to make them more representative of local populations	Recommendations for exit strategy activities

	Albania, May 7, 2007.				
	Agolli, Irida, <i>Final Report—Awareness Education Component of SSR Programme</i> , “Progres dhe Civilizim” Association, June 2007.	Evaluation of the awareness education activities conducted by the SSSR Programme. Relevance, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability	External. Mini-survey, document review, focus groups, key informant interviews	children, police and community have widely benefited by this Programme (p5), seems to suggest that the activities are not sustainable without more input.	Recommends that program be extended and to find more funding. Does not show any change, only level at point in time.
2008	Russel, Judith Kallick, <i>From Security to Development: An Evaluation of the Support to Security Sector Reform Project</i> , SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania. April 8, 2008.	Evaluation of activities conducted in exit stage of the program.	External. Key informant interviews in some project areas.	Cannot determine impact of the programme on sustainability, programme should have system to monitor itself, programme having an impact on the areas where it is operating	Suggests major changes but provides little evidence to support it.

Annex 2: Bibliography

Agolli, Irida, *Final Report—Awareness Education Component of SSR Programme*, 'Progres dhe Civilizim', Association, June 2007.

Albanian State Police, Republic of Albania, *Strategjie e Policise, 2007-2013*, 2007.

Centre for Rural Studies & Sustainable Development, *Survey on Public Assessment and Customer Satisfaction*, UNDP Albania, November 2006.

Centre for Rural Studies, *SALWC Project: Socio-economic Analysis and Impact Assessment*, UNDP Albania, 2002.

DeBlieck, Sean, *Community Based Policing: Best Practices for Programme Extension*. SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, August 2004. Not published.

DeBlieck, Sean, *The Critical Link: Community Policing Practices in Southeastern Europe*, UNDP Albania, February 2007.

DeBlieck, Sean, *Representation, Relevance and Interest: An Assessment of the SSSR Programme's Community Problem Solving Groups*, SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, May 7, 2007.

DeBlieck, Sean, *Research Notes*. SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, August 2004. Not published.

Faltas, Sami and Wolf-Christian Paes, *'You Have Removed the Devil From Our Door': An Assessment of the UNDP Small Arms and Light Weapons Control (SALWC) Project in Albania*, Bonn International Centre for Conversion, South Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, UNDP, October 30, 2003.

Hoxha, Artan, Sckelzen Marku, et al., *Human Security in Albania*, Institute for Contemporary Studies and Centre for Rural Studies, UNDP, November 2003. Not published.

Institute for Democracy and Mediation, *Security Issues No. 5*, 2007.

Kenney, Dennis Jay, *Public Perceptions of the Police in Albania*, SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, January 1, 2004.

Mathias, Graham, David Kendrick, Gordon Peake and Hesta Groenewald, *Operational Document Supporting Community Based Policing In Albania*, Saferworld, January 2004.

Mathias, Graham, David Kendrick, Gordon Peake and Hesta Groenewald, *Philosophy and Principles of Community Based Policing*, Saferworld, South Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, UNDP, 15 September, 2003.

Nurellari, Adri, *Public Awareness and Information Evaluation Report*, SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania, August 2006.

Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, *Survey of OSCE Long-Term Missions and other OSCE Field Activities*, July 2007.

Rakipi, Albert, Enika Abazi, et al, *Early Warning Report: Human Security in Albania with a Case Study on the Energy Crisis*, Albanian Institute for International Studies, UNDP Albania, April 2004.

Republic of Albania, *Community Policing Strategy*, February 2006.

Republic of Albania, *National Security Strategy of the Republic of Albania*.

Roos, Mari-Ann, *Analysis of the Criminal Justice System of Albania*, Report by the Fair Trial Development Project, OSCE Presence in Albania, 2006.

Russel, Judith Kallick, *Final Evaluation of the United Nations Volunteers Programme Contribution to the Chernobyl Recovery and Development Programme*, UNDP Ukraine, December 2007.

Russel, Judith Kallick, *From Security to Development: An Evaluation of the Support to Security Sector Reform Project*, SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania. April 8, 2008. Not published.

Ryan, Barry, *An Evaluation of the UNDP Support to Security Sector Reform in the Republic of Albania*, UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, 2006.

Ryan, Barry, *Summary of an Evaluation of the Support to Security Sector Reform Programme of UNDP Albania*. UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery. August 2006. Not published.

SSSR Programme, 'SSSR Exit Strategy', UNDP Albania, 2007.

UNDP Albania, 'SSSR Project Document,' October, 2007.

Annex 3: Selected websites

Albanian State Police, Republic of Albania,

<http://www.moi.gov.al/old/anglisht/M.P.O/State%20policie.htm>

Institute for Democracy and Mediation, <http://idmalbania.org/en/>

Institute of Statistics, Republic of Albania, <http://www.instat.gov.al/>

Ministry of Interior, Republic of Albania, <http://www.moi.gov.al/>

Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe Mission to Albania, <http://www.osce.org/albania/>

Police Assistance Mission for the European Community to Albania, <http://www.pameca.org.al/>

Support to Security Sector Reform Programme, www.sssr.undp.org.al

United Nations Development Programme Albania, <http://www.undp.org.al/index.php>

University of Limerick, <http://www.ul.ie/ppa/Politics/ryan.htm>

Annex 4: Interview schedule

May 20, 2008

- Ms. Liliana Kadiu, Project Manager
- Ms. Gjenovefa Brovina, National Community Development Co-ordinator , SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania

May 21, 2008

- Mr Vladimir Malkaj, Cluster Manager UNDP Albania
- Mr Taulant Kondi, Head of Public Order, Albanian State Police
- Mr Besnik Ahmetaj, Head of Community Policing Sector and Services to Third Parties Branch, Albanian State Police
- Mr Robert Korkuti, National Community Based Policing Expert, SSSR Programme, UNDP Albania

May 22, 2008

- Mr Klaas Los, Senior Police Assistance Officer
- Mr Flori Ademaj, National Security Officer Security and Co-operation Department, OSCE Presence in Albania