"Community-Oriented Policing Services" Project (COPS) in Afghanistan

January 2020 – December 2021

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

Evaluation commissioned by UNDP

Evaluation prepared by Andrei IOVU,
Juris Doctor, International evaluation consultant

KABUL, AUGUST 2022

Evaluation information	
Final/midterm review/ other	Final project evaluation
Evaluator	Andrei Iovu, Juris Doctor
Evaluator email address	andrei_iovu@ymail.com

Evaluation dates	Start	Completion
	1 March 2022	15 August 2022

Project Information	
Project title	Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS)
Country	Afghanistan

Project dates	Start	Planned end
	1st of January 2020	31st December 2023
Total committed budget	$ 15,763,832.00
Funding source	LOTFA – MPTF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of acronyms and abbreviations

ANP	Afghan National Police
AWP	Annual Work Plan
COPS	Community-Oriented Policing Services Project
CPD	UNDP Country Programme Document
CPSS	Community and Police Perception Survey
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
CSTC-A	Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EU	European Union
GD	General Directorate
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit/ German Agency for International Cooperation
GPPT	German Police Team
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
IC	Individual Contract
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
LNOB	Leave No One Behind
LOTFA	Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOIA	Afghanistan Ministry of Interior Affairs
MPD	Project "MOIA Police Development"
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NPP	Afghanistan National Priority Programme
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PD	Police District
PeM	Police-e-Mardumi
PHQ	Police Headquarters
PMU	Project Management Unit
POPP	Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
ProDoc	Project Document
RBAP	Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific of UNDP
RS	Resolute Support
SBCC	Social and Behavior Change Communication
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDSCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Intervention summary

The "Community-Oriented Policing Services" project was designed to be a 4-year long intervention that was officially launched on the 1st of January 2020 and was expected to be finalized on the 31st of December 2023. The intervention focused on supporting the Afghan National Police (ANP) with an initial emphasis on the PHQ and PDs in Kabul, with further extension to other provinces of Afghanistan. The project was supported by LOTFA and managed by UNDP. The COPS project aimed to contribute to the achievement of SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions.

The project has focused on achieving deliverables on 4 outputs:

(1) Improved capacity of Police Provincial Headquarters to lead and sustain reform.
(2) Improved police response to community needs and priorities.
(3) Constructed/ rehabilitated standard Police Districts to support community-oriented policing.
(4) Improved administrative services at Police Districts' levels to support police services.

The COPS project represented an attempt to tackle some of the essential challenges that the ANP faced toward becoming a better security provider for the public in Afghanistan. However, a series of turbulent events have challenged the implementation and the duration of the project. In the first months of the project implementation, following an unfortunate staff security incident, UNDP put in place stricter security rules which limited the mobility of the project team and interaction with the stakeholders and beneficiaries. Later, restrictions were applied due to COVID-19. Over the following months, the political instability in Afghanistan has deepened the obstacles to the project implementation.

The events that culminated on the 15th of August 2021 when the Taliban took over the government in Afghanistan, have determined the LOTFA donors to foreclose all projects and the trust fund itself, a decision that took effect on the 4th of December 2021. This affected the implementation of the COPS project which had to close prematurely.

Respectively, out of the 4-year timeframe, approximately 48 months, the project duration comprised approximately 20 months, which is 42% of the entire project lifespan. Due to challenges that the project has faced as part of the implementation process, none of the 3 outcome indicators was achieved. Equally, none of the 4 outputs and the total of the 17 output final targets were fulfilled. However, the analysis performed as part of the present evaluation report has indicated that the project has undertaken significant steps toward implementation. The findings are further presented in this final evaluation report.

Evaluation context and purpose

Following the UNDP requirements, the COPS project had to go through an evaluation process performed by an external evaluator. The present report represents the independent judgement of the evaluator based on a set of criteria and benchmarks which are expressly regulated by the UNDP independent evaluation policy and guidelines.

The purpose of the present evaluation was defined in the Terms of Reference of the assignment outlining two main directions:

- First, the purpose of accountability is by exploring why certain aspects of the COPS project have or have not been implemented as planned, by looking at the project design and prospects for successful replication.

- Second, the purpose of learning is by exploring the lessons learned in the evaluation to support a better understanding of future interventions.

Through the generation of evidence and objective information, the report shall enable program managers and other stakeholders to make informed management decisions and plan strategically if future interventions will be resumed in Afghanistan. The specific objectives of the assignment are further presented in the report.

Methodology overview

The methodology has been structured around the revised OECD/ DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the intervention. All these criteria are in full arrangement with the provisions of the UNDP guidelines, notably with the provisions of the revised UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. The report ensures alignment with the new UNDP Evaluation Policy and the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework.

The evaluation was designed to employ a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, by putting forward a participatory and consultative approach that sought to ensure close engagement with the monitoring personnel, project management, implementing partners, and male and female beneficiaries. However, following the adjustment of the methodology to the limitations related to the country context, the report has employed the following methods:

- *Structured document review*: the respective method comprised examination of the project documentation and reports compiled through the implementation process.

- *Semi-structured interviews:* this method was meant to be employed with selected stakeholders to explore the questions put forward in the ToR by addressing questions in a conversational format, around the evaluation criteria.

- *Direct observation during the meetings:* this method was meant to be applied as a complementary source of gathering information, including documentary evidence, interviews, and observations compiled, summarized, and organized according to the questions asked in the evaluation.

In the context of the present report, the aspects of gender, disability, vulnerability, and social inclusion were specifically evaluated and reflected in a separate chapter. The gender profile of interview respondents from the total of 4 people interviewed, included 3 males and 1 female. The validation of the report was conducted by 2 representatives of the UNDP Afghanistan, involving 1 male, and 1 female.

Main conclusions, recommendations, and good practices

The project evaluation purpose that was reflected in the ToR of the assignment expressly stated: to explore why certain aspects of the COPS project have or have not been implemented as planned, by looking at the project design and prospects for successful replication of the intervention. In this context, the evaluator came to the following **conclusions**:

- The COPS project design fulfilled most of the requirements regulated by the UNDP POPP on project development. The project described comprehensively the partnerships with other development partners. It assigned the roles as well as the prioritization of building the partnerships for the COPS project implementation.

- The ProDoc identified the beneficiaries and indicated how their engagement should take place. It also outlined the layers of coordination and prioritized their engagement in the project implementation.

- The scaling-up and sustainability aspects of the intervention were included in the project design by indicating how the responsibility for overseeing and monitoring will gradually be transferred to the PHQ.

- The Multi-year work plan was structured following the UNDP requirements.

- The Monitoring Plan was in line with the UNDP's programming policing and procedures. The monitoring activities, purposes, frequency, and expected results were clearly defined and structured.

- The COPS project built upon the previous UNDP and international partners' knowledge and experience in the field of community policing in Afghanistan. The ProDoc expressly presented the lessons learned from other projects which were incorporated into the project design.

- The analysis of the Results Framework formulation indicated that from point of view of its

structure, it fulfilled most of the UNDP requirements by presenting the intended outcome and its indicators, baseline values, targets, and means of verification. The analysis of the Outcome Indicators concluded that all three indicators fit the S.M.A.R.T criteria.

At the same time, the examination of the project design outlined several *limitations*:

- In the description of the project strategy, the project should have explained how the intervention was aligned with the UNDSCF/ CPD outcome. The COPS project strategy design was mostly focused on the intervention's approach with limited analytical coverage of the strategic frameworks of UNDP.

- In the description of the expected results, there was no nexus to the higher-level results (provisions of the strategic frameworks of MOIA and UNSDCF) nor the analysis of these policies.

- The presentation of the project partnerships should have indicated a clear linkage with the project's Theory of Change, by outlining what assumptions and expected results achieved by partners were critical for the fulfillment of the project results. In the case of the COPS project, there was only a broad description of the assigned roles.

- The analysis of the Results Framework formulation outlined some limitations in the formulation of the Outcome Indicators:

  • Even though the project anticipated further extension outside Kabul in other districts, the geographic focus of all Outcome Indicators was only on Kabul.

  • The baseline for the third Outcome Indicator was not identified by being prescribed that it will be decided by August 2019 following ANP satisfaction survey completion (while the respective data was not untimely reflected in an updated version of the Results Framework).

  • The final targets for the Outcome Indicators were also facing inexactitudes. It was indicated that these targets will be decided after the pilot period based on 500 interviews in the intervention area (while the respective data was not untimely reflected in an updated version of the Results Framework).

  • The second and third Outcome Indicator prescribed a percentual increase in beneficiaries' perception, respectively by a 10% increase in satisfaction among the people in the intervention areas on security and safety perception, and at least by 25% increase in satisfaction of PD personnel with the support services received by the PHQ in the second year of project implementation. Respectively, the final targets were identified rather ambiguous and without a clear methodological explanation that would support such a percentage increase in the intervention area (by keeping also in mind that the overall context may vary for each of the districts which also could impact the achievement of the indicators).

  • The analysis of the COPS's output indicators against the IATI standards indicated that the same limitations were further transposed in this context, notably:

    o Kabul was indicated as the sole geographic area.
    o Baseline data on most of the indicators specified "TBD" and has not been further presented in other documents of the project that would indicate updates to the Results Framework.
    o Final targets were indicating an increase in the percentage of trust and satisfaction with limited explanation and clarity on how methodologically the respective benchmarks were established (i.e., indicators 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.3), while other indicators were not aligning with the SMART criteria (i.e., Indicator 1.1,1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.6, 2.7, 3.2, 4.2).

  • The analysis of the project progress reports (quarterly, annual, and final draft) has indicated that the Results Framework was not updated on the missing data, and the respective limitations were not ultimately addressed.

  • Another shortcoming of the Results Framework formulation represented the fact that

most of the results indicators (i.e., especially the ones under Output 2 – 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and Output 3 – 3.3) were bound to public opinion polls, which could challenge the objective assessment of indicators fulfillment as no other methods of verification were included.

The examination of the implementation process outlined the following *conclusions*:

- The COPS project has followed the spirit of the lessons that were reflected in the ProDoc. Notably, the key-intervention instrument for strengthening community trust in ANP was further reflected in supporting the PeM councils and CSOs (by introducing the small grants' funding mechanism for engaging CSO through micro-projects on community security identified through the police districts' PeM Councils). In the context of the COPS project, the iterative approach was realized through the introduction of gradual steps for the implementation of the outputs based on preliminary assessments, surveys as well as comprehensive consultations with the MOIA. The COPS project has followed the lessons on the importance of providing comprehensive support, by introducing activities on capacity building, infrastructure assessment, and equipment provision. However, the CSO micro-project scheme was removed from the implementation plan at the insistence of the MOIA.

- The analysis of the total cumulative expenses in comparison with the total budget of the COPS project indicated a low delivery rate. During the implementation timeframe, the project has absorbed approximately 12% of the total committed budget.

- The analysis indicated that the COPS project has started to implement measures toward the achievement of the Output Indicators, however, due to the situation that the project has faced which led to premature closure, the final targets were not fulfilled.

- At the same time, the key results of the COPS project implementation comprised:

  • Under output 1, the project completed the Kabul PHQ assessment. The assessment reviewed the existing coordination, planning, mentoring, and implementation of community policing initiatives at the district level at the Kabul PHQ. Following the assessment, a detailed reporting mechanism was developed for Kabul PDs to report challenges and recommendations undertaken by PDs at the district police and community consultation sessions.

  • Under output 1, following the recommendation from the capacity assessment of the MOIA a four-day cascading training was organized for the PDs education offices and Police Staff College senior instructors. The direct training beneficiaries were the PHQ and PDs education officers.

  • Under output 2, the project strengthened the Police and Community Partnership in 6 PDs of Kabul city.

  • Under output 2, the project completed a total of 19 community and police consultation sessions. The activity brought the police and community together by implementing the Social and Behavior Change Communication actions.

  • Under output 2, the project completed a two-week classroom and on-the-job training on Social and Behavior Change Communication to the MOIA-related from PDs in media and public relations, gender and human rights, religious and cultural affairs, family response units, and community policing. The first training covered the MOIA directorates while the second training targeted Kabul's 19 PDs.

  • Under output 2, the project completed the second round of 60 bilateral interviews. The in-depth interviews were organized with experts, community members, and ANP male and female officers to ascertain the behaviors and situations that could lead to or prevent crimes.

  • Under output 2, the project launched three docuseries about the police professional behavior, police information center, police impartiality, public confidence, police commitment, police conduct and behavior, police respect for human rights, police and the rule of law, police and fighting corruption and ethics. The video docuseries were

displayed in 6 PDs, where ANP officers learned the gradual integration of community policing concepts into their duties in their respective communities.

- Under output 2, the project implemented the second round of Capacity Building Modular Training in 5 PDs in Kabul city. The training brought police and the community together to fight crime and insurgency in their neighborhoods. This was a cascading training where the MOIA trained 12 officers, and they provided on-the-job training to 270 commissioned and non-commissioned officers and PDs personnel.

The main *obstacles* that the project faced in the implementation process:

- From the beginning of the project implementation, following an unfortunate staff security incident, UNDP put in place stricter security rules which limited the mobility of the project team and interaction with the project partners.

- There was a high turnover of staff within the MOIA leadership, which impacted the timeliness of activities. Whereby the moment when some activities would be agreed on with the MOIA, the leadership would change again, and the process of coordination would start over from the beginning with significant changes to the project implementation approach.

- Another factor that negatively impacted the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation related to understaffing of the project. The project's initial HR Plan included a total of 24 staff members. The COPS project planned a P-4 International Project Manager and a P-5 Chief Technical Advisor. However, the leadership of the MOIA insisted that these two positions should be abolished, and the budget transferred to other project activities. This led to the situation where the project staff members had to do "double-hatting", meaning that they were performing several roles at once that were not initially plotted in the project design.

- The breakout of COVID-19 in Afghanistan in late March 2020 delayed the implementation of the project activities. Due to the pandemic, the authorities have imposed a lockdown across the country. Given the magnitude of the pandemic, the MOIA has been focusing its attention and resources on addressing COVID-19, specifically within the police force, instead of prioritizing the project implementation.

- Due to the pandemic, UNDP has limited the numbers of international staff in the country, while the national staff was telecommuting. The restrictions have disrupted the organization of the infrastructure assessments and impeded the ability to hold meetings with MOIA and ANP on the implementation of the project.

Gender-specific conclusions

Project design:

- It is plausible that the Risk Log of the COPS project has identified out of the 4 risks, one related to "Limited participation of communities, particularly women and other underrepresented groups in project activities". There were 6 measures put forward to mitigate the respective risk. It was pertinent to include this risk in the Risk Log, as the environment of the project context was mostly "male-dominated" as emphasized by the interview respondents.

- The analysis of the Results Framework outlined that out of the 3 outcome indicators, 2 were gender sensitive (by indicating the percentage of males and females expressing (a) trust toward the ANP in Kabul and (b) positive perceptions of the safety and security in their respective PDs). However, the third outcome indicator did not include disaggregated data on sexes (by indicating the percentage of PD personnel reporting satisfaction with the support services received by PHQ). This indicator could have also been sensitive to gender, by indicating the percentage of males and females reporting satisfaction with the support services received by PHQ.

- None of the outcome targets presented in the Results Framework was gender sensitive as the indicators were not disaggregated on sexes, disability, and other vulnerable groups.

- At the output level, out of the total number of 17 output results indicators, there were only 3 indicators that were disaggregated on sexes. There was only 1 output result indicator

specifically targeting women – "2.4. % of women (a) attending, (b) represented at the PeM (by target PD)", which is insufficient if taken into account that the COPS project was targeting communities.

- In the output final targets, only one target related to the output result indicator 2.4 presented above, which indicated an increase of 30% in women attending PeM meetings, and 30% in women represented at the PeM.

- The baseline data did not contain any data on gender, except on the output indicator 2.4. indicating 30% of women represented at the PeM and no data on the women attending the PeM meetings.

- The focus-group interview with the representatives of the UNDP Country Office in Afghanistan that were associated with the implementation of the COPS project indicated that the project design could have placed a bigger emphasis on gender mainstreaming. This was particularly relevant as the COPS project focused on direct interaction with communities.

Project implementation:

- The focus-group interview highlighted that although the project design has not made the necessary focus on gender, the implementation of the project was focused on gender mainstreaming, and the inclusion of women, marginalized communities, and disadvantaged groups in the project activities.

- The analysis of the progress reports has confirmed that the project activities were involving women, marginalized communities, and disadvantaged groups. Moreover, the collection of data was disaggregated by sexes (the specific activities related to the training of women police are presented further in the report).

- Respectively, in the first year of the implementation, the project finalized the assessment of 13 PDs in Kabul city. The aim of the assessment was to identify infrastructure requiring rehabilitation. The assessment also covered the situation of the existing Family Response Units, female detention cells, and Police-e-Mardumi meeting halls.

- The project organized a two-day community consultation in Kabul PDs 4, 5, 6, 7 8 & 12 to develop a sense of duty and commitment to proactive community-oriented policing by undertaking community and police consultation sessions at the grassroots level in the identified PDs of Kabul. A total of 1,900 participants from the 6 PDs of Kabul attended the events. There were 730 female participants (approximately 38%) and 1170 male participants (approximately 62%) from Shura's. The community consultation collected key suggestions from the PeM Shura's led by the Community Policing Directorate of MOIA.

- The project organized a total of 6 consultations, under the title of "Strengthening Police and Community Partnership Consultations" in PDs 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 12 of Kabul city. The activity aimed at bringing police and community together by implementing the Social and Behavior Change Communication (SBCC) actions. A total of 568 community representatives, of whom 255 were female (approximately 45%), attended the six-day community consultation sessions.

- The project started consultations with the Community Policing Directorate to include one male and one female police officer under SBCC 1 planned in early April 2021 as well as involving the Family Response Units to jointly implement the MOIA broader outreach initiatives under SBCC 2 and Inclusive Community Outreach Initiative.

- Following the community consultations, the project identified gender-specific challenges and has put forward recommendations to overcome them. As an example, it has identified that there was an absence of dedicated female police officers whereas a recommendation was put forward to increase women's presence in the police stations and that the female police officers should conduct outreach initiatives in the girls' schools.

To improve the project design, especially in the context of future interventions, it is *recommended*:

- To annex to the ProDoc the Partner Capacity Assessment Tool and HACT Micro Assessment

when the project employs the HACT modality. In the case of the COPS project, this was particularly relevant as the ProDoc indicated that the assessment of the MOIA capacities concluded that the institution was not able to meet the standards to undertake financial services.

- To improve the contingency planning during the project design. Conducting a comprehensive risk analysis could provide viable mitigation measures during the project implementation phase.

- To elaborate an exit strategy from the beginning of the intervention. The project design should reflect the vision of how the results will be secured and what follow-up actions are expected from the authorities following the project's finalization. This aspect could improve sustainability and national ownership.

To improve implementation, it is *recommended*:

- To enhance the planning and hands-on monitoring of the project implementation. Many of the staffing and recruitment challenges could have been addressed through better project oversight. Respectively, to tackle the recruitment challenge, UNDP has various modalities in place, such as sourcing people from other country offices to provide initial support to projects. Another recommendation to tackle this challenge is the prioritization of project staff recruitment at the operationalization/ inception phase of the project. Alternatively, when the project is continuously facing "double-hatting", the project team could receive on-the-spot training that allows increasing capacities to take over the tasks or positions that remain vacant or the ones that were annulled/ canceled.

- To strengthen the risk management of interventions, especially in complex security contexts. This should represent a continuous exercise involving an adaptive management approach. The provisions of the UNDP Guidance Note "Managing Risks Across UNDP Programming and Operations" as well as other resources could help the project teams in better understating the importance of risk management.

- To prepare methodologies and guidance documentation for the monitoring practices at the project level to empower the project team to perform efficient M&E functions.

- To assign a gender and LNOB focal point in the project team that will assure the mainstreaming of the respective aspects in the project activities and documents.

- To improve the monitoring of the project reports' quality. This recommendation concerns the quarterly, annual, and final project reports that were provided by the COPS project. Good quality reports improve the evaluation of the project and provide useful insight into the project implementation. Unfortunately, in the case of the COPS project, the reports contained mostly repetitive information that was formulated in a rather abstract manner which made the extraction of information for conducting the final evaluation challenging.

- To collect data and report on the progress toward SDG achievement. The ProDoc indicated that the COPS project aimed to contribute to the achievement of SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions.

To summarize the *good practices*:

- One of the good practices of the project design was to provide a comprehensive framework of cooperation with various projects and international organizations in Afghanistan by also defining the type of relationship/ interaction that the COPS project should maintain. The respective approach replicated to other interventions, could facilitate swift cooperation and fruitful communication of projects with other initiatives. It also contributes to the achievement of the coherence criteria of interventions.

- The application of the iterative approach in the project design represented both an innovation and a solution to improve the quality of the intervention, by the means of emphasizing that "one size will not fit all". This approach helps increase the trust of local beneficiaries in the intervention and builds up the ownership on the side of the national counterparts.

- Speaking about the project implementation process, to mitigate the delays in project delivery, as well as to respond to the fluctuation of staff in the key positions of the MOAI, the COPS project team developed a coordination and debriefing plan that helped to easier present the details on the project implementation to the partners.

- Another good practice of the project implementation concerned the strong cooperation and regular exchanges with other international development partners. This helped the team to mitigate overlap of activities, exchange valuable information on the implementation of projects, as well as built networks of cooperation.

- In terms of the achieved results, the COPS project implementation has prioritized gender despite the obstacles that the project has faced and the limited gender guidance of the ProDoc. This represented an application of adaptive management to align the implementation of the project with the corporate values as the promotion of gender equality, human rights, and disability concerns are guiding principles for all United Nations entities.

1. OBJECT OF EVALUATION

In this chapter, the evaluator will analyze the development context of the COPS project, the expected results chain of the intervention, resources allocated for the implementation, key-stakeholders involved, as well as the implementation status of the project.

1.1. Country and development context

The Government of Afghanistan has assumed full responsibility for the safety and security of its citizens since 2014 when this responsibility transitioned from the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force to the Afghan National Security Forces. This made security, especially the government's ability to provide security-related services, a key factor in gaining the people's confidence in, and support of, the government. As the primary provider of internal security, the ability of the Afghanistan National Police to provide quality services was thus directly linked to people's support for the government.

The worsening security conditions have caused the militarization of police and this has led to less contact with communities, thereby further contributing to their ineffectiveness as a police force. The emphasis on military tactics has resulted in a police force that was not prepared to undertake basic police services nor to engage with the communities. This inability to serve the public has made it difficult for the police to be trusted, thereby limiting their ability to obtain vital information, and further preventing effectiveness in providing security and enforcing the rule of law.

The MOIA, as the main public entity responsible for policies in the field of public security and policing, has recognized in its Strategic Plan the challenges faced by the ANP in its relation to the community. It expressed the goal of transforming the ANP from a paramilitary force into a professional police institution that would be able to respond to the needs of the public far more appropriately and be capable of providing the rule of law to the people of Afghanistan.

To achieve this transformation, the MOIA has approached the LOTFA with the request to support a project that would tackle the issue of police-community relations and enhancement of ANP capacities, which further lead to the conceptualization of the COPS project.

1.2. Summary of the intervention

The project "Community-Oriented Policing Services" represented a multi-donor intervention supported under the LOTFA and implemented by UNDP that targeted security and community trust in the government and ANP. The COPS intervention hypothesized that insecurity harms Afghans' views toward their country's future and confidence in the government. This assumption was supported by the results of several surveys conducted in Afghanistan which indicated that resolving the safety and security challenges is central to people's confidence in the government. The surveys that were conducted to assess the trust and expectations of people from the government have indicated that people tend to trust non-governmental entities when reporting crimes more than government bodies.

The intervention was meant to be piloted first in the PHQ and PDs in Kabul. After the achievement of results at this level, further geographical replication was anticipated.

The *Outcome* of the COPS project was: "Stable conditions of safety and security (Law and Order) established across all provinces". Three main Outcome Indicators were referring to the baseline data presented in the project's Results Framework:

- *Percentage of people (male and female) expressing trust toward the ANP in Kabul*, by taking as reference the baseline data presented by the Asia Foundation where 38% of respondents expressed "relations between police and public are very well", where the final project target was to achieve at least 5% annual increase of positive perception in the areas of intervention. The means of verification toward the achievement of this Outcome Indicator was the organization of the Community and Police Perception Survey.

- *Percentage of people (male and female) expressing positive perceptions of the safety and security in their respective police districts (in selected key engagement/ intervention areas)*, by taking as reference the baseline data presented in the UNDP's (LOTFA) Community and

police perception survey, where the final target was to achieve an increase by at least 10% security and safety perception in key intervention areas that shall be measured by the means of Community and police perception survey.

- *Percentage of surveyed PD personnel reporting satisfaction with the support services received by PHQ*, by indicating that the baseline data will be determined by August 2019 following ANP satisfaction survey completion, where the final target was indicated as at least a 25% increase of satisfaction in year two in the target PDs, which was expected to be verified by the means of the ANP satisfaction survey completion and Rapid Pro reports from police personnel at PD.

All three Outcome Indicators have set Kabul as a geographical area. The same geographic area was set for the output indicators which are further presented.

Output 1. The capacity of the Police Provincial Headquarters to lead and sustain reform improved comprised 3 results indicators:

1. *Availability of comprehensive individual and institutional capacity assessment at PHQs* (including institutional planning capacity needs assessment at PHQ and the capacities to deal with PeM issues). The baseline data was not indicated, as it was expected to be decided after an organizational review of the PHQs planned for July – August 2019. As the final target was set the completion of the comprehensive individual and institutional capacity assessments and data information on capacity development plans. As a means of verification was expected to serve the Organizational/ Functional Review.

2. *The extent to which PHQ Plans are aligned with the needs and priorities of PDs* (with the following options: fully aligned, partially aligned, not aligned). As mentioned above, the baseline data was expected to be identified following assessments of the plans and the PHQ organizational review. The final target was set that PHQ plans shall be aligned with the needs and priorities of PDs. The verification means indicated the elaboration of the Organizational/ Functional Review, assessments of existing plans, monitoring of implementation, and racking systems.

3. *The number of functions at PHQ and PDs optimized and adjusted to improve coordination between the respective two institutions*. The baseline indicated equal to zero functions identified for optimization. The target was expected to be determined per PD and PHQ. The verification was anticipated to be conducted based on the Organizational/ Functional Review.

Output 2. Improved police response to community needs and priorities comprised 8 results indicators:

1. *The number of assessments and research studies related to community-oriented police services conducted*. The baseline data was anticipated to be filled based on the community and police perception survey for Kabul while the final targets were expected to include assessments and recommendations reflected in PHQ planning. The means of verification indicated final reports and publications.

2. *The percentage of surveyed community members who participate in PeM councils that are satisfied with the PeM Councils*. The baseline data was not indicated while the final targets were set to the indicators of percentage of community satisfaction growth by 10% increase of satisfaction in the first year, 15% in the second year, and 20% by the third year. The means of verification included the organization of the Community and Police Perception Survey.

3. *The percentage of surveyed community members who participate in PeM councils and express trust toward PeM councils* (disaggregated by age, gender, businesses, disabilities, other vulnerable groups, PD). The baseline was not indicated while the final targets were set to indicate the percentage of community satisfaction increase by 10% in the first year, 15% in the second year, and 20% in the third year.

4. *The percentage of women attending and represented at the PeM (by target PD)*. The baseline data for women's attendance was not available due to the lack of data while the representation was set as a target of a 30% increase. The final targets for both attendance and representation were set to a 30% increase while the verification means included the data of the official statistics from the PeM meetings and verification exercise, population satisfaction survey with PeM as

a regular source of information, especially after the project launch.

5. *The percentage of security concerns voiced by the population addressed and solved* (per PD and gender disaggregated). The baseline data was expected to be determined after the organization of the initial PeM Council meetings while as final targets were set at least 20% of concerns were solved in the first year, 30% in the second year, and 40% in the third year of the project implementation. The verification means included the comparison of minutes of community consultation meetings with the PD Security Plans and the Community and Police Perception Survey.

6. *The level of implementation of a specific communication and behavioral change campaign/ training program targeting ANP staff* (completely, partially, not implemented). The baseline data indicated that the campaign was not implemented while the final target was set as the implementation of the behavioral change campaign/ training program targeting ANP. The verification means indicated the organization of a regular monitoring system and the organization of communication campaign activities.

7. *The level of effectiveness of communication products/ campaign elements.* The baseline data indicated that the campaign was not implemented. The final target was set as moderately effective to very effective (KPIs to measure communication effectiveness to be established) while the verification means were set to a regular monitoring system of communication campaign activities to be established later after the project launch.

8. *The percentage of ANP officers trained and enabled to integrate the PeM concept into the work of PDs.* This indicator was added in the second year of the project implementation.

Output 3. Standard PDs constructed/ rehabilitated to support community-oriented policing outlined 3 results indicators:

1. *The number of pilot PDs rehabilitated following assessments and in critical infrastructure areas* (to improve the security of police of women, men, and public visiting PD). The baseline data indicated that 19 Kabul city PDs stations were assessed, and the infrastructure gaps were identified while the final targets were set that 6 PDs shall be rehabilitated in Kabul in the first year of implementation, and 19 PDs rehabilitated in Kabul in the second year. The means of verification were established based on the infrastructure survey reports as well as the monitoring of the rehabilitation process, UNDP reporting, and agreements with the MOIA and the PHQs. Additionally, it included the post-implementation monitoring system and verification of investment plans for PD rehabilitation.

2. *The number of PDs with minimum security measures reaching 100%* (an index derived as a result of the infrastructure survey) with the following parameters: electronic access control system, steel gates, boom barriers, sentry posts, security control room, anti-blast windows, physical barriers, perimeter lights, and watch tower). The baseline data indicated that none of the 19 Kabul city PDs stations met the minimum security measures. The final target was set to be determined upon the finalization of the infrastructure survey results. The verification means indicated the data included the Annual PD Infrastructure Assessments.

3. *The percentage of surveyed police PD personnel satisfied with the infrastructure in target PD police stations*, *the percentage of surveyed public satisfied with the infrastructure in target PD police stations* (disaggregated on sexes male and female), and *the percentage of surveyed public reporting that their PD police station is accessible* (disaggregated on sexes m/f). The baseline data was expected to be decided later. The target indicators were set to at least a 50% increase of the baseline value while the verification means were the Annual Community and Police Perception Survey.

Output 4. Administrative services are improved at PDs levels to support police services outlined 4 results indicators:

1. *The availability of Administrative Capacity Framework for PDs Parameters* (asset management, reporting to PHQ, logistics, and supply chain management). The baseline data was not available while the final targets were set to the administrative capacity framework for PDs developed by PHQ. The verification means included the results of the institutional and

individual capacity assessment and the ANP satisfaction survey results that were expected to inform the selection of the administrative services.

2. *The availability of improved SOPs for key administrative functions at PDs*. The baseline data indicated that SOPs require review and development while the final targets included the review and improvement of the SOPs for key administrative functions at PDs. The verification means were expected to be performed based on the Results of the Functional Analysis of PDs.

3. *The degree to which the core administrative functions in pilot PDs are improved* by (a) the percentage of personnel (at PHQ and PD) satisfied with the optimized key functions and (b) time reduced (in %) in the key administrative processes. The baseline data was set to 0% while the final targets were set to increase by 50% the satisfaction level. The means of verification was set to be determined based on the post-satisfaction survey of the MOIA – PHQ – PD and the follow-up functional review of the optimized functions.

4. *The availability of functional inventory management systems at PDs*. The baseline data indicated that there is no proposed inventory management system while the final target was set that the inventory management system is functional at selected PDs. The verification means were expected to be determined after the implementation of the task-based survey mobile app.

1.3. Implementation approach of the intervention

The project was set to be realized in a phased approach over the course of 4 years by following *2 directions*:

(a) *Community-oriented policing is being used to transform community-police relations.* This was the centerpiece of the project and it aimed to apply the four essential elements of Community Policing which are reflected in the Manual on Community-Oriented Policing in UN Peace Operations: (1) Consultations with communities; (2) Responding to communities; (3) Mobilizing communities; (4) Solving recurring problems. When implementing the respective provisions, the project committed to focusing on the inclusion of women, youth, and marginalized groups.

(b) *Establishing an enabling environment* through infrastructure and administrative capacity-building to ensure the ANP has the means to implement Community-oriented policing, by providing capacity-building to the District Police Stations in Kabul, maximizing national ownership by increasing the leadership capacity of the Kabul PHQ.

The *national ownership* of the project results was anticipated to be secured through closely engaging the Kabul PHQ in taking the lead in planning, monitoring, and rolling out the project across all police districts in Kabul.

The project **strategy** focused on building upon the high-level commitments of the Government, and notably of the MOIA, to pursue the country's demilitarization of police services and improving the overall communities' trust in ANP. The barriers to good community-police governance for the national security in Afghanistan were fundamental issues of demonstrating the viability of the government and overall capacity to realize legitimate power. Through improved planning and decisions consistent with the principles reflected in the Manual on Community-Oriented Policing in UN Peace Operations the overall public trust in the government to assure security could increasingly grow and built-up social cohesion in Afghanistan.

The **phased approach** of the project implementation anticipated the support of 19 District Police Stations in Kabul. A further extension to Herat and Mazar was also one of the options for increasing the project's intervention area in the second year of implementation. The realization of the phased approach was planned to be conducted in the following sequencing:

- In the first phase of the project implementation – approximately 20 months – the project was anticipating supporting 6 PDs in Kabul.
- In the second phase of the project, another 6 PDs were expecting to receive support.
- The final third phase of the project was planned to cover the remaining 7 PDs.

At the same time, the phased approach was meant to serve both as a prerequisite and motivation

for the MOIA to enhance sustainability, project absorption, and compliance with the declared commitments on police reform.

The ***Theory of Change*** of the COPS project was built on the idea that strengthening community-police relations shall lead to an effective and responsive ANP capable of protecting and serving the public.

The Theory of Change of the COPS project was developed on the following logic:

- If the ANP is provided with support to improve their capacity to engage and serve their community (through the establishment of engagement mechanisms and the means to serve the community by having adequate personnel, infrastructure, training, and equipment)

- Then the ANP will be more capable and confident to professionally serve the communities they are resolving issues that are relevant to the community

- All of these should result in increased safety and stability within communities and increased acceptance and trust of the ANP as an integral part of the community and as the primary provider of safety and security

- This will turn into contributing to creasing public trust in the government and security institutions improving stability for the country.

The ProDoc emphasized the fact that the Theory of Change design has taken into consideration the challenging and constantly changing security environment within Afghanistan, which has made it difficult to introduce changes to make the ANP into a professional police force focusing on law and order. It stressed that the Theory of Change reflected the need to focus on a bottom-up and people-centered approach while being part of a comprehensive package of projects supporting the MOIA and ANP to better serve the people of Afghanistan.

1.4. Roles of the national counterparts

The ProDoc regulated that the project's key counterpart was the MOIA with the relevant agencies responsible to implement parts of the COPS project. Respectively, good coordination among the respective actors was crucial for the success of the project.

The main project stakeholders (including the MOIA, subordinated agencies, and development partners) identified in the ProDoc at the inception phase to be actively involved in the implementation are presented in the table below.

Table 1. *COPS project stakeholders and roles*

Stakeholder	Stakeholder role as regulated in the Project Document
MOIA	The main institutional counterpart of the COPS project responsible for the coordination and supervision of the implementation process
Deputy Minister for Security	Provision of strong leadership over provincial and district-level activities
PeM Directorate	Project partner
Kabul Provincial Police Headquarters	Project partner, ownership in relation to community-oriented policing's administrative functions
Deputy Minister for Support	Project partner
Provincial Coordination Directorate under the Deputy Minister for Policy and Strategy	Project partner
Kabul Police Chief	Provision of regular engagement with the project
Deputy Civilian Police Chief	Leading the community-oriented policing's administrative functions

Stakeholder	Stakeholder role as regulated in the Project Document
ANP officers (selected number of personnel based on the project team recommendation)	Serving as advisors and technical experts while community-oriented policing is implemented and further extended to other regions

The MOIA as the national implementing partner of the COPS project agreed to take full programmatic, financial responsibility and accountability for the effective use of UNDP resources and delivery of the project outputs, by assuming:

- Programmatic responsibilities that involved setting policy direction, reviewing, developing, and approving strategies, policies, work processes, concept notes, terms of reference, and meeting agendas.

- Financial responsibility and accountability by agreeing that UNDP would provide funding only after the successful conclusion of the standardized capacity development assessment (through the HACT modality).

However, the ProDoc indicated that the assessment of the MOIA capacities concluded that the institution was not able to meet the standards to undertake financial services.

2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the evaluation objectives and scope, by elaborating on the limitations in the application of some evaluation methods. It presents the criteria, performance standards, and other measures that were used in the context of the evaluation, by also taking into consideration the available information that was possible to collect during the assignment.

2.1. Evaluation purpose and objectives

The evaluation purpose was defined by the provisions of the Terms of Reference, by indicating the following:

- *Purpose of accountability,* by exploring why certain aspects of the COPS project have or have not been implemented as planned, by looking at the project design and prospects for successful replication of the project.

- *Purpose of learning*, by exploring the lessons learned in the evaluation and supporting a better understanding of future interventions.

The assignment defined 14 specific objectives for the COPS project evaluation which are further detailed in *Annex 2* of the present report. In sum, the evaluation objectives were formulated to assess the coordination among international partners and COPS project, activities toward the provision of capacity-building to MOIA staff to assume the Community Policing Initiatives, training provided to female MOIA personnel, implementation of the CPSS findings, supporting the Kabul PDs activities, assessing the project design and quality and timeliness of the inputs, efficiency, relevance, effectiveness, management arrangements, identification of advantages, bottlenecks and lessons learned, as well as provide recommendations.

2.2. Methodology overview

In line with the UNDP evaluation policies and procedures, the COPS project was required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon its premature completion. This report concerns the terminal evaluation of the project to assess the results achieved from its commencement on the 1st of January 2020 to the finalization on the 4th of December 2021.

The methodology has been structured around the OECD/ DAC revised evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the intervention. All these criteria are in full alignment with the provisions of the UNDP standards, notably with the provisions of the revised UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. The reflection of the respective Guidelines in the present report ensures affiliation with the new UNDP Evaluation Policy and the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework.

Additionally, as prescribed by the OECD/ DAC guidelines and the UNDP requirements, the evaluation of the COPS project was performed by a qualified external expert, by seeking to analyze the complex issues and capture the intended and unintended effects of the COPS's development intervention in Afghanistan.

The evaluation is referring to the UNDP Quality Standards for Programming which defined the following criteria: strategic, relevant, principled, management and monitoring, efficient, effective, sustainability, and national ownership. In this sense, an adapted scorecard has been applied to evaluate of the COPS project.

The report synthesizes lessons learned from the project design and implementation process to help guide future UNDP interventions in Afghanistan or other locations that face similar challenges, notably, lack of trust between communities and police. The application of the revised OECD/DAC criteria has allowed a better assessment of the report's alignment to the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports by including the critical indicators for a high-quality evaluation report. Additionally, the evaluation has employed the UNDP Quality Standards for Programming as a complementary list of criteria for the assessment of the COPS project.

The report is also based on the performance assessment approach guided by the principles of results-based management. The evaluation tracks the impact per the project's Results Framework. The contribution of project outputs and project management is evaluated concerning

the achievement of the project outcomes and overall objective. It reviewed the implementation experience and achievement of the project results against the Project Document, including any changes made during implementation, by looking at the overall application of the adaptive management as part of the COPS project.

2.3.   Data available for conducting the evaluation

The inception phase of the evaluation has started by addressing the evaluation objectives' information needs. Respectively:

- *To evaluate the status of coordination among international partners such as the Community Policing for Afghanistan CPA project funded by the German and UN-Habitat policing program,* the evaluator requested:
    - CPA project contact persons' details (e-mails and phone numbers).
    - Contact details of any other relevant partners involved in Afghanistan on similar policing programs.
    - Any relevant documentation on the coordination process among international partners.

- *To evaluate the status of the training and capacity building of MOIA staff to fully assume responsibilities of the Community Policing Initiatives,* the evaluator requested:
    - MOIA contact persons' details (e-mails and phone numbers) responsible for the Community Policing Initiatives.

- *To evaluate the UNDP COPS intervention to the capacity-building demand of MOIA staff, Kabul PHQ, and PDs staff,* the evaluator requested:
    - MOIA staff, Kabul PHQ, and PDs staff contact persons' details (e-mails and phones).

- *To evaluate the status of training for female MOIA personnel to perform policing functions,* the evaluator requested:
    - MOIA contact persons' details (e-mails and phones) responsible for the training.
    - List of participants at the training.
    - Agenda of the training.
    - Other relevant documentation on the training organization.

- *To assess the status of recommendations of CPSS findings* the evaluator requested the following information:
    - Presenting the CPSS recommendations.
    - Contact persons' details of the Kabul PD responsible for the incorporation of the CPSS recommendations.

- *To evaluate the support for the Kabul Police District activities implemented by local implementing partners* was requested information on:
    - Contact persons' details of the relevant Kabul PD representatives.
    - Contact persons' details of the local implementing partners.

- *To assess the project design in terms of its relevance to the overall development situation at the national level, relevance to national strategies, and relevance to beneficiaries* the evaluator requested:
    - English translation of the following documents: Afghan National Peace and Development Framework 2017-2021; Afghanistan National Priority Program; Afghan Ministry of Interior Strategic Plan (2018-2021), UNDP Country Program Document.

- *To assess the quality and timeliness of inputs, the reporting, and monitoring system, and the extent to which these have been effective* the evaluator requested:
    - Information on the implementation of the Monitoring Plan.
    - Contact details of the persons responsible for collecting monitoring information and further conducting the monitoring of the project.

- *To assess the cost-efficiency of the project interventions, the relevance, and effectiveness of the project's strategy, approaches for the achievement of the project objectives,*

performance of the project in terms of timeliness of producing the expected outputs, the project's management arrangements, achievement of the project results as well as seeking to identify recommendations to key project stakeholders for future projects/ program development, the evaluator requested:

- Contact details of the MOIA staff dealing with the monitoring of the project's activities.

Due to the context of the COPS project's premature closure and the consequences following the regime change in Afghanistan, most of the requested information was not available. Equally, the organization of the interviews with the project beneficiaries was not possible.

At the inception phase of the assignment, the evaluator received the following documents on the COPS project:

- COPS Project Document
- Human Resource Plan 2021 (version revised April 2021)
- Annual Working Plan for January – December 2021 (version revised in April 2021)
- Procurement Plan for January – December 2021 (version revised in April 2021)
- Organigram COPS dated from 17th August 2021
- COPS 2020 First Quarterly Project Progress Report (January – March 2020)
- COPS 2020 Quarterly Project Progress Report (April – June 2020)
- COPS 2020 Quarterly Project Progress Report (July – September 2020)
- COPS 2020 Annual Project Progress Report
- COPS 2021 Quarterly Project Progress Report (January – March 2021)
- COPS 2021 Second quarter Progress Report (April – June 2021)
- COPS 2021 Third Quarter Progress Report (1st of July – 15th of August 2021)

After the submission of the draft evaluation report, the following list of documents was made available:

- COPS Final Report (draft version)
- Design and Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report
- COPS Output and Activity Description
- Human Resource Plan 2021
- Organigram COPS dated from 19th February 2020
- Annual Working Plan for January – December 2020
- Summarized COPS Project Budget
- Revised Annual Working Plan for January – December 2020
- COPS Revised HP Plan 2020
- COPS revised Procurement Plan 2020
- Meeting minutes of the LOTFA Steering Committee from 11th December 2019

Additionally, after the submission of the draft evaluation report, one of the former COPS's national project coordinators was delegated for a semi-structured interview and 3 representatives of the UNDP Country Office in Afghanistan were available for a focus-group discussion.

2.4. Overview of the methodological approach

The overall design of the present evaluation has been built on the explicit provisions of the Results Framework and the Theory of Change of the COPS project. This approach aligns with the requirements put forward in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines revised in 2021.

The report was prepared in full correspondence with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016). The norms include internationally agreed principles, goals and targets, utility, credibility, independence, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, and professionalism. The present evaluation follows the principles outlined in the 2019 Evaluation Policy which stem from the General Assembly resolutions and the UNDP Executive Board's decisions.

In this sense, the present evaluation was realized in alignment with the directions put forward in the IC with the Ref. No. 2022/009 and the Terms of Reference for the COPS project evaluation being conducted in the following phases:

- Desk review.
- Preparation of the evaluation design and methods.
- Preparation of the detailed Inception Report.
- Application of the evaluation methodology.
- Analysis of the collected data.
- Presentation of the preliminary findings and validation of the draft evaluation report.
- Submission of the Final Evaluation Report.

The evaluation report was drafted in alignment with the following regulatory framework for conducting external evaluations:

- UNDP, 2021, Evaluation Guidelines.
- UNDP, 2019, Revised UNDP Evaluation Policy.
- UNDP, 2020, Social and Environmental Standards.
- UNDP, 2018, Disability Inclusive Development in UNDP. Guidance Note.
- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), 2020, Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.
- UNEG, 2018, Guidance on Evaluating Institutional Gender Mainstreaming.
- UNEG, 2016, Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- UNEG, 2014, UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equity in Evaluations.
- United Nations, 2018, System-Wide Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator. Technical Guidance.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Network on Development Evaluation, Better Criteria for Better Evaluation, 2019, Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use.
- UNDP, 2018, Updated UNDP programme and operations policies and procedures (POPP) for project and programme management (PPM).
- United Nations, 2019, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework.
- UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports (UNEG/G (2010)/2).

2.5. Overview of tools and methods

The evaluation has employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. The evaluation design has been put forward to follow a participatory and consultative approach that sought to ensure close engagement with the monitoring personnel, project management, implementing partners, and male and female direct beneficiaries. An overview of the methodological tools is reflected in the table below.

The evaluation was designed to be conducted in a participatory and consultative manner by seeking to ensure close engagement with key counterparts. In this sense, the pool of methods for fulfilling the assignment comprised the following:

- *Structured document review*: the respective method examined the project documentation and reports compiled through the implementation of the intervention.

- *Structured and semi-structured interviews:* this method was meant to be employed with selected stakeholders to explore the questions put forward in the ToR, by applying questions in a conversational format, around the evaluation criteria.

- *Direct observation during the meetings:* this method was meant to be commissioned as a complementary source of extracting information, including documentary evidence, interviews, and observations compiled, summarized, and organized according to the questions asked in the evaluation.

- *Focus group:* organization of structured discussions on the project topics with various groups comprising multiple respondents with the purpose to examine and refine individual and collective perspectives and experiences on the COPS project.

Table 2. *Overview of the methodological tools and available information for conducting the evaluation*

Methodological tools	(Yes/No)	Comments
Document review		
COPS ProDoc	Yes	The information was provided before the kick-off meeting
Annual workplans	Yes	
Theory of change and results framework	Yes	
Consolidated quarterly and annual reports	Yes	
Project quality assurance report	Yes	The reports were made available after the submission of the draft evaluation report
Final project report	Yes	
Activity designs	No	The information was not available
Results-oriented monitoring report	No	
Highlights of project board meetings	No	
Technical/financial monitoring reports	No	
Interviews and meetings (by the means of semi-structured interviews, and focus group discussions)		
Meetings with: - Key stakeholders of the COPS project (men and women) - MOIA and other government counterparts (men and women) - Donor community - CSO representatives (men and women)	No	Meeting the COPS project stakeholders and beneficiaries was not possible due to the regime change in Afghanistan.
- UNDP Country Office	Yes	Interviews conducted after the submission of the draft evaluation report.
- COPS project team	Yes	
Surveys and questionnaires	No	Conducting questionnaires and surveys of male and female stakeholders of the COPS project was not possible due to the regime change in Afghanistan.
Field visit	No	
Data review and analysis	Yes	Review of alternative sources and methods to ensure maximum validity, and reliability of data.
Gender and human rights lens	Yes	All the evaluation products have addressed gender, disability, and human rights dimension.

2.6. Addressing gender equality, disability, vulnerability, and social inclusion in the evaluation methodology

Since the promotion of gender equality, human rights and disability concerns are guiding principles for all United Nations entities, these interrelated issues are incorporated in the respective evaluation as well. This is a requirement that is expressly reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. The gender-responsive approach represents a requirement in the UNEG "Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations", even for project evaluations that were not gender-responsive in their design.

As prescribed in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, all evaluations commissioned by UNDP must

integrate human rights and gender equality, by aiming to meet the requirements of the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women Evaluation Performance Indicators.

In the context of the present report, the aspects of gender, disability, vulnerability, and social inclusion were specifically evaluated and reflected in a separate chapter. The gender profile of the interview respondents from the total of 4 people engaged, included 3 males and 1 female. The validation of the report was conducted by 2 representatives of the UNDP Afghanistan, involving 1 male, and 1 female.

3. FINDINGS

This chapter addresses the evaluation criteria and evaluation objectives put forward in the Terms of Reference of the evaluation assignment, by looking at the COPS project design and implementation process. The findings are based on evidence derived from the data collection and analysis of the methods described in the methodology section of the report.

3.1. Assessing the project evaluability

The very context and circumstances of the COPS project evaluation make it relevant to first explore the extent of its evaluability. The checklist that is being put forward by the revised UNDP Evaluation Guidelines is further applied to assess the evaluability of the project.

The assessment is conducted with the purpose to measure the decision to conduct a project evaluation even though the project has ceased implementation prematurely by reaching approximately 42% of the expected total duration. It also contributes to putting forward recommendations for conducting evaluations in similar situations.

Table 3. *Evaluability checklist*

	Assessment questions*	(Y) Yes	(N) No
1.	Does the subject of the evaluation have a clearly defined theory of change? Is there a common understanding as to what initiatives will be subject to evaluation?	Y	
2.	Is there a well-defined results framework for the initiative that is subject to evaluation? Are goals, outcome statements, outputs, inputs, and activities clearly defined?	Y	
3.	Is there sufficient data for evaluation? This may include baseline data, data collected from monitoring against a set of targets, well-documented progress reports, field visit reports, reviews, and previous evaluations.		N
4.	Is the planned evaluation still relevant, given the evolving context? Are the purpose and scope of the evaluation clearly defined and commonly shared among stakeholders? What evaluation questions are of interest to whom? Are these questions realistic, given the project design and likely data availability and resources available for the evaluation?		N
5.	Will political, social, and economic factors allow for effective implementation and use of the evaluation as envisaged?		N
6.	Are there sufficient resources (human and financial) allocated to the evaluation?	Y	
*The checklist is presented based on the evaluator's assessment in accordance with the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines			

The UNDP Evaluation Guidelines prescribe that if the answers to one or more of the questions included in the checklist under no. 1 to 3 are 'no', the evaluation can still go ahead. Respectively, despite the complex situation for conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the COPS project and the limited information, the COPS project qualifies for a final project evaluation.

3.2. Analysis of the project design

Project design and formulation

The project design and formulation were screened through the provisions of the UNDP POPP on the development of project documents and quality standards. Respectively, the results of the analysis indicated the following findings:

- In general terms, the ProDoc fulfills the requirements for the project design regulated by the POPP on project development.

- The project describes comprehensively the partnerships with other development partners. It assigned the roles as well as the prioritization of building the partnerships for the project implementation.

- The Project Document identified the beneficiaries and indicated how their engagement should take place. It also outlined the layers of coordination and prioritized their engagement in the project implementation.

- The scaling-up and sustainability aspects of the intervention were included in the project design by also indicating how the responsibility for overseeing and monitoring will gradually be led by the PHQ.

- The Multi-year Work Plan was structured following the overall UNDP requirements.

- The Monitoring Plan was in line with the UNDP's programming policing and procedures. The monitoring activities, purposes, frequency, and expected results were clearly defined and structured.

However, the analysis has also outlined several limitations:

- In the description of the project strategy, the project should have explained how the intervention is aligned with the UNDSCF/ CPD outcome. The COPS project strategy design was mostly focused on the intervention's approach with limited analytical coverage of the strategic frameworks of UNDP.

- In the description of the expected results, there was no nexus to the higher-level results (provisions of the strategic frameworks of MOIA and UNSDCF) nor the analysis of these policies.

- The presentation of the project partnerships should have indicated a clear linkage with the project's Theory of Change, by outlining what assumptions and expected results achieved by partners were critical for the fulfillment of the COPS project results. In the case of the COPS project, there was a broad description of the assigned roles.

To improve the project design, especially in the context of future interventions, it is *recommended*:

- To annex to the ProDoc the Partner Capacity Assessment Tool and HACT Micro Assessment when the project employs the HACT modality. In the case of the COPS project, this was particularly relevant as the ProDoc indicated that the assessment of the MOIA capacities concluded that the institution was not able to meet the standards to undertake financial services, it was particularly relevant to annex.

Lessons from other projects incorporated into project design

The COPS project built upon the previous UNDP and international partners' knowledge and experience in the field of community policing in Afghanistan.

The COPS project has learned from the earlier LOTFA engagement during the community policing initiative in Phase VI (2011-2014) which supported the development of a Community Policing Model. From the respective intervention, the COPS project has learned that further assistance to strengthen the capacities of police forces is needed by providing financial and operational support to the establishment of the Community Policing Secretariat in the MOIA.

From Phase 1 of the Police Development Project (2015-2016) and Phase 2 (2017-2018), the COPS project learned that overemphasis at the MOIA level and provision of equipment support without a clear understanding of the intended results at the community level is not yielding the expected results.

From the GIZ interventions to the community policing in Afghanistan, especially in the northern region, the project has learned that strong national ownership was a key element for the success of the GIZ's intervention. Some of the successful approaches to assure such ownership included close involvement of MOIA in all steps of the project implementation, which also helped to

guarantee the sustainability of the approach. It also learned about the engagement with local NGOs which were more accepted by the communities than the national NGOs.

The COPS ProDoc summarized that the UNDP's previous experience with the PeM Councils has formed the following conclusions that shall be further replicated in the COPS project:

(1) Community Policing and the PeM councils are relevant

This finding was based on the MPD Project that established that further support to the ANP shall continue to facilitate public participation, notably as part of the PeM Community, Police Partnership Committees, and CSOs.

(2) Iterative approach

The iterative approach toward the implementation of the COPS project was built on the knowledge of previous UNDP experience in Afghanistan indicating wide diversity of the public which shall be implicated and taken into consideration when establishing the goals and targets of the project. Respectively, local solutions should be encouraged to assuring local sustainability. The main learning of this approach was that "one size will not fit all".

(3) Comprehensive support

The COPS project has learned from the previous LOTFA interventions on community policing that focusing only on establishing PeM Directorate under the MOIA in Kabul as well as the PeM Department at the PHQ had only limited impact on service delivery at the community level.

From the analysis of the project progress reports and the interview with the project team representative, it was learned that the COPS project has followed in general terms the lessons that were reflected in the ProDoc. Notably, the key-intervention instrument for strengthening community trust in ANP was further reflected in supporting the PeM councils and CSOs (by introducing the small grants' funding mechanism for engaging CSO through micro-projects on community security identified through the police districts' PeM Councils).

The COPS project design and implementation combined the "soft" and the "hard" components that were put forward in the lessons learned from other projects. It included a wide variety of activities targeting the capacity-building of the ANP and MOIA as well as the activities that aimed to improve the police infrastructure and equipment provision.

Speaking about the iterative approach in the context of the COPS project, it was realized through the introduction of gradual steps for the implementation of the outputs based on preliminary assessments, surveys as well as comprehensive consultations with the MOIA. It is important to outline that the iterative approach is a relatively new presence in the frame of project management which required balancing the UNDP's corporate and country's needs. This approach implies that at the corporate level, requirements must be kept to the minimum level necessary to integrate information and present results.

Analysis of the Results Framework formulation

The Results Framework formulation fulfilled most of the UNDP requirements by presenting the intended outcome and its indicators, baseline values, targets, and means of verification. These criteria are indispensable for the formulation of Results Frameworks in the UNDP projects, as the organization seeks to meet the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standards.

Another requirement of IATI is to make sure that indicators presented in the Results Framework are S.M.A.R.T (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound), provide accurate baselines, targets underpinned by reliable evidence and data, and avoid acronyms so that external audience clearly understand the results of the project.

Respectively, the analysis of the Outcome Indicators against these requirements indicated that all 3 indicators fit the S.M.A.R.T criteria with some limitations:

- Even though the project anticipated further extension outside Kabul in other districts, the geographic focus of all Outcome Indicators was only on Kabul.

- The baseline for the third Outcome Indicator was not identified by being prescribed that it will

be decided by August 2019 following ANP satisfaction survey completion (while the respective data was never introduced in an updated version of the Results Framework).

- The final targets for the Outcome Indicators were also facing inexactitudes. It was indicated that these targets will be decided after the pilot period based on 500 interviews in the intervention area (while the respective data was not reflected in the Results Framework).

- The second and third Outcome Indicator prescribed a percentual increase in beneficiaries' perception, respectively by a 10% increase in satisfaction among the people in the intervention areas on security and safety perception, and at least by 25% increase in satisfaction of PD personnel with the support services received by the PHQ in the second year of project implementation. Respectively, the final targets were identified rather ambiguous and without a clear methodological explanation that would support such a percentage increase in the intervention area (by keeping also in mind that the overall context may vary for each of the districts which also could impact the achievement of the indicators).

The analysis of the COPS's output indicators against the IATI standards indicated that the same limitations were further transposed in this context, notably:

- Kabul was indicated as the sole geographic area.

- Baseline data on most of the indicators specified "TBD" and has not been further presented in other documents of the project that would indicate updates to the Results Framework.

- Final targets were indicating an increase in the percentage of trust and satisfaction with limited explanation and clarity on how methodologically the respective benchmarks were established (i.e., indicators 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.3), while other indicators were not aligning with the S.M.A.R.T. criteria (i.e., Indicator 1.1,1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.6, 2.7, 3.2, 4.2).

The analysis of the project reports (quarterly, annual, and final draft) has indicated that the Results Framework was not updated on the missing data, and the respective limitations were not ultimately addressed.

Additionally, another shortcoming of the Results Framework formulation represented the fact that most of the results indicators (i.e., especially the ones under Output 2 – 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and Output 3 – 3.3) were bound to public opinion polls, which could challenge the objective assessment of indicators fulfillment as no other methods of verification were included.

To conclude, the formulation of the Results Framework was compliant with the template requirement of UNDP, however, the IATI standards were only partially met. The most problematic areas concerned the formulation of indicators based on the S.M.A.R.T. criteria and the provision of accurate targets supported by reliable evidence and data.

Analysis of assumptions and risks

The Risk Log that was annexed to the ProDoc identified 4 risks all of which were updated on the 30th of September 2018. These were:

1. *Little or no political will by the government officials in developing community policing.* This risk is marked with the grading of Likelihood[1] – 2 and Impact[2]– 5.

The main countermeasures to address this risk were identified as:

- Regular Board meeting to discuss/confirm support for community policing reform.
- Dialogue with MOIA, ANP, and community.
- Mid-Term Review (2020) to assess the situation.

2. *Strong political leadership to limit any pushback and resentment arising from those in the MOIA and non-target areas seeking support from the project in their areas.* This risk was marked with the grading of Likelihood – 2 and the Impact – 5.

---

[1] The risk probability is graded based on a 1-5 scale (1 = Not likely; 5 = Expected)
[2] The risk impact is graded based on 1-5 scale (1 = Negligible; 5 = Extreme)

The main countermeasures to address this risk were identified as:

- Constate update to MOIA leadership on project progress to re-establish support and reassure of project impact.
- Communication campaigns to promote project activities within communities.
- Regular meetings and workshops to engage leadership in project implementation.

3. *Limited access to MOIA, ANP, and Community facilities by the UNDP Project implementation team members*. This risk was also marked with the grading of Likelihood – 2 and the Impact – 5.

The proposed countermeasures to address this risk comprised:

- Engage civil society organizations and ANP personnel as capacity development and project executors.
- Regular security reviews and undertaking additional security measures.

4. Limited participation of communities, particularly women and other underrepresented groups in project activities. This risk was marked with the Likelihood of 3 and the Impact of 3.

The mitigation measures put forward included:

- Establish gender and diversity goals with project partners on Project Board for all project activities.
- Empower women to participate in community policing activities.
- Specify targets for gender and underrepresented groups to participate in project training activities.
- Collaborate with gender equality advocates in and out of government.
- Community outreach activities involving women and underrepresented groups participating in the project.
- Working with credible partners/ interlocutors who have legitimacy and access in target communities, where UNDP may not otherwise have access.

The Risk Log maintained in the First Quarterly Report of 2020 all four risks indicated in the ProDoc, as well as the countermeasures (with only one exception, the fourth risk' countermeasure was removed "Working with credible partners/ interlocutors who have legitimacy and access in target communities, where UNDP may not otherwise have access."

At the same time, the analysis of the First Quarterly Report of 2020 on the section that described the risks has indicated opposing information. Notably, it described 3 new risks that were not reflected in the Risk Log:

a) The report indicated frequent changes in the MOIA leadership. It specified that the newly elected president has not appointed the cabinet and the MOIA leadership may impact the implementation of activities because of divergent perceptions of the project priorities. However, UNDP has been closely working with Kabul PHQ and MOIA to keep the activities running smoothly.

- Secondly, the report described that the breakout of COVID-19 in Afghanistan in late March delayed the implementation of project activities. Due to the pandemic, the authorities have imposed a lockdown across the country. Given the magnitude of the pandemic, the MOIA has been focusing its attention and resources on addressing COVID-19, specifically within the police force, instead of prioritizing the project implementation.

b) Thirdly, the report indicated that UNDP has also limited the numbers of international staff in the country, while the national staff was telecommuting. The restrictions have disrupted the organization of the infrastructure assessments and impeded the ability to hold meetings with MOIA and ANP on the implementation of the project.

Respectively, even though the Risk Log has been updated in the timeframe of drafting the First Quarterly Report of 2020, it did not include the new (actual) risks that the project was facing in the implementation process.

The same tendency was observed in the upcoming reports of the COPS project. As follows:

- The second Quarterly Report for 2020, described the COVID-19 outbreak as posing significant risks to the project. However, the Risk Log was not updated, by maintaining the same risks and countermeasures as indicated above.

- The third Quarterly Report for 2020, described COVID-19 and delays in staff recruitment as posing significant risks to the project implementation. However, as indicated, no updates to the Risk Log were introduced.

- The Annual Report for 2020 did not contain any risk analysis, by only annexing the Risk Log that reflected the limitations presented above.

- The first quarterly report for 2021, described administrative risks and the procurement process as risks to the project, and it annexed the Risk Log from the previous year.

- The second Quarterly Report for 2021 indicated management of expectations, procurement delays, movement restrictions, and COVID-19 as project risks. The Risk Log was adjusted on the chapters referring to the countermeasures while maintaining the same risks as in the previous reports.

- The third Quarterly Report for 2021 included the same/ identical information on the risk description and in the Risk Log as the one presented in the Second Quarterly Report for 2021.

The analysis of these reports indicated that there was no connection between the narrative part of describing the risks and the information in the Risk Log annexed to the reports. The countermeasures were also not updated and were maintained the same in the quarterly reports, even though the project was facing challenges due to risks in the implementation process.

Additionally, speaking about the project implementation and the challenges that the project has faced, the representatives of the UNDP Afghanistan affiliated with the COPS project implementation have mentioned that following an unfortunate staff security incident, UNDP put in place stricter security rules which limited the mobility of the project team and interaction with the project partners. This was also not reflected in the Risk Log, nor suitable mitigation measures were identified.

3.3.   Evaluation of the implementation process

Project Finance

The actual expenditure and the leverage of co-financing have been difficult to assess due to the limited information available for analysis. However, by accumulating the data from the available material, the expenses per output are presented in the table below.

Table 4. *Expenses by Output (1st of January 2020 – 31st of December 2021)*

Output & Description	Total Cumulative Expenses (in USD)
Output 1: Capacity of Police Provincial Headquarters to lead and sustain reform improved	354,052.97
Sub-total Output 1	**354,052.97**
Output 2: Improved police response to community needs and priorities	1,003,657.60
Sub-total Output 2	**1,003,657.60**
Output 3: Standard PDs constructed/ rehabilitated to support community-oriented policing	254,450.16
Sub-total Output 3	**254,450.16**
Output 4: Administrative services are improved at PD levels to support police services	221,269.62
Sub-total Output 4	**221,269.62**

Grand Total	1,833,430.35

The analysis of the total cumulative expenses in comparison with the total budget of the COPS project indicated a low delivery rate. During the implementation timeframe, the project has absorbed approximately 12% of the total committed budget.

Monitoring and evaluation

The monitoring framework that was put in place for the project was reflected in the ProDoc in Annex 4. The overall design and formulation of the Monitoring Plan of the COPS project were in line with the UNDP's programming policing and procedures. The monitoring activities, purposes, frequency, and expected results were clearly defined and structured.

The main role for performing the monitoring and evaluation was attributed to LOTFA with the following main responsibilities:

- Development and application of relevant M&E activities including overall frameworks, tools, data collection, and analysis.
- Providing real-time data back to project implementers on the project implementation.
- Working with the COPS team to provide support in critical design, planning, and piloting activities, notably to provide (1) police and community perception surveys in Kabul; (2) provincial and district police station mapping; (3) infrastructure and capacity assessments of the COPS project.

However, the evaluator could not verify the application of the Monitoring Plan as additional documents were not available. The draft of the COPS Final Project Report that was submitted for review did not reflect the results of the monitoring activities.

Overall results (attainment of objectives)

The assessment of progress was based on data provided in the quarterly progress reports for 2020, the annual report for 2020, and the quarterly progress reports for 2021 as well as the final draft report.

Table 5. *Analysis of the Results Framework achievement*

Indicators	Final targets	Means of verification	Status
Project Outcome: Stable conditions of safety and security (Law and Order) established across all provinces.			
% of people (m/f) expressing trust toward the ANP in Kabul	At least 5% annually in the areas of intervention	Community and police perception survey (annual)	Due to the premature closure of the project, the final targets of the Outcome Indicators were not achieved.
% of people (m/f) expressing positive perceptions on the safety and security in their respective police districts in Kabul	By at least 10% security and safety perception in key intervention areas have been increased	Community and police perception survey (annual)	
% of surveyed PD personnel reporting satisfaction with the support services received by the PHQ in Kabul	At least 25% if Y2 in the target PDs	ANP satisfaction survey completion Rapid Pro reports from police personnel	

Indicators	Final targets	Means of verification	Status
		at PD	
Output 1: The capacity of the Police Provincial Headquarters to lead and sustain reform improved.			
1.1. Availability of comprehensive individual and institutional Capacity Assessments at PHQs in Kabul	Comprehensive individual and institutional Capacity Assessments completed, and data inform Capacity Development Plans	Organizational/ Functional Review	Some activities for the achievement of the indicator were completed. The final target was not achieved.
1.2. Extent to which PHQ Plans are aligned with the needs and priorities of PDs a) Fully aligned b) Partially aligned c) Not aligned Following plans are meant in this indicator: Budget planning and formulation (including for PDs) PeM implementation plan Staffing and change management plans Infrastructure improvement plan Procurement of Equipment, PPE, and maintenance plans	PHQ Plans are aligned with the needs and priorities of PDs	Organizational/ Functional Review Assessment of existing plans; monitoring of implementation and racking systems	Some activities for the achievement of the indicator were completed (i.e., preparation of the terms of reference). The final target was not achieved.
1.3. # of functions at PHQ and PDs optimized and adjusted to improve coordination between the two	Target TBD per PD and PHQ	Organizational/ Functional Review	Some activities for the achievement of the indicator were completed (i.e., in total 12 functions were identified for the needs analysis and assessment). The final target was not achieved.
Output 2: Improved police response to community needs and priorities			

Indicators	Final targets	Means of verification	Status
2.1. Number of assessments and research studies related to community-oriented police services conducted	Assessments are completed and recommendations are reflected in PHQ planning	Final Reports/ Publications	Some activities for the achievement of the indicator were completed (i.e., Community Police Perception Survey completed for Kabul which covered 19 PDs and a total number of 7000 respondents, around 20% respondents were police officers). The final target was not achieved.
2.2. % of surveyed community members who participate in PeM councils that are satisfied with the PeM Councils	% of community with satisfaction increases: By 10% in Y1 By 15 % in Y2 By 20 % in Y3	Community and Police perception survey	Little progress for achieving the target. The final target was not achieved.
2.3. % of surveyed community members who participate in PeM councils and express trust toward PeM councils (disaggregated by age, gender, businesses, disabilities, other vulnerable groups, PD)	% of community members who express trust increases By 10% in Y1 By 15 % in Y2 By 20 % in Y3	Community and Police perception survey	Some activities for the achievement of the indicator were completed (i.e., organization of community consultations in 6 PDs of Kabul where a total of total 1900 Kabul citizens participated). The final target was not achieved.
2.4. % of women (a) attending, (b) represented at the PeM (by target PD)	(a) at least 30% (b) at least 30%	Official statistics from PeM meetings and verification exercise Population satisfaction survey with PeM	Some activities for the achievement of the indicator were completed (i.e., the level of women attending the Shura meeting increased to 35% based on the Community and Police Consultation Sessions organized in the PDs 4, 5, 6, 7 8 & 12). The final target was not achieved.

Indicators	Final targets	Means of verification	Status
2.5. % of security concerns voiced by population addressed and solved (per PD and gender disaggregated)	At least 20% of concerns are solved in Y1 and 30% in Y2 40% in Y3	Comparison of the minutes of community consultation meetings with the PD Security Plans	Some activities for the achievement of the indicator were completed (i.e., assessment of the level of public's satisfaction of police and behavior and response to community's needs increased by to 5%, based on the Community and Police Consultation Sessions). The final target was not achieved.
2.6. Level of implementation of a specific communication and behavioral change campaign/ training program targeting ANP staff (completely; partially; not implemented)	Behavioral change campaign/ training program targeting ANP implemented	A regular monitoring system of communication campaign activities will be established	Some activities for the achievement of the indicators were completed (i.e., preparation of TORs for the SBCC 1 and SBCC 2 prepared, reviewed and approved; work has started on the implementation of the SBCC; training for ANP started by involving 48 officials in 19 PDs). The final targets were not achieved.
2.7. Level of effectiveness of communication products/ campaign elements	Moderately effective to very effective (KPIs to measure communication effectiveness to be established)	Regular monitoring system of communication campaign activities will be established	
2.8. # of ANP officers trained and enabled to integrate PeM concept into the work of PDs (Newly added in 2021)			Some activities for the achievement of the indicators were completed (i.e., training for the ANP started). The final target was not achieved.
Output 3: Standard PDs constructed/ rehabilitated to support community-oriented policing			

Indicators	Final targets	Means of verification	Status
3.1. Number of pilot PDs rehabilitated following assessments and in critical infrastructure areas (to improve the security of policewomen and men and the general public visiting PD, +FRU)	6 PDs rehabilitated in Kabul in Y1 19PDs Rehabilitated in Kabul in Y 2	An infrastructure survey report as well as monitoring of the rehabilitation process. UNDP reporting; Agreements with MOIA and PHQs Post implementation; Monitoring system in place; Verification of investment plans on PD rehabilitation	Some activities for the achievement of the indicators were completed (i.e., the project conducted the assessments, the bills of quantity were completed with reaching to final stage for contracting the construction company, most of the preparatory activities for procurement had almost been completed including the launch of the Invitation to Bid, the project received bids under evaluation stage). The final target was not achieved.
3.2. Number of PDs with minimum security measures reaching 100% (an index derived from the infrastructure survey)	TBD upon finalization of infrastructure survey results	Annual PD infrastructure assessments/ verification	The activity was planned for the Q4 of 2021, when the project ceased the implementation. The final target was not achieved.
3.3. (a) % of surveyed police PD personnel satisfied with the infrastructure in target PD police stations (b) % of surveyed general public satisfied with the infrastructure in target PD police stations (m/f) (c) % of surveyed general public reporting that their PD police station is accessible (m/f)	At least 50% At least 50% At least 50%	Annual community and police perception survey	Little progress for achieving the indicator. The final target was not achieved.
Output 4: Administrative services are improved at PD levels to support police services			

Indicators	Final targets	Means of verification	Status
4.1. Availability of Administrative Capacity Framework for PDs Parameters - Reporting to PHQ - Logistics and supply chain management	Administrative Capacity Framework for PDs developed by PHQ	Results of Institutional and individual capacity assessment ANP satisfaction survey results will inform the selection of admin services	
4.2. Availability of improved SOPs for key administrative functions at PDs	SOPs for key administrative functions at PDs reviewed and improved	Results of Functional Analysis of PDs	All the activities under this output were planned in the 2nd half of 2021. The final targets were not achieved.
4.3. Degree to which the core administrative functions in pilot PDs are improved (a) Proxy: % of personnel (at PHQ and PD) satisfied with the optimized key functions (b) Time reduced (in %) in the key administrative processes	Proxy: satisfaction level increased by 50% Proxy: TBD upon functional review	Post satisfaction survey on MOIA – PHQ – PD and the follow-up functional review on optimized functions	
4.4. Availability of functional inventory management systems at PDs	Inventory management system is functional at selected PDs	Task-based survey – mobile app	

Respectively, the COPS project has started to implement measures for the achievement of the Output Indicators, however, due to the challenges that the project has faced as well as the premature closure, the final targets were not fulfilled.

Assessment of interaction with other stakeholders and beneficiaries

Speaking about the assessment of interaction with the key stakeholders, including the project beneficiaries, the COPS project reports provided a rather limited perspective on the respective topic.

Respectively, the analysis of the COPS project's quarterly, annual, and final report (draft) yielded the following findings:

- First and Second Quarterly Project Progress Reports for the year 2020 (covering January – March 2020 and April – June 2020) on the partnership section were containing nearly the same text, meaning that the COPS project in the reporting period, assisted MOIA and PeM Directorate to establish an inclusive coordination mechanism by setting up the COPS working group with representation from all national and international stakeholders. The Working group

had the task to oversee the implementation of the project and the development of strategies and activities to enhance the safety and security of the citizens of Afghanistan.

- In the first quarter, the report indicated that the project was dynamically coordinating activities with all national and international partners working in the rule of law area (RS, CSTC-A, GPPT UN-HABITAT, etc.). At the same time, the MOIA PeM Directorate, PMO, and COPS project were developing a joint implementation plan to ensure ownership, effectiveness, and timely implementation of the project. While for the Second Quarterly Report, was only indicated that the project was dynamically coordinating activities with all national and international partners working in police reform and rule of law sector, without providing more insights.

- Third Project Quarterly Project Progress Report for the year 2020 (covering July – September 2020), repeatedly indicated the same information from the First and Second Quarterly Project Progress Reports for the year 2020.

- The COPS 2020 Annual Project Progress Report copied again the same text as in the Third Project Quarterly Project Progress Report for the year 2020, only by adding that the team has built partnerships with UN-HABITAT, GIZ's largest Community Policing Project for Afghanistan CPA, and NATO advisory team by undertaking monthly coordination meetings.

- First Quarterly Project Progress Report for the year 2021 (covering January – March 2021), broadly indicated that in this reporting period, the team had several coordination meetings with the international partners who were involved in supporting the Community Policing Initiatives in Afghanistan, by involving GIZ's largest Community Policing Project, UN-HABITAT technical assistance to community policing and the EU funded project that supported the Family Response Units.

- Second and Third Project Quarterly Project Progress Reports for the year 2021 (covering April – June 2021 and July – August 2021) contained the same text.

- COPS Final Project Report (draft) although it introduced a section on the quality of the partnerships, it has not reflected the overall interaction and the character of the engagement with the partners. In the respective section, there were reflected aspects that were not related to this matter such as movement restrictions, COVID-19 implications, community consultations in 19 PDs of Kabul, training of ANP in Social and Behavior Change Communication SBCC, conducting Kabul PDs assessments and PHQ assessments and implementation of outreach activities through the third parties.

At the same time, the answers to the semi-structured interview with the COPS project representative have yielded the following findings which are further presented in the table below.

Table 6. *Assessing interaction with other stakeholders*

Relevant actors/ intervention	Assigned role in the ProDoc	Findings
NATO, Resolute Support (RS) Mission and Central Security Transition Command-Afghanistan, described as key partners of MOIA and ANP	The ProDoc indicated that COPS shall cooperate with the respective actors through MOIA Support Team Forum via regular meetings	- COPS conducted technical working meetings with this team. - The interaction was frequent, almost on a weekly basis.
UN-HABITAT	Close work due to its extensive experience in PeM in Kabul	- COPS team met the UN-HABITAT frequently. - COPS project team members working on the implementation of the Output 2 have stayed in close touch with this team.

Relevant actors/ intervention	Assigned role in the ProDoc	Findings
GIZ	To assure close work and uniformity of PeM approaches and exchange of lessons learned	- COPS team met the GIZ team frequently. - The main interaction was focused on the implementation of Output 2.
German Policing Project Team	Closely working with the mission due to the leading role in support of the ANP's training and education	- The meetings were organized on average once per month. - The interaction was mostly on the organization of the training for ANP. - The cooperation was mostly focused on the implementation of Output 1 and 4.
EU Police Team	Working closely on gender and police reform	- The COPS project team representatives met the EU Police Team several times. - The cooperation was focused on the gender aspects mainly.
Afghan CSOs	Running the small grants' funding mechanism for engaging CSO through micro-projects on community security identified through the police districts PEM Councils	- The cooperation with the Afghan CSOs was organized through the cooperation of the NGO consortium comprising approximately 8-9 organization, mostly located outside Kabul. - The consortium's thematic work was focused on community policing, gender, and safe shelters for women. - The small grants mechanism was not implemented by the COPS project since the MOIA did not agree on the respective component. The focus of MOIA was to have spending focused on infrastructure interventions rather than on supporting the CSO.

In conclusion to this section, the project team has built partnerships with the main stakeholders that were identified in the ProDoc. However, the reports compiled by the project team on the analysis of partnership provided limited information and insights. The quarterly progress reports should have provided more comprehensive information on the established partnerships and overall interaction with other stakeholders. The Final Project Report should have provided an overall assessment of the quality of partnership through the implementation timeframe of the project.

Assessment of the project's adherence to the Quality Standards

The adherence of the project to the UNDP Quality Standards for Programming was performed based on the checklist presented in Table 7. The evidence of criteria fulfillment was assessed based on the project's progress reports as well as from the interviews.

Table 7. *Assessment checklist of project's adherence to the Quality Standards for Programming and Projects*

Overall rating scale		
Highly Satisfactory ◎◎◎	**Satisfactory** ◎◎○	**Inadequate** ◎○○
More than 80% of the answers are rated with "3", no answers rated with "1"	More than 50% of the answers are rated with "2"	More than 50% of the answers are rated with "1"
Rating criteria (by presenting the option that best reflects the COPS project)		

Strategic

1. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan? • **3:** The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the UNDP Strategic Plan and adapts at least one UNDP Signature Solution. The project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. • **2:** The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan[4]. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. • **1:** The project responds to a partner's identified need, but this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.	3 **2** 1

Relevant

2. Do the project target groups leave furthest behind? • **3:** The target groups are clearly specified, prioritizing discriminated and marginalized groups left the furthest behind, identified through a rigorous process based on evidence. • **2:** The target groups are clearly specified, prioritizing groups left furthest behind. • **1:** The target groups are not clearly specified.	3 **2** 1
3. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design? • **3:** Knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from sources such as evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and/or monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to justify the approach used by the project. • **2:** The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources but have not been used to justify the approach selected. • **1:** There is little, or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references made are anecdotal and not backed by evidence.	3 **2** 1
4. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national/regional/global partners and other actors? • **3:** An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project, including identification of potential funding partners. It is clear how results achieved by partners will complement the project's intended results and a communication strategy is in place to communicate results and raise visibility vis-à-vis key partners. • **2:** Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labor between UNDP and partners	3 **2** 1

through the project, with unclear funding and communications strategies or plans.

1: No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work. There is a risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners' interventions in this area.

Principled

5. Does the project apply a human rights-based approach?	3 **2**
	1

- **3:** The project is guided by human rights and incorporates the principles of accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination in the project's strategy. The project upholds the relevant international and national laws and standards. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget.
- **2:** The project is guided by human rights by prioritizing accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget.
- **1:** No evidence that the project is guided by human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.

6. Does the project use gender analysis in the project design?	3 **2**
	1

- **3:** A participatory gender analysis has been conducted and results from this gender analysis inform the development challenge, strategy and expected results sections of the project document. Outputs and indicators of the results framework include explicit references to gender equality, and specific indicators measure and monitor results to ensure women are fully benefitting from the project.
- **2:** A basic gender analysis has been carried out and results from this analysis are scattered (i.e., fragmented and not consistent) across the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework may include some gender sensitive outputs and/or activities but gender inequalities are not consistently integrated across each output.
- **1:** The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project's development situation on gender relations, women, and men, but the gender inequalities have not been clearly identified and reflected in the project document.

7. Did the project support the resilience and sustainability of societies and/or ecosystems?	3 **2**
	1

- **3:** Credible evidence that the project addresses sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges, which are integrated in the project strategy and design. The project reflects the interconnections between the social, economic, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget.
- **2:** The project design integrates sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, and relevant management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget.
- **1:** Sustainability and resilience dimensions and impacts were not adequately considered.

Management & Monitoring

	3	**2**
8. Does the project have a strong results framework?		
		1

- **3:** The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the key expected development changes, each with credible data sources and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate.
- **2:** The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate.
- **1:** The project's selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators.

	3	**2**
9. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including composition of the project board?		
		1

- **3:** The project's governance mechanism is fully defined. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document.
- **2:** The project's governance mechanism is defined; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The project document lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles.
- **1:** The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled later. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.

	3	**2**
10. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risk?		
		1

- **3:** Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project Risk Log, based on a comprehensive analysis drawing on the program's theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments, and other analyses such as funding potential and reputational risk. Risks have been identified through a consultative process with key internal and external stakeholders. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk, reflected in project budgeting and monitoring plans *(both must be true).*
- **2:** Project risks related to the achievement of results are identified in the initial project Risk Log based on a minimum level of analysis and consultation, with mitigation measures identified for each risk.
- **1:** Some risks may be identified in the initial project Risk Log, but no evidence of consultation or analysis, and no clear risk mitigation measures are identified. This option is also selected if risks are not identified and/or no initial Risk Log is included with the project document.

Efficient

	3	**2**
11. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?		
		1

- **3:** The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Realistic resource mobilization plans are in place to fill unfunded components. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications, and security have been incorporated. - **2:** The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget, but no funding plan is in place. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates. - **1:** The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget.	

12. Is the Country Office/Regional Hub/Global Project fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?	3 **2**
	1
- **3:** The budget fully covers all project costs that are attributable to the project, including program management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country program planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.) - **2:** The budget covers significant project costs that are attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant. - **1:** The budget does not adequately cover project costs that are attributable to the project, and UNDP is cross subsidizing the project.	

Effective

13. Have targeted groups been engaged in the design of the project?	3 2
	1
- 3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritizing discriminated and marginalized populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of target groups as stakeholders throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (e.g., representation on the project board, inclusion in samples for evaluations, etc.) - 2: Some evidence that key targeted groups have been consulted in the design of the project. - 1: No evidence of engagement with targeted groups during project design.	

14. Does the project plan for adaptation and course correction if regular monitoring activities, evaluation, and lesson learned demonstrate there are better approaches to achieve the intended results and/or circumstances change during implementation?	Yes 3
	No 1

Sustainability & National Ownership

15. Have national/regional/global partners led, or proactively engaged in, the	3 **2**
	1

design of the project? • **3:** National partners (or regional/global partners for regional and global projects) have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP. • **2:** The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national/regional/global partners. • **1:** The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners.		
16. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific/ comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted? • **3:** The project has a strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on a completed capacity assessment. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly. • **2:** A capacity assessment has been completed. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on the results of the capacity assessment. • **1:** Capacity assessments have not been carried out.	3 | **2** 1	
17. Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilization and communications strategy)?	Yes 3 **No** 1	

Respectively, the application of the checklist indicates that the COPS project assessment is "satisfactory", as more than 50% of the answers were graded with "2". This means that there is room for improvement on most of the criteria. However, it also shows that despite the challenges the project has faced, the intervention managed to ensure the UNDP quality standards. Further, in the last chapter, the evaluator will present the recommendations which derive from the findings deriving from this checklist.

3.4. Application of the OECD/DAC criteria

Relevance

The focus-group interview with the representatives of the UNDP Afghanistan that were associated with the implementation of the COPS project outlined unanimously the high relevance of the project. The main arguments were the following:

- The relevance of the intervention derived from the results of surveys that were conducted prior to the project implementation, which showed a high level of mistrust of the population in the police. The surveys indicated that the population perceived the police as a force affiliated with criminality.
- The project aimed to close the gap of trust between the community and the police, by improving its services to the population.
- The project strategy consisted in piloting the intervention approach in 19 PDs in Kabul by developing model police stations, where people could feel secure to walk inside and report the security challenges that they face.

The analysis of the relevant documentation supported the conclusion that the COPS project had a high degree of relevance for Afghanistan. Respectively, in addition to the results of the opinion polls, the project was also based on the provisions of sectoral public policies in Afghanistan that were outlining the importance of such intervention.

- The MOIA Strategic Plan for 2018-2021 highlighted the priorities for enhancing the police-community relationship. The areas affiliated with the COPS project intervention were reflected in the Plan's Strategic Goal no. 2: Provide Law Enforcement Through Detecting Crime and Countering Criminal Activity, and Strategic Goal no. 1: Strengthen Public Order and Ensure

Security. The Strategic Plan outlined the same approach as the COPS project has shough to implement, meaning the reforming of police, improvement of internal operational processes, and changing the behavior of police in the interaction with the communities.

- Afghan National Peace and Development Framework for 2017-2021, Section 2.3. Political and Security.
- National Priority Programs of Afghanistan: NPP 1 Afghan Peace and Reintegration and NPP5 Law and Justice for All.
- Afghanistan National Priority Program, Section 2.6. Urban governance and Institutions.
- UNDP Strategic Plan Outcome: Outcome 2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development.
- UNDP Country Program Document: Outcome 2. Trust in and access to fair, effective, and accountable rule of law services is increased by applicable international human rights standards and the Government's legal obligations.

Respectively, the COPS project relevance was high for Afghanistan as it clearly responded to the needs of beneficiaries. It was relevant both at the level of the governmental policies as it addressed a highly regarded topic – the trust in the Government of Afghanistan as well as for the public – increasing public security. Additionally, the project was intended for the achievement of SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions, which is particularly relevant for post-conflict societies.

Coherence

The assessment of the COPS project's compatibility with other interventions in Afghanistan has indicated that it has been well integrated with other partner projects and priorities of the Government. The analysis conducted as part of this report in the sub-chapter "Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design" concluded that the COPS project built upon the previous UNDP and international partners' knowledge and experience in the field of community policing in Afghanistan. It has been learned from the earlier LOTFA engagement as well as from the GIZ interventions to community policing in Afghanistan, especially in the northern region.

Additionally, the analysis presented in the sub-chapter "Assessment of interaction with other stakeholders and beneficiaries" concluded that the project has built and maintained partnerships with the main stakeholders that were identified in the ProDoc.

The examination of the project progress reports for 2020 indicated that the project supported MOIA and PeM Directorate to establish an inclusive coordination mechanism through the setting up of the COPS working group with representation from all national and international stakeholders. The working group had the role to oversee the implementation of the project and the development of strategies and activities to enhance the safety and security of the public. Such a platform, along with the cooperation and partnerships with UN-HABITAT, GIZ's Community Policing Project for Afghanistan, and NATO advisory team, served as a plausible mechanism for assuring the coherence of the intervention.

Finally, the coherence of the intervention was also assured through the project coordination mechanisms that were established. The LOTFA donors along with the MOIA leadership were organizing monthly technical meetings on the progress of the projects supporting security in Afghanistan. The interview with the UNDP Afghanistan representatives has confirmed that in terms of coherence and coordination with other interventions, the project was well established, by maintaining regular communication with the government actors, donors, and CSOs.

Effectiveness and efficiency

The effectiveness of the COPS project, as a criterion that explores the extent to which the intervention achieved its objectives and its results, has been limited. The achievement of intended results at the level of Project Outcome Indicators and Outputs Indicators was not performed. The analysis conducted in the previous section indicated that some progress took place toward achieving the Output Indicators, but none of the COPS project Output Indicators were ultimately achieved. The same applied to the achievement of the project's Outcome Indicators. Most of the factors that determined this situation were beyond the control of the COPS project (i.e., regime change, political instability, COVID-19 pandemic).

The interview with the UNDP Afghanistan representatives outlined that:

- Speaking about the value for money, the project was prepared as a result of an evidence-based decision, notably, the gap in the relations between the community and police. The funding that was approved for the project was well thought through.

- There was a high turnover of staff within the MOIA leadership, which impacted the timeliness of activities. Whereby the moment when some activities would be agreed on with the MOIA, the leadership would change again, and the process of coordination would start over from the beginning with significant changes to the project implementation approach. As an illustration, in 2020, the COPS project Steering Committee could not approve the AWP because the MOIA considered that some activities had to be changed. To overcome this situation, the project team had to go back and restart the coordination of the AWP with the MOIA.

- Another factor that negatively impacted the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation related to understaffing of the project. The project's initial HR Plan included a total of 24 staff members. The COPS project planned a P-4 International Project Manager and a P-5 Chief Technical Advisor. However, the leadership of the MOIA insisted that these two positions should be abolished, and the budget transferred to other project activities. This led to the situation where the project staff members had to do "double-hatting", meaning that they were performing several roles at once that were not initially plotted in the project design.

To conclude, the effectiveness and efficiency of the project were affected by a myriad of factors and contingencies that took place in the timeframe when the project was implemented. There were also intrinsic factors that could have improved the overall organization of the project, which were described in the previous chapters.

Impact

The project design aimed toward making an unprecedented advance in the provision of security services by the ANP to the public. This is especially true considering the starting point and the baseline data indicating low trends in the attitudes toward the government and police from the side of communities.

The positive trends of the project's impact were observed through the following:

- The project conducted the assessment of 13 PDs of Kabul city which identified the infrastructure requiring rehabilitation. It further extended to the assessment for the renovation of the Family Response Unit, female detention cells, and PeM meeting halls.

- The project team drafted the terms of reference for enhancement of police and community partnership and for supporting Kabul PDs to deliver improved community-oriented policing partnerships.

- The project conducted community consultations in six Kabul PDs to encourage a proactive community-policing approach and support police consultations at the grassroots level. The consultations were attended in total by approximately 1900 participants, while the data on participation rate was also disaggregated by gender (730 females and 1170 males).

Consequently, since the project has ceased prematurely, the possibilities to evaluate the impact are limited. However, the potential impact that the project could have had is significant. The intervention anticipated having a holistic approach by changing how the ANP worked and could have also impacted aspects related to human rights, gender equality, and inclusion.

Sustainability and National Ownership

The project's main approach to sustainability was to strengthen the institutional, legislative, and human capacities for continuing the reform of the ANP through the introduction of consultation mechanisms between the communities and the ANP.

The project intended to develop both the infrastructure and the capacities of people involved in increasing the police-community relationships, by reducing the risks of unrest and military conflict over the long term.

The project design was formulated expressly with the idea of increasing and empowering the national authorities to take over the initiatives of the project. It allocated a leading role to the representatives of the MOIA to manage the project, which aimed to increase their involvement. A comprehensive analysis of the assigned roles and responsibilities to the national counterparts is presented in the chapter "Roles of the national counterparts".

The interview with the UNDP Afghanistan representatives outlined that:

- The implementation of the COPS project used the national structures to enhance sustainability and national ownership of the project.
- It was very much bound to the institutional setting, where the leadership in the implementation was handled by the MOIA. As an example, the MOIA was at the forefront in the preparation of the AWP whereas the UNDP was allocated a facilitation role.

However, the change of regime in Afghanistan has completely jeopardized the prospects for sustainability of the COPS project. The institutional framework and governance model have changed which ultimately has reduced to zero the sustainability and ownership that was established as part of the COPS project.

3.5. Findings on gender, disability, vulnerability, and social inclusion

The analysis of the aspects related to gender, disability, vulnerability, and social inclusion focused on the evaluation of the project design and the implementation of the initiative.

The findings regarding the project design outlined the following:

- It is plausible that the Risk Log of the COPS project has identified out of the 4 risks, one related to "Limited participation of communities, particularly women and other underrepresented groups in project activities". There were 6 measures put forward to mitigate the respective risk. It was pertinent to include this risk in the Risk Log, as the environment of the project context was mostly "male-dominated" as emphasized by the interview respondents.

- The analysis of the Results Framework outlined that out of the 3 outcome indicators, 2 were gender sensitive (by indicating the percentage of males and females expressing (a) trust toward the ANP in Kabul and (b) positive perceptions of the safety and security in their respective PDs). However, the third outcome indicator did not include disaggregated data on sexes (by indicating the percentage of PD personnel reporting satisfaction with the support services received by PHQ). This indicator could have also been sensitive to gender, by indicating the percentage of males and females reporting satisfaction with the support services received by PHQ.

- None of the outcome targets presented in the Results Framework was gender sensitive as the indicators were not disaggregated on sexes, disability, and other vulnerable groups.

- At the output level, out of the total number of 17 output results indicators, there were only 3 indicators that were disaggregated on sexes. There was only 1 output result indicator specifically targeting women – "2.4. % of women (a) attending, (b) represented at the PeM (by target PD)", which is insufficient if taken into account that the COPS project was targeting communities.

- In the output final targets, only one target related to the output result indicator 2.4 presented above, which indicated an increase of 30% in women attending PeM meetings, and 30% in women represented at the PeM.

- The baseline data did not contain any data on gender, except on the output indicator 2.4. indicating 30% of women represented at the PeM and no data on the women attending the PeM meetings.

- The focus-group interview with the representatives of the UNDP Country Office in Afghanistan that were associated with the implementation of the COPS project indicated that the project design could have placed a bigger emphasis on gender mainstreaming. This was particularly relevant as the COPS project focused on direct interaction with communities.

The findings regarding the implementation of the project outlined the following:

- The focus-group interview highlighted that although the project design has not made the necessary focus on gender, the implementation of the project was focused on gender mainstreaming, and the inclusion of women, marginalized communities, and disadvantaged groups in the project activities.

- The analysis of the progress reports has confirmed that the project activities were involving women, marginalized communities, and disadvantaged groups. Moreover, the collection of data was disaggregated by sexes (the specific activities related to the training of women police are presented further in the report).

- Respectively, in the first year of the implementation, the project finalized the assessment of 13 PDs in Kabul city. The aim of the assessment was to identify infrastructure requiring rehabilitation. The assessment also covered the situation of the existing Family Response Units, female detention cells, and Police-e-Mardumi meeting halls.

- The project organized a two-day community consultation in Kabul PDs 4, 5, 6, 7 8 & 12 to develop a sense of duty and commitment to proactive community-oriented policing by undertaking community and police consultation sessions at the grassroots level in the identified PDs of Kabul. A total of 1,900 participants from the 6 PDs of Kabul attended the events. There were 730 female participants (approximately 38%) and 1170 male participants (approximately 62%) from Shura's. The community consultation collected key suggestions from the PeM Shura's led by the Community Policing Directorate of MOIA.

- The project organized a total of 6 consultations, under the title of "Strengthening Police and Community Partnership Consultations" in PDs 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 12 of Kabul city. The activity aimed at bringing police and community together by implementing the Social and Behavior Change Communication (SBCC) actions. A total of 568 community representatives, of whom 255 were female (approximately 45%), attended the six-day community consultation sessions.

- The project started consultations with the Community Policing Directorate to include one male and one female police officer under SBCC 1 planned in early April 2021 as well as involving the Family Response Units to jointly implement the MOIA broader outreach initiatives under SBCC 2 and Inclusive Community Outreach Initiative.

- Following the community consultations, the project identified gender-specific challenges and has put forward recommendations to overcome them. As an example, it has identified that there was an absence of dedicated female police officers whereas a recommendation was put forward to increase women's presence in the police stations and that the female police officers should conduct outreach initiatives in the girls' schools.

Respectively, the COPS project at the level of implementation has focused on involving marginalized communities, women, and disadvantaged groups. However, in the project design phase, the focus on this component was insufficient, especially by keeping in mind that the project anticipated implementation at the community level. The project design could increase the emphasis on tackling gender stereotypes among the ANP officers and at the level of communities and include more targets specifically designed to tackle this component.

3.6. Addressing the evaluation objectives

The assignment's ToR has put forward the list of evaluation objectives that the COPS Final Evaluation Report was expected to cover.

Objective 1. Evaluating the status of coordination among international partners such as the Community Policing for Afghanistan CPA project funded by German and UN-Habitat policing program
        The respective information was reflected in the previous sections.
Objective 2. Evaluating the status of the training and capacity building of MOIA staff to fully assume responsibilities of the Community Policing Initiatives
        There was not enough data provided to conduct the respective assessment.
Objective 3. UNDP COPS intervention to the capacity-building demand of MOIA staff, Kabul

PHQ, and PDs staff

COPS project provided several on-request trainings, focused on gender and human rights (information provided during the interview with the COPS project representative).

Objective 4. Status of training for female MOIA personnel to perform policing functions

The Second Quarterly Report for Quarter 2021 indicated that:

- Under output 1, the project organized a six-day training of trainers in resource management, reporting, and community policing for Kabul PHQ and Kabul (PDs personnel. The training was conducted based on the capacity needs assessment conducted by PDs education offices and Police Staff College senior instructors. A total of 22 participants (8 female officers and 14 male officers) benefited from the training. As a result of the one-week training program, the PDs personnel trained in integrating community policing (professional policing), managing available resources to build trust, providing weekly community consultation reports, and providing clear recommendations to Kabul PHQ for aligning resources for tackling crime and insurgency in their respective neighborhood.

- Under output 2, the project completed a one-week of classroom and on-the-job training in Social and Behavior Change Communication to MOIA-related directorates personnel in media and public relations, gender and human rights, religious and cultural affairs, family response units, and community policing. The training covered how to apply SBCC and the ways it can be utilized for proactive community policing and crime prevention. A total of 40 participants from the MOIA-related directorates attended the training (18 female ANP officers and 22 male ANP officers).

- Under output 2, the project implemented the Capacity Building Modular Training in 9 PDs of Kabul city. The training program focused on bringing police and community together to fight crime and insurgency in their neighborhoods. This was a cascading training where the MOIA trained 22 officers, and they provided on-the-job training to 270 commissioned, non-commissioned officers, and PDs personnel, 108 of whom were female police officers.

Objective 5. Assess the status of recommendations of CPSS findings

Based on the findings of the interview with the COPS project representative, it was mentioned that two projects were developed based on the results of the CPSS findings. COPS further recruited NGOs to implement the respective initiatives.

Objective 6. Supporting Kabul Police District activities implemented by local implementing partners

Based on the findings of the interview with the COPS project representative, it was mentioned that some of the Kabul PDs activities were implemented by NGOs supported by the COPS project.

Objective 7. Assess the project design in terms of its relevance to the overall development situation at the national level, relevance to national strategies, and relevance to beneficiaries.

The findings are reflected in the previous sections.

Objective 8. Assess the quality and timeliness of inputs, the reporting, and monitoring system, and the extent to which these have been effective

The findings are reflected in the previous sections.

Objective 9. Assess the cost-efficiency of the project interventions

The findings are reflected in the previous sections.

Objective 9. Assess the cost-efficiency of the project interventions

The findings are reflected in the previous sections.

Objective 10. Assess the relevance and effectiveness of the project's strategy and approaches for the achievement of the project objectives.

The findings are reflected in the previous sections.

Objective 11. Assess the performance of the project in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of producing the expected outputs.

The findings are reflected in the previous sections.

Objective 12. Assess the relevance of the project's management arrangements; identify advantages, bottlenecks and lessons learned concerning the management arrangements.

The findings are reflected in the previous sections.

Objective 13. Analyze underlying factors beyond UNDP control that affect the achievement of the project results.

The findings are reflected in the previous sections.

Objective 14. Provide recommendations to key project stakeholders for future projects/ program development.

Recommendations are provided in the next chapter.

4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND GOOD PRACTICES

4.1. Conclusions

Addressing the project evaluation purpose that was reflected in the ToR of the assignment: to explore why certain aspects of the COPS project have or have not been implemented as planned, by looking at the project design and prospects for successful replication of the intervention, the evaluator came to the following *conclusions*:

- The COPS project design fulfilled most of the requirements regulated by the UNDP POPP on project development. The project described comprehensively the partnerships with other development partners. It assigned the roles as well as the prioritization of building the partnerships for the COPS project implementation.

- The ProDoc identified the beneficiaries and indicated how their engagement should take place. It also outlined the layers of coordination and prioritized their engagement in the project implementation.

- The scaling-up and sustainability aspects of the intervention were included in the project design by indicating how the responsibility for overseeing and monitoring will gradually be transferred to the PHQ.

- The Multi-year work plan was structured following the UNDP requirements.

- The Monitoring Plan was in line with the UNDP's programming policing and procedures. The monitoring activities, purposes, frequency, and expected results were clearly defined and structured.

- The COPS project built upon the previous UNDP and international partners' knowledge and experience in the field of community policing in Afghanistan. The ProDoc expressly presented the lessons learned from other projects which were incorporated into the project design.

- The analysis of the Results Framework formulation indicated that from point of view of its structure, it fulfilled most of the UNDP requirements by presenting the intended outcome and its indicators, baseline values, targets, and means of verification. The analysis of the Outcome Indicators concluded that all three indicators fit the S.M.A.R.T criteria.

At the same time, the examination of the project design outlined several *limitations*:

- In the description of the project strategy, the project should have explained how the intervention was aligned with the UNDSCF/ CPD outcome. The COPS project strategy design was mostly focused on the intervention's approach with limited analytical coverage of the strategic frameworks of UNDP.

- In the description of the expected results, there was no nexus to the higher-level results (provisions of the strategic frameworks of MOIA and UNSDCF) nor the analysis of these policies.

- The presentation of the project partnerships should have indicated a clear linkage with the project's Theory of Change, by outlining what assumptions and expected results achieved by partners were critical for the fulfillment of the project results. In the case of the COPS project, there was only a broad description of the assigned roles.

- The analysis of the Results Framework formulation outlined some limitations in the formulation of the Outcome Indicators:

  • Even though the project anticipated further extension outside Kabul in other districts, the geographic focus of all Outcome Indicators was only on Kabul.

  • The baseline for the third Outcome Indicator was not identified by being prescribed that it will be decided by August 2019 following ANP satisfaction survey completion (while the respective data was not untimely reflected in an updated version of the Results Framework).

  • The final targets for the Outcome Indicators were also facing inexactitudes. It was

indicated that these targets will be decided after the pilot period based on 500 interviews in the intervention area (while the respective data was not untimely reflected in an updated version of the Results Framework).

- The second and third Outcome Indicator prescribed a percentual increase in beneficiaries' perception, respectively by a 10% increase in satisfaction among the people in the intervention areas on security and safety perception, and at least by 25% increase in satisfaction of PD personnel with the support services received by the PHQ in the second year of project implementation. Respectively, the final targets were identified rather ambiguous and without a clear methodological explanation that would support such a percentage increase in the intervention area (by keeping also in mind that the overall context may vary for each of the districts which also could impact the achievement of the indicators).

- The analysis of the COPS's output indicators against the IATI standards indicated that the same limitations were further transposed in this context, notably:

  o Kabul was indicated as the sole geographic area.
  o Baseline data on most of the indicators specified "TBD" and has not been further presented in other documents of the project that would indicate updates to the Results Framework.
  o Final targets were indicating an increase in the percentage of trust and satisfaction with limited explanation and clarity on how methodologically the respective benchmarks were established (i.e., indicators 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.3), while other indicators were not aligning with the SMART criteria (i.e., Indicator 1.1,1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.6, 2.7, 3.2, 4.2).

- The analysis of the project progress reports (quarterly, annual, and final draft) has indicated that the Results Framework was not updated on the missing data, and the respective limitations were not ultimately addressed.

- Another shortcoming of the Results Framework formulation represented the fact that most of the results indicators (i.e., especially the ones under Output 2 – 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and Output 3 – 3.3) were bound to public opinion polls, which could challenge the objective assessment of indicators fulfillment as no other methods of verification were included.

The examination of the implementation process outlined the following conclusions:

- The COPS project has followed the spirit of the lessons that were reflected in the ProDoc. Notably, the key-intervention instrument for strengthening community trust in ANP was further reflected in supporting the PeM councils and CSOs (by introducing the small grants' funding mechanism for engaging CSO through micro-projects on community security identified through the police districts' PeM Councils). In the context of the COPS project, the iterative approach was realized through the introduction of gradual steps for the implementation of the outputs based on preliminary assessments, surveys as well as comprehensive consultations with the MOIA. The COPS project has followed the lessons on the importance of providing comprehensive support, by introducing activities on capacity building, infrastructure assessment, and equipment provision. However, the CSO micro-project scheme was removed from the implementation plan at the insistence of the MOIA.

- The analysis of the total cumulative expenses in comparison with the total budget of the COPS project indicated a low delivery rate. During the implementation timeframe, the project has absorbed approximately 12% of the total committed budget.

- The analysis indicated that the COPS project has started to implement measures toward the achievement of the Output Indicators, however, due to the situation that the project has faced which led to premature closure, the final targets were not fulfilled.

- At the same time, the key results of the COPS project implementation comprised:

  - Under output 1, the project completed the Kabul PHQ assessment. The assessment reviewed the existing coordination, planning, mentoring, and implementation of

community policing initiatives at the district level at the Kabul PHQ. Following the assessment, a detailed reporting mechanism was developed for Kabul PDs to report challenges and recommendations undertaken by PDs at the district police and community consultation sessions.

- Under output 1, following the recommendation from the capacity assessment of the MOIA a four-day cascading training was organized for the PDs education offices and Police Staff College senior instructors. The direct training beneficiaries were the PHQ and PDs education officers.

- Under output 2, the project strengthened the Police and Community Partnership in 6 PDs of Kabul city.

- Under output 2, the project completed a total of 19 community and police consultation sessions. The activity brought the police and community together by implementing the Social and Behavior Change Communication actions.

- Under output 2, the project completed a two-week classroom and on-the-job training on Social and Behavior Change Communication to the MOIA-related from PDs in media and public relations, gender and human rights, religious and cultural affairs, family response units, and community policing. The first training covered the MOIA directorates while the second training targeted Kabul's 19 PDs.

- Under output 2, the project completed the second round of 60 bilateral interviews. The in-depth interviews were organized with experts, community members, and ANP male and female officers to ascertain the behaviors and situations that could lead to or prevent crimes.

- Under output 2, the project launched three docuseries about the police professional behavior, police information center, police impartiality, public confidence, police commitment, police conduct and behavior, police respect for human rights, police and the rule of law, police and fighting corruption and ethics. The video docuseries were displayed in 6 PDs, where ANP officers learned the gradual integration of community policing concepts into their duties in their respective communities.

- Under output 2, the project implemented the second round of Capacity Building Modular Training in 5 PDs in Kabul city. The training brought police and the community together to fight crime and insurgency in their neighborhoods. This was a cascading training where the MOIA trained 12 officers, and they provided on-the-job training to 270 commissioned and non-commissioned officers and PDs personnel.

The main *obstacles* that the project faced in the implementation process:

- From the beginning of the project implementation, following an unfortunate staff security incident, UNDP put in place stricter security rules which limited the mobility of the project team and interaction with the project partners.

- There was a high turnover of staff within the MOIA leadership, which impacted the timeliness of activities. Whereby the moment when some activities would be agreed on with the MOIA, the leadership would change again, and the process of coordination would start over from the beginning with significant changes to the project implementation approach.

- Another factor that negatively impacted the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation related to understaffing of the project. The project's initial HR Plan included a total of 24 staff members. The COPS project planned a P-4 International Project Manager and a P-5 Chief Technical Advisor. However, the leadership of the MOIA insisted that these two positions should be abolished, and the budget transferred to other project activities. This led to the situation where the project staff members had to do "double-hatting", meaning that they were performing several roles at once that were not initially plotted in the project design.

- The breakout of COVID-19 in Afghanistan in late March 2020 delayed the implementation of the project activities. Due to the pandemic, the authorities have imposed a lockdown across the country. Given the magnitude of the pandemic, the MOIA has been focusing its attention

and resources on addressing COVID-19, specifically within the police force, instead of prioritizing the project implementation.

- Due to the pandemic, UNDP has limited the numbers of international staff in the country, while the national staff was telecommuting. The restrictions have disrupted the organization of the infrastructure assessments and impeded the ability to hold meetings with MOIA and ANP on the implementation of the project.

Gender-specific conclusions

Project design:

- It is plausible that the Risk Log of the COPS project has identified out of the 4 risks, one related to "Limited participation of communities, particularly women and other underrepresented groups in project activities". There were 6 measures put forward to mitigate the respective risk. It was pertinent to include this risk in the Risk Log, as the environment of the project context was mostly "male-dominated" as emphasized by the interview respondents.

- The analysis of the Results Framework outlined that out of the 3 outcome indicators, 2 were gender sensitive (by indicating the percentage of males and females expressing (a) trust toward the ANP in Kabul and (b) positive perceptions of the safety and security in their respective police districts). However, the third outcome indicator did not include disaggregated data on sexes (by indicating the percentage of PD personnel reporting satisfaction with the support services received by PHQ). This indicator could have also been sensitive to gender, by indicating the percentage of males and females reporting satisfaction with the support services received by PHQ.

- None of the outcome targets presented in the Results Framework was gender sensitive as the indicators were not disaggregated on sexes, disability, and other vulnerable groups.

- At the output level, out of the total number of 17 output results indicators, there were only 3 indicators that were disaggregated on sexes. There was only 1 output result indicator specifically targeting women – "2.4. % of women (a) attending, (b) represented at the PeM (by target PD)", which is insufficient if taken into account that the COPS project was targeting communities.

- In the output final targets, only one target related to the output result indicator 2.4 presented above, which indicated an increase of 30% in women attending PeM meetings, and 30% in women represented at the PeM.

- The baseline data did not contain any data on gender, except on the output indicator 2.4. indicating 30% of women represented at the PeM and no data on the women attending the PeM meetings.

- The focus-group interview with the representatives of the UNDP Country Office in Afghanistan that were associated with the implementation of the COPS project indicated that the project design could have placed a bigger emphasis on gender mainstreaming. This was particularly relevant as the COPS project focused on direct interaction with communities.

Project implementation:

- The focus-group interview highlighted that although the project design has not made the necessary focus on gender, the implementation of the project was focused on gender mainstreaming, and the inclusion of women, marginalized communities, and disadvantaged groups in the project activities.

- The analysis of the progress reports has confirmed that the project activities were involving women, marginalized communities, and disadvantaged groups. Moreover, the collection of data was disaggregated by sexes (the specific activities related to the training of women police are presented further in the report).

- Respectively, in the first year of the implementation, the project finalized the assessment of 13 PDs in Kabul city. The aim of the assessment was to identify infrastructure requiring rehabilitation. The assessment also covered the situation of the existing Family Response

Units, female detention cells, and Police-e-Mardumi meeting halls.

- The project organized a two-day community consultation in Kabul PDs 4, 5, 6, 7 8 & 12 to develop a sense of duty and commitment to proactive community-oriented policing by undertaking community and police consultation sessions at the grassroots level in the identified PDs of Kabul. A total of 1,900 participants from the 6 PDs of Kabul attended the events. There were 730 female participants (approximately 38%) and 1170 male participants (approximately 62%) from Shura's. The community consultation collected key suggestions from the PeM Shura's led by the Community Policing Directorate of MOIA.

- The project organized a total of 6 consultations, under the title of "Strengthening Police and Community Partnership Consultations" in PDs 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 12 of Kabul city. The activity aimed at bringing police and community together by implementing the Social and Behavior Change Communication (SBCC) actions. A total of 568 community representatives, of whom 255 were female (approximately 45%), attended the six-day community consultation sessions.

- The project started consultations with the Community Policing Directorate to include one male and one female police officer under SBCC 1 planned in early April 2021 as well as involving the Family Response Units to jointly implement the MOIA broader outreach initiatives under SBCC 2 and Inclusive Community Outreach Initiative.

- Following the community consultations, the project identified gender-specific challenges and has put forward recommendations to overcome them. As an example, it has identified that there was an absence of dedicated female police officers whereas a recommendation was put forward to increase women's presence in the police stations and that the female police officers should conduct outreach initiatives in the girls' schools.

4.2. Recommendations

To improve the project design, especially in the context of future interventions, it is *recommended*:

- To annex to the ProDoc the Partner Capacity Assessment Tool and HACT Micro Assessment when the project employs the HACT modality. In the case of the COPS project, this was particularly relevant as the ProDoc indicated that the assessment of the MOIA capacities concluded that the institution was not able to meet the standards to undertake financial services.

- To improve the contingency planning during the project design. Conducting a comprehensive risk analysis could provide viable mitigation measures during the project implementation phase.

- To elaborate an exit strategy from the beginning of the intervention. The project design should reflect the vision of how the results will be secured and what follow-up actions are expected from the authorities following the project's finalization. This aspect could improve sustainability and national ownership.

To improve implementation, it is *recommended*:

- To enhance the planning and hands-on monitoring of the project implementation. Many of the staffing and recruitment challenges could have been addressed through better project oversight. Respectively, to tackle the recruitment challenge, UNDP has various modalities in place, such as sourcing people from other country offices to provide initial support to projects. Another recommendation to tackle this challenge is the prioritization of project staff recruitment at the operationalization/ inception phase of the project. Alternatively, when the project is continuously facing "double-hatting", the project team could receive on-the-spot training that allows increasing capacities to take over the tasks or positions that remain vacant or the ones that were annulled/ canceled.

- To strengthen the risk management of interventions, especially in complex security contexts. This should represent a continuous exercise involving an adaptive management approach. The provisions of the UNDP Guidance Note "Managing Risks Across UNDP Programming and Operations" as well as other resources could help the project teams in better understating the

importance of risk management.

- To prepare methodologies and guidance documentation for the monitoring practices at the project level to empower the project team to perform efficient M&E functions.

- To assign a gender and LNOB focal point in the project team that will assure the mainstreaming of the respective aspects in the project activities and documents.

- To improve the monitoring of the project reports' quality. This recommendation concerns the quarterly, annual, and final project reports that were provided by the COPS project. Good quality reports improve the evaluation of the project and provide useful insight into the project implementation. Unfortunately, in the case of the COPS project, the reports contained mostly repetitive information that was formulated in a rather abstract manner which made the extraction of information for conducting the final evaluation challenging.

- To collect data and report on the progress toward SDG achievement. The ProDoc indicated that the COPS project aimed to contribute to the achievement of SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions.

4.3. Good practices

- One of the good practices of the project design was to provide a comprehensive framework of cooperation with various projects and international organizations in Afghanistan by also defining the type of relationship/ interaction that the COPS project should maintain. The respective approach replicated to other interventions, could facilitate swift cooperation and fruitful communication of projects with other initiatives. It also contributes to the achievement of the coherence criteria of interventions.

- The application of the iterative approach in the project design represented both an innovation and a solution to improve the quality of the intervention, by the means of emphasizing that "one size will not fit all". This approach helps increase the trust of local beneficiaries in the intervention and builds up the ownership on the side of the national counterparts.

- Speaking about the project implementation process, to mitigate the delays in project delivery, as well as to respond to the fluctuation of staff in the key positions of the MOAI, the COPS project team developed a coordination and debriefing plan that helped to easier present the details on the project implementation to the partners.

- Another good practice of the project implementation concerned the strong cooperation and regular exchanges with other international development partners. This helped the team to mitigate overlap of activities, exchange valuable information on the implementation of projects, as well as built networks of cooperation.

- In terms of the achieved results, the COPS project implementation has prioritized gender despite the obstacles that the project has faced and the limited gender guidance of the ProDoc. This represented an application of adaptive management to align the implementation of the project with the corporate values as the promotion of gender equality, human rights, and disability concerns are guiding principles for all United Nations entities.

ANNEX 1. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Evaluators/Consultants

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well-founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners, and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact during the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate, and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings, and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System: Name of Consultant: **Andrei Iovu**
Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): **Individual Consultant**

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed in **Chisinau, the Republic of Moldova** on the **13th of April 2022**

ANNEX 2. Assignment's 14 specific objectives

- **Objective 1.** Evaluating the status of coordination among international partners such as the Community Policing for Afghanistan CPA project funded by German and UN-Habitat policing program.

- **Objective 2.** Evaluating the status of the training and capacity building of MOIA staff to fully assume responsibilities of the Community Policing Initiatives.

- **Objective 3.** UNDP COPS intervention to the capacity-building demand of MOIA staff, Kabul PHQ, and PDs staff.

- **Objective 4.** Status of training for female MOIA personnel to perform policing functions.

- **Objective 5.** Assess the status of recommendations of CPSS findings.

- **Objective 6.** Supporting Kabul Police District activities implemented by local implementing partners

- **Objective 7.** Assess the project design in terms of its relevance to the overall development situation at the national level, relevance to national strategies, and relevance to beneficiaries

- **Objective 8.** Assess the quality and timeliness of inputs, the reporting, and monitoring system, and the extent to which these have been effective

- **Objective 9.** Assess the cost-efficiency of the project interventions

- **Objective 10.** Assess the relevance and effectiveness of the project's strategy and approaches for the achievement of the project objectives.

- **Objective 11.** Assess the performance of the project in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of producing the expected outputs.

- **Objective 12.** Assess the relevance of the project's management arrangements; identify advantages, bottlenecks and lessons learned concerning the management arrangements.

- **Objective 13.** Analyze underlying factors beyond UNDP control that affect the achievement of the project results.

- **Objective 14.** Provide recommendations to key project stakeholders for future projects/ program development.

ANNEX 3. Evaluation criteria explanation

In 2019 OECD/DAC revised and further specified their evaluation criteria, published in "Better Criteria for Better Evaluations: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use", and added a new criterion, coherence. The revised approach of the above-mentioned benchmarks better reflects the LNOB, gender and takes the lens of the Agenda 2030, as follows:

1. **Relevance:** entails examining the extent to which the COPS project objectives and overall project design responded to beneficiaries' needs and priorities, as well as alignment with national, global, and partner/institutional policies and priorities. The evaluation of relevance includes the determination of whether the objectives of the COPS project were adequately defined, realistic, and feasible and whether the results are verifiable and aligned with current international standards for development interventions.

2. **Coherence:** represents the new criteria of the OECD/DAC methodology that examines the extent to which other donors' interventions (particularly policies) supported or undermined the intervention and vice versa. Coherence includes concepts of complementarity, harmonization, coordination, and the extent to which the intervention has added value while avoiding duplication. This is particularly important as in line with Agenda 2030, greater attention must be paid to coherence and the synergies between policy areas and interventions performed by different development actors.

3. **Effectiveness:** represents the standard that looks at the extent to which the intervention achieved its objectives and its results while considering the relative importance of the objectives in the context of the intervention. This is also the main criterion that helps to evaluate the success of the COPS project.

4. **Efficiency:** represents the criterion that indicates the extent to which the COPS project delivered the expected results in an economic and timely way. This is not including only the cost-effective aspects, but also the timely delivery.

5. **Impact**: represents the criterion that helps to explore the extent to which the intervention has generated significant positive or negative, intended, or unintended higher-level effects. Impact addresses the intervention's ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects – holistic and enduring changes in systems or norms. The impact criterion is exploring whether the intervention created the change that matters to beneficiaries.

6. **Sustainability:** indicates the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue. It encompasses several elements for analysis – financial, economic, social, and environmental and the respective interaction between them.

ANNEX 4. Pool of evaluation questions

The Terms of Reference indicated the list of questions that shall be addressed to the stakeholders in the process of conducting the evaluation. For purposes of improving the accuracy of gathering information as well as mainstreaming LNOB and gender, some of the questions that were indicated in the Terms of Reference were slightly adjusted, by maintaining the intended meaning of the inquiry. Additionally, the evaluator has added some questions specifically to elucidate the LNOB and gender dimensions of the intervention, by applying the gender lens to the evaluation criteria.

The questions to assess the **relevance** of the COPS formulated in the context of the assignment in the ToR were the following:

1. What is the value/relevance of the intervention regarding the national and international partners' policies and priorities?
2. How effective was COPS in garnering national ownership of the activities?
3. Where was the project not able to deliver on enhancing national ownership and why?
4. What were good practices for securing national ownership?
5. How much support did the Government provide to the COPS project's efforts to garner national ownership?

In addition to these questions, the evaluator has put forward the following questions that seek to elucidate the *gender* and *human rights* dimension of COPS's project relevance:

1. Was the COPS project designed in a way that responded to the needs and priorities of all genders? If so, how?
2. To what extent does the intervention's design reflect the rights of persons of all genders and included feedback from a diverse range of local stakeholders including marginalized groups?
3. Does the intervention meet the practical and strategic needs of all genders?

The assessment of **coherence** as an evaluation criterion was not reflected in the ToR of the assignment. In this sense, the evaluator has put forward the following questions:

1. Did the COPS project team regularly participate in the thematic groups and coordination structures in the MOIA?
2. Did COPS closely coordinate with international initiatives that support the transformation of the ANP?

To reflect the *gender* and *human rights* dimension of the COPS's project **coherence**, the following questions were put forward:

1. To what extent are the intervention's design, delivery and results coherent with international law and commitments to gender equality and rights?
2. To what extent does the intervention support national legislation and initiatives that aim to improve gender equality and human rights? What lessons can be learned?

The questions to assess the **effectiveness** of the COPS project formulated in the context of the assignment in the ToR were the following:

1. Has the COPS project successfully delivered the results as identified under each of the project outputs?
2. What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
3. How effective was the governance arrangement of the project?
4. To what extent has there been collaboration and communication among UNDP, donors, and MOIA at the central level?
5. How effective have the capacity development initiatives undertaken by the COPS project been?

6. Have the initiatives been adequate and resulted in sustainable capacity in the target MOIA departments at the central, provincial, and regional offices?
7. How effective has COPS been in addressing the challenges in demand-driven initiatives, and priorities raised by communities?
8. Has the capacity development support of COPS to the ANP-led community-oriented police within MOIA?
9. How effective and efficient were the lines of reporting between UNDP and MOIA, and how clear was the division of responsibilities and accountability of various functions and activities between the government and UNDP?
10. How was the overall project designing process?
11. Was it designed through a consultative process with MOIA counterparts, donors, and other stakeholders?
12. How effective was the international partners' role in COPS funding, implementation of activities, communication, and overall coordination?

To identify the *gender* and *human rights* dimension of the COPS's project **effectiveness**, the following questions were put forward:

1. Did the intervention achieve its objectives and expected results in ways that contributed to gender equality? If so, how?
2. Were there differential results for different people? If so, how and why?
3. Were different approaches necessary to reach people of different genders?
4. Was the intervention adjusted to address any concerns and maximize effectiveness?
5. Was the theory of change and results framework informed by analysis of gender equality, political economy analysis, and human rights? If so, to what extent?

The questions to assess the **efficiency** of the COPS project formulated in the context of the assignment in the ToR were the following:

1. How efficiently were funding, staff, and other resources used to achieve the expected results of the project?
2. Based on cost-benefit analysis what conclusions can be drawn regarding 'value for money' and cost-related efficiencies or inefficiencies in implementing the COPS project?
3. What was the quality and timeliness of the implementation of activities and the responsiveness of the project to adapt and respond to changes and challenges?
4. What were the risks and how effective was expectation management?
5. Were the organizational structures, management, planning, and implementation processes effective and efficient?
6. Did the project use the resources most economically to achieve its objectives?
7. Have the resources invested led to the achievement of the intended results?

To elucidate the *gender* and *human rights* dimension of the COPS's Project **efficiency**, the following questions were put forward:

1. Were different resources allocated in ways that considered gender equality? If so, how were they allocated? Was differential resource allocation appropriate?
2. Do the investment costs per person target the differentiated needs of people of different genders?

The questions to assess the **sustainability** of the COPS project formulated in the context of the assignment in the ToR were the following:

1. What is the sustainability of the results achieved, with a focus on capacities built and the ability of the institutions to operate with reduced international technical assistance in the future?
2. How predictably and regularly had resources been supplied to COPS?
3. To what extent were COPS project capacity-building initiatives/training sustainable and what are the longer-term effects?

To assess the *gender* and *human rights* dimension of the COPS's project **sustainability**, the following questions were put forward:

1. Did the intervention contribute to greater gender equality within wider legal, political, economic, and social systems? If so, how and to what extent?
2. Did it result in enduring changes to social norms that are harmful to people of all or some genders? If it did not achieve this, why not?
3. Will the achievements in gender equality persist after the conclusion of the intervention? Have processes contributed to sustaining these benefits?
4. Have mechanisms been set up to support the achievement of gender equality in the longer term?

The questions to assess the **impact** of the COPS formulated in the context of the assignment in the ToR were the following:

1. What were the unintended effects of the COPS project interventions (negative and positive)?
2. What are the results of the intervention in terms of changes in the lives of beneficiaries against set indicators?
3. To what extent has COPS impacted the wider objective of re-building the ANP?
4. What changes, both positive and negative, both intended and unintended, can be attributed to the interventions?
5. What is the estimated impact of the COPS funding on overall security in the country?
6. What were the intended and unintended aspects of the program related to the political, security, and developmental dimensions?

To better determine the *gender* and *human rights* dimension of the COPS's project **impact**, the following questions were put forward:

1. Were there equal impacts for different genders or were there any gender-related differences in engagement, experience, and impacts? If so, why did these differential impacts occur?
2. To what extent did gender-related impacts intersect with other social barriers including race/ethnicity, disability, age, and sexual orientation to contribute to differential experiences and outcomes?
3. How did gendered norms and barriers within the wider political, economic, religious, legislative, and socio-cultural environment impact outcomes?
4. To what extent have impacts contributed to equal power relations between people of different genders and to changing social norms and systems?

From the analysis of the questions that were put forward in the ToR, the main accent was put on elucidating the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of the COPS project. Also, the questions in the ToR were complemented by the evaluator with gender-sensitive inquiries.

ANNEX 5. List of interviewed people

Chencho Gyalmo Dorjee, Peace and Governance Adviser, UNDP Afghanistan
Mohammad Haroon Nusrat, former COPS's national project coordinator
Sainey Ceesay, Team Lead, LOTFA Projects Closure
Syed Haroon Ahmadi, RBM Analyst Development Effectiveness Unit, UNDP Afghanistan

ANNEX 6. Focus-group questions

1. What was the relevance of the intervention regarding the national and international partners' policies and priorities?

2. How effective was COPS in garnering national ownership of the activities?

3. Where was the project not able to deliver on enhancing national ownership and why?

4. What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

5. Why then the project did not adjust the work plan and intervention approach? – COVID?

6. How effective was the governance arrangement of the project?

7. To what extent has there been collaboration and communication among UNDP, donors, and MOIA at the central level?

8. What conclusions can be drawn regarding "value for money" and cost-related efficiencies or inefficiencies in implementing the COPS project?

9. What was the quality and timeliness of the implementation of activities?

10. What lessons learned and recommendations could be learned from the:

11. Is there anything you would like to add and do you think some questions were not raised during this interview that could have been important to be discussed?