

**PROVISION FOR POST PROJECT EVALUATIONS FOR THE UNITED  
NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND  
Contract NO.PD:C0110/10**

**EVALUATION REPORT**



**UDF-KAZ-08-256**

**Acknowledgements**

The evaluators would like to thank the Kazakh International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law (BHR) and its implementing partners (the Kazakh Ministry of Interior and the Human Rights Commission under the President of Kazakhstan), who took the time to share their experiences and information with the evaluation team. In particular, the team would like to thank BHR's acting director Ms. Roza Akylbekova, project coordinators Ms. Victoria Tyuleneva and Ms. Mariya Goloborodkina, and the head of BHR's educational center, Mr. Yuriy Gussakov, for their assistance, information and logistical support. All errors and omissions remain the responsibility of the authors.

**Disclaimer**

The views expressed in this report are those of the evaluators. They do not represent those of UNDEF or of any of the institutions referred to in the report.

**Authors**

## Table of Contents

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
II. INTRODUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT.....	4
(i) Project and evaluation objectives.....	4
(ii) Evaluation methodology.....	5
(iii) Development context.....	5
III. PROJECT STRATEGY.....	7
(i) Project strategy and approach.....	7
(ii) Logical framework.....	8
IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	9
(i) Relevance.....	9
(ii) Effectiveness.....	11
(iii) Efficiency.....	13
(iv) Impact.....	14
(v) Sustainability.....	17
(vi) UNDEF Value Added.....	18
V. CONCLUSION.....	19
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	21
IX. ANNEXES.....	23
ANNEX 1: EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	23
ANNEX 2: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	24
ANNEX 3: SCHEDULE OF INTERVIEWS.....	25
ANNEX 4: ACRONYMS.....	26





is fully consistent with government policy , since recommended by the Human Rights

## II. INTRODUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

### i. The project and evaluation objectives

This report contains the evaluation of the project titled “Human Rights Education for the Police” – The project ran from 1 April 2010 – 31 May 2012 (including a 2 month no-cost extension), with a total grant of USD 175,000 (out of which UNDEF retained USD 17,500 for monitoring and evaluation).

The project was designed by the Kazakh International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law (BHR). It was implemented in partnership with the

Kazakh Ministry of Interior, the Human Rights Commission under the President of Kazakhstan, the Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) and the Tajik Bureau for Human Rights. As defined in the Project Document, the overall objective was to improve human rights protection through the elaboration of a human rights education course for introduction into the curricula of Kazakh institutions training future police officers. The target population consisted of academic staff of Kazakh police training institutions, i.e. the Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) in Almaty, the MIA Academy in Karaganda and the Academy of the Financial Police in Astana<sup>4</sup>.

**Orientation map<sup>2</sup> to indicate police academies participating in the project: MIA academies of Almaty, Karaganda, Aktobe and Kostanay; Academy of the Financial Police in Astana<sup>3</sup>**

UNDEF and Transtec have agreed on a framework governing the evaluation process, set out in the Operational Manual. According to the manual, the objective of the evaluation is to “conduct in-depth analysis of UNDEF-funded projects to gain a better understanding of what constitutes a successful project which will in turn help UNDEF devise future project strategies. Evaluations also assist stakeholders to determine whether projects have been implemented in accordance with the project document and whether anticipated project

---

<sup>2</sup> Map published by Bernard Tom under the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Unported license; source: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Kazakhstan\\_provinces\\_and\\_province\\_capitals.svg#filelinks](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Kazakhstan_provinces_and_province_capitals.svg#filelinks)

<sup>3</sup> BHR's training for academic staff from these five locations took place in: Almaty, Karaganda and Astana.

<sup>4</sup> In accordance with the final narrative report two MIA schools in Aktobe and Kostanay were added with the approval of UNDEF at a later stage to the project's target group.

(ii) Evaluation methodology

The evaluation was conducted by an international expert, working with a national expert, under the terms of the framework agreement between UNDEF and Transtec. In accordance



House<sup>9</sup> nk K z kh n w h 6 n "p c gh " nd 5 n "cv b ", d n ng "not free" in 2011<sup>10</sup>. At the international level, Kazakhstan is bound by the International Bill of Human Rights, as it has ratified the two overarching covenants that between them cover the whole range of civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. It has also ratified most of the main human rights conventions<sup>11</sup>. At the national level, Kazakhstan adopted a National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP) for 2009 – 2012 which constitutes a consolidated program of planned concrete steps for the improvement of legislation and practices of its application, the national system of protection of human rights and the education of the population regarding human rights and mechanisms of their protection<sup>12</sup>.

Notwithstanding the importance of ratifying international human rights instruments and related national policies, the current challenge lies in their proper implementation. The NHRAP recognizes that violations of the constitutional rights of citizens by law-enforcement agencies are widespread. Most common violations are illegal detention, unwarrantable entry and search of homes and unlawful methods of investigation such as the use of violence and other degrading treatment. The NHRAP identifies low levels of professional training of officers of criminal investigation and lack of elementary knowledge of criminal legislation and international treaties ratified by Kazakhstan as the main causes of the violations of human rights by law-enforcement agents.

The year 2011 saw the worst confrontation in recent history, when on December 16<sup>th</sup> police and government troops opened fire on a public gathering of civilians, including striking oil workers, in the south-western city of Zhanaozen<sup>13</sup>. At least 15 people were killed and more than 100 seriously injured. One protester was killed later in a separate incident<sup>14</sup>. A 20-day state of emergency was imposed by the president and all commut31acfs (w)15(as)(t)-4(hst)TJET EMC /P A

### III. PROJECT STRATEGY

(ii) Logical framework

## IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS

### (i) Relevance

#### Baseline Situation

BHR relied on three sources to underpin its initial assessment: (i) information gathered in the context of previous activities (e.g. research for its human rights education program targeting secondary-level institutions and personal observations made by staff of BHR's Astana office when training law enforcement officers); (ii) interviews with MIA

## 2. Curriculum Development

Police academies and universities did not dispose of consolidated training materials to raise awareness among future police officers that the protection of human rights was their function and duty. Those higher educational institutions that actually offered optional human rights courses would leave the choice of training materials to its faculty staff and would provide the training mostly in Russian language. Educational materials or training for police officer candidates in Kazakh language were unavailable.

Accordingly, the consultations between BHR, MIA and Human Rights Commission arrived at a choice of training manual topics and associated co-authors ensuring a combination of academic expertise and practical field experience. In other words, the objective was to develop training material which clarified that human rights values are constitutionally guaranteed, that the police is at the service of



were completed. While the student version of the manual introduces police practice to the human rights perspective, the version for faculty staff includes additional recommendations on the application of interactive teaching methods.





85,900)<sup>18</sup> over the total number of 72 direct beneficiaries<sup>19</sup> provides a high average cost of





(v) Sustainability

Five months after project completion, evaluators came across a number of issues that risk undermining the sustainability of the project's results. The project's design expected acceptance of the project's outputs, which turned out to be a risky assumption in an environment where the violation of human rights by the police is still a practical reality. While the project's achievements are not to be disputed, there is a potential risk that the efforts and fruits of the work of the implementing partners will become out of date if not exploited soon:

1. The provision of "Human Rights" education by police cadets

Interviews conducted at the time of the evaluation visit revealed that Kazakhstan's higher educational institutions assigned with the training of future police officers were still lecturers' only. This is because

manuals could be expected to launch either by the academic mid-term or autumn semesters of 2013.

2. Only a fraction of the produced Human Rights Training Manuals were distributed

Given the above, only a limited number of the new manuals are currently in use. BHR withheld the textbooks pending the launch of the new human rights courses. For the time

## V. CONCLUSIONS

i. We found that exposure to international experience through a combination of study visits and workshops was appropriate to facilitate the generation of an informed and up-to-date human rights perspective

ultimate impact, which is the mandatory provision of human rights courses by all of Kazakhstan's police academies, the project's 900 indirect beneficiaries at this point cannot be taken into consideration. Therefore the **potential benefit of efficient project conduct is at risk**. If the project's outputs came to use in the very near future, the average cost per beneficiary would decrease to USD 88.40.

vi. Five months after the project closing date courses based on the project's outputs were still not offered by higher training institutions for future Kazakh police officers. The Ministry of Education to date has neither approved nor given its view on the project's outputs, which puts the **sustainability of the project's outcomes at risk**. Given that the line authority for higher education did neither veto the objectives nor the time plan during the project's initial consultations, we conclude that the grantee and its implementing partners did not foresee and maintain ongoing communication and coordination with the Ministry of Education to secure its timely (and political) approval. As a result, there is no clear perspective as to when human rights training will become a mandatory discipline for Kazakhstan's police academies and by when beneficiaries can make use of the 2,600 copies of the training manual produced by BHR.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

To strengthen the outcome and similar projects in the future, evaluators recommend to UNDEF and project grantees:

- i. The pertinence



recommend to the grantee to conduct interviews throughout (at key stages/milestones) and after completion of a project, not only with beneficiaries but also with all stakeholders involved in or concerned by the project. Covering project achievements systematically (i.e. progress/change compared to outcome of the initial contextual analysis) will improve BHR's impact assessment in quantitative and qualitative terms and thus enhance the organization's strategic objectives. This may also help the grantee to attract new donors and implementing partners for an expansion of the original project.

v. Based on the above we recommend to UNDEF to become more explicit vis-à-vis applicants about the benefits of generating and using comparative survey data (baseline vs. outcome). We suggest that you consider that applications including solid survey approaches will be given preference.

vi. In relation to our conclusion that that the grantee and its implementing partners did not foresee and maintain ongoing communication and coordination with the Ministry of Education to secure approval, we believe that it is of utmost importance for democracy development projects to include and continuously involve all stakeholders concerned by the introduction of previously unavailable knowledge and skills. This applies in particular to CSO projects requiring cooperation with multiple central government institutions, as it ensures continuous consultation and thus a process more likely to identify practical or administrative challenges. Based on our observations on sustainability, we therefore recommend to the grantee and to UNDEF to ensure that future project applications include specific measures promoting cooperation and ownership in case the acceptance of project deliverables is of concern to multiple government institutions, notably through a project design applying an inclusive partnership approach, to the extent possible, that

## IX. ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

DAC criterion	Evaluation Question	Related sub-questions
Relevance	To what extent was the project, as designed and implemented, suited to context and needs at the beneficiary, local, and national levels?	<p><i>f</i>Were the objectives of the project in line with the needs and priorities for democratic development, given the context?</p> <p><i>f</i>Should another project strategy have been preferred rather than the one implemented to better reflect those needs, priorities, and context? Why?</p> <p><i>f</i>Were risks appropriately identified by the projects? How appropriate are/were the strategies developed to deal with identified risks? Was the project overly risk-averse?</p>
Effectiveness	To what extent was the project, as implemented, able to achieve objectives and goals?	<p><i>f</i>To what extent was the project implemented as envisaged by the project document? If not, why not?</p> <p><i>f</i>Were the project activities adequate to make progress towards the project objectives?</p> <p><i>f</i>What has the project achieved? Where it failed to meet the outputs identified in the project document, why was this?</p>

Efficiency

# ANNEX 2: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

UNDEF

- f* Final Narrative Report
- f* Mid-Term/Annual Progress Report
- f* Proje



# ANNEX 4: ACRONYMS

BHR	Kazakh International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law
DIHR	Danish Institute for Human Rights
M&E	