Evaluation Report Title: Independent Evaluation of the Security Sector Accountability and Police Reform (SSAPR) Programme

Response to Evaluation Report (overarching narrative)

Summary of Evaluation Findings

The evaluation includes three main findings, a series of conclusions, and a set of implications for future security sector reform programmes. It does not propose a series of recommendations.

Key finding 1: Police officers exposed to SSAPR positively changed their practice as a result of the programme.

Key finding 2: Communities in SSAPR pilot sites positively changed their practice around community engagement as a result of the programme.

Key finding 3: Local authorities in SSAPR intervention sites engaged better with communities following programme support.

Conclusions on the short- and long-term impact of SSAPR: The evaluation finds that the programme improved the public's sense of security in intervention sites, and their perceptions of police performance. Poor and marginalised groups benefited in particular from the programme.

The evaluation also finds that *absolute* levels of recorded criminality actually increased slightly over the programme implementation period (albeit that the increase was lower in intervention sites than in non-intervention sites). The increase is accounted for by misdemeanour crimes, with reports of serious crimes having fallen in number.

The evaluation's quantitative analysis shows that the more exposure Congolese citizens had to the SSAPR programme's range of interventions, the more positive were their perceptions of public security. The evaluation notes that the introduction of *Forums de Quartier* (community groups convened to discuss security issues) had a significant impact on improving police-community collaboration.

The evaluation notes that the programme achieved short-term results against the programme's impact, but finds that long-term improved performance of the Congolese police cannot be assured if police officer salaries are not paid on time, or unless the police are supplied with the equipment and material support necessary to operate a professional law enforcement operation.

In addition, the evaluation observes that because some of the programme's external accountability mechanisms were reliant, or partly-reliant upon external funding or externally-funded technical expertise, DFID closure of the programme put at risk the long-term sustainability of these mechanisms.

Implications for future police reform programmes: the evaluation puts forward a set of five implications for the scale up of police reform programmes:
- Buy-in of national counterparts is vital for long-term change, and requires active political engagement from programme implementers and donors.
- Police training and community engagement can successfully combine to improve perceptions of security, but making improvements sustainable is more challenging.
- The constraints to behavioural change must be addressed in any institutional reform programme.
- Accountability activities introduced as part of the programme were simultaneously the least costly, and the most effective.
- Security sector reform programmes need to gather better data not just about changes in perception of security, but on actual recorded rates of criminality and violence.

DFID Response

DFID welcomes the publication of the 'Independent Evaluation of the Security Sector Accountability and Police Reform Programme (SSAPR).' The evaluation is based on a rigorous methodology, and tracks progress across a five-year period, both in sites benefiting from DFID support, and in locations beyond the project's operating sphere.

We accept each of the evaluation findings, and the evaluation's conclusions on the programme's short- and long-term impact, including the risks to long-term sustainability. We acknowledge the evaluation's 'implications' section.

We note that the evaluation shows that the combination of programme interventions (support and training to the police; reform of security sector institutions; support for external scrutiny of the security sector) have combined to produce measurable improvements in perceptions of security, and in police performance. In this sense, the evaluation helps validate the concept of community-based policing as a way to improve perceptions of safety and security, and strengthen security sector accountability before the people.

We welcome the evaluation's recognition of the substantial gains that have been made in boosting Congolese citizens' trust of police officers, where the latter have benefited from training, and where citizens are able to scrutinise the activities of state security actors.

We recognise that the improvements realised through the programme are jeopardised by limited progress in the underlying reform of public sector institutions in DRC, such as the state's failure to pay a fair wage to state security agents, and to pay it on time, and in full. We also recognise that there remain constraints in the broader accountability framework of the Congolese security infrastructure. The evaluation correctly points out that DFID originally envisaged longer-term support to security sector and police reform in DRC, which would have increased the likelihood of 'locking in' the gains that were made from 2009-2015. Broader political constraints, and the UK's concerns about the direction of travel with regards human rights in DRC ultimately made further support to this reform programme untenable.

The findings of the evaluation have been taken forward into the design of our future work in DRC, notably programmes on governance and public administrative reform.

Further to a thorough consideration of the report findings, DFID has conducted its own analysis of the programme's performance in the SSAPR Project Completion Review (PCR), which is publicly available through the DFID 'Development Tracker' website. The PCR includes a list of our own post-completion follow-up actions.

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

Evaluation Report Title:		

Recommendations	Accepted or Rejected	If "Accepted", Action plan for Implementation or if "Rejected", Reason for Rejection
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		