

Development Co-operation between Sweden and the Baltic States in the Field of Prison and Probation

**Andrew Barclay
Claes Sandgren**

**Department for Central and
Eastern Europe**

Development Co-operation between Sweden and the Baltic States in the Field of Prison and Probation

**Andrew Barclay
Claes Sandgren**

Sida Evaluation 03/11

**Department for Central and
Eastern Europe**

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, *Sida Studies in Evaluation*, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

Reports may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Telephone: (+46) (0)8 506 423 80
Telefax: (+46) (0)8 506 423 52
E-mail: info@sida.se

Reports are also available to download at:

<http://www.sida.se>

Authors: Andrew Barclay, Claes Sandgren.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 03/11
Commissioned by Sida, Department for Central and Eastern Europe

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: 2002-002946
Date of Final Report: December 2002
Printed by Elanders Novum
Art. no. SIDA2498en
ISBN 91-586-8515-4
ISSN 1401-0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Acknowledgments

Sida has commissioned the Swedish Institute for Legal Development (Sild) to do an evaluation of the development co-operation between Sweden and the Baltic States in the field of prison and probation. The study has been carried out by us. We are indebted to Ms. Mina Neumüller who has given us invaluable administrative support. Special thanks and acknowledgment go to the various persons interviewed who shared with us their time and knowledge.

Norwich and Stockholm, December 2002

Andrew Barclay

Claes Sandgren

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Background	4
1.1 Introduction	4
1.2 Mandate of the evaluation	4
1.3 Character of the evaluation	4
1.4 Methodology	4
1.5 Scope and limitations	5
1.6 Evaluation team	5
2 The Evaluation	6
2.1 Visits	6
2.2 Interviews	6
2.3 Documentation	7
3 The Development Co-operation	8
3.1 History and development	8
3.2 Partners	8
3.3 Objectives, content and activities	9
3.4 Methods	10
3.5 Budget	10
4 Estonia Project Review	11
5 Latvia Project Review	14
6 Lithuania Project Review	16
7 Findings	21
7.1 Relevance of the programme objectives	21
7.2 Effectiveness	22
7.3 Sustainability	23
7.4 Efficiency	24
7.5 Gender aspects	25
8 Methodology	26
8.1 Twinning	26
8.2 Decision making and planning	27
8.3 Co-ordination	28
8.4 Monitoring and reporting	28
8.5 Local ownership	28
9 Conclusions and Recommendations	30
9.1 General conclusions	30
9.2 The future	30
9.3 2003	31
9.4 After 2003	31

Annex 1: Terms of Reference 32

Annex 2: Persons Interviewed 36

Annex 3: Documentation 38

Executive Summary

Sweden and the three Baltic States – Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania – have had a development cooperation in the field of prison and probation since 1995. There have been twinning arrangements between prisons and training centres in Sweden on the one hand and in the Baltic States on the other. This study is an evaluation of the cooperation since 1998 when the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) started to fund the cooperation.

A framework of objectives was agreed between the respective Ministries of Justice for each of the partnerships between Sweden and the three Baltic countries in each of the years between 1998–2002. The framework of objectives differed from country to country but were drawn from the principles of the European Prison Rules, and from the findings and recommendations of the Council of Europe reports into the prison systems of the Baltic countries written as part of the “Nord-Balt Prison Project”. Our assessment is that the framework of objectives was completely relevant to the needs of the countries to meet the overall objective, and that all the activities that we learned about were within that framework.

The consistent and major objective of the twinning programmes was to change the attitude and behaviour of staff towards prisoners, to treat prisoners with humanity and dignity, and improve the relationships between staff and prisoners. Without fail, this was perceived by every person we spoke to in the Baltic countries as a major change and result of the project. On such short visits, it was difficult to assess the depth of change. However, the consistency with which it was reported, the strength of the feeling expressed about it by the managers of the institutions, and our limited observations, make us confident that this has been a major result of this project.

An essential element of the methodology of the programmes is to establish trust, understanding and friendships between the partners. We believe that this was the correct approach and was key in the main objective of changing the values of the prison staff, and thus, in turn, their attitude and behaviour towards prisoners.

Our assessment is that the great majority of the improvements and changes that have occurred as a direct or indirect result of the twinning programmes should be able to be sustained. The majority of these improvements and changes have been achieved largely within the current resources of those prisons. Most have received some material support from the twinning partner in Sweden, but this has been “supportive” rather than central to the results. There may be problems in the future, depending on whether or not those material standards can be maintained. However, there is now an expectation amongst the Ministry officials, prison management and staff that these are the standards that are required. However, several senior officials on both sides of the twinning programmes expressed doubts concerning sustainability without the continuation of the partnership with Sweden and other countries. Sustainability in the wider context, we think, is variable from country to country.

The results of the twinning programme that we have described in preceding paragraphs have come from the expenditure of 14,500,000 SEK between January 1998 and November 2002. In our experience this is good “value for money”. To have achieved these results in 3 different countries over a period of over 4 years with that amount of money is very worthwhile. We doubt if another approach could have achieved an equal amount with a similar budget.

Accepting the limitations of our assessment, our overall conclusion is that gender awareness has not been a high priority for the projects, but that there is a gradual and significant improvement in the area, and that this is a policy issue that can be developed in future twinning activities.

A disadvantage of the twinning has been the insufficient dissemination to other institutions and use of the knowledge in those institutions (spread of “best practice”). This is so with respect to the policy level in two of the countries but also, and still more so, the prisons which are not twinned. Nor have we found much exchange of knowledge with institutions that are twinned with other Nordic prisons. We have also noted that the training centres in a limited way are used for dissemination of the experience and knowledge gained in the cooperation. It is true that formal teaching cannot replace on the spot learning but it should be possible to transfer more knowledge in the courses of the training centres than is now the case.

Twinning is meant to be a form of institutional capacity building. Nonetheless, it has proven that the cooperation often becomes dependent on a few key persons. A consequence has been a temporary stand-still in at least one case of change of directors. This is a sign that the cooperation should be designed in a way to reduce such dependence on one or two persons, but it also demonstrates that twinning not necessarily differs from traditional technical assistance. The twinning may also centre for a long time around one or two key persons who come to regard the cooperation as “theirs”. It might create a lack of renewal and of incentive to disseminate best practice to other institutions.

As pointed out above, the mode of work has allowed for a high degree of *flexibility*. An example is that measures against the spread of drug abuse and HIV could be incorporated into the co-operation even though this was not foreseen at the time of the planning.

There is a considerable discrepancy between the financial means made available by Sida and the use of the funds. About one third of the means have not been used but have been “returned” to Sida. There seems to be a planning problem that explains this failure to use the funds, since directors we have met would have liked to have more resources at their disposition. The participants did not have a full view of the funding arrangements and figures.

There have been few, if any, efforts to measure progress in a systematic way. There are for instance no indicators elaborated to establish whether results are reasonable or to measure whether objectives are met. It should be a task for Sida to encourage twinning institutions to discuss possible indicators. It would also facilitate for Sida – that now has limited knowledge about the development – to follow the programmes.

Local costs have been covered by the Baltic institutions to a degree that is much lower than desired, the reasons being that the Baltic institutions have not received funding for the twinning from their States and have not been pushed by Sida to contribute. The small contribution of the Baltic partners tends to move the initiative to the Swedish side. The Swedish side controls the budget. No director on the Baltic side that we met had seen the budget for its twinning cooperation or had any idea of the magnitude of the budget or its break-down on sub-items. Reporting has been a matter for the Swedish part. The limited participation of the Baltic twinning institutions reduces their ownership of the cooperation.

We find that the co-operation over-all has been very successful. One area, though, where the speed of progress has been limited is the development of alternatives to imprisonment.

The only part that we find partly doubtful is the sustainability of activities and results after the Sida funding has come to an end. It is well known that also successful twinning programmes, which produce good benefits in professional and technical development, often have unsatisfactory outcomes at the level of sustainable institutional capacity building. In this case we have some doubts that there is sufficient preparedness and domestic capacity to ensure the sustainability without continued external contacts and other types of international cooperation.

The Sida funding of the twinning cooperation will come to an end when the Baltic States accede the European Union. Hence, there is need for a *strategy* for the future. We think that the Baltic States should strengthen the sustainability of ongoing activities and results; appropriate budgetary means necessary to finance some activities of external cooperation; reinforce the capacity to manage aid resources from EU; involve non-governmental organizations complementary to the State; develop tools for cooperation that work on a low-budget basis; and prepare for a transition to a regular international cooperation concerning prison and probation.

1 Background

1.1 Introduction

Sweden and the three Baltic States – Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania – have had a development cooperation in the field of prison and probation since 1995. There have been twinning arrangements between prisons and training centres in Sweden on the one hand and in the Baltic States on the other. This study is an evaluation of the cooperation since 1998 when the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) started to fund the cooperation.

1.2 Mandate of the evaluation

According to our terms of reference the purpose of the evaluation is twofold:

- “to assess relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, local ownership, cost-efficiency and methods of the Swedish support to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania within the field of prison and probation financed by Sida.”
- “to make recommendations regarding content and form for a strategic continued development cooperation in 2003 between the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration and the Prison Administrations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.”

The purpose is further explained in the terms of reference where some more instructions are given. Among other things the methods of the cooperation are stressed. – The terms of reference are enclosed (Annex 1).

1.3 Character of the evaluation

	Accountability	Learning	Basis for decision
Policy	1	2	3
Effectiveness	4	5	6
Efficiency	7	8	9

The evaluation has a rather wide scope. It treats all three levels on the vertical axis but the emphasis is on effectiveness (results, attainment of objectives) and efficiency (use of funds, methods). All three purposes at the horizontal axis are included but the emphasis is on accountability and learning. For this reason all nine squares above are at least touched upon but most attention is devoted to squares no. 4, 5, 7 and 8.

This evaluation is directed at Sida as the funding agency and the prison administrations as the implementing agencies of the cooperation. We hope that it could also be useful to others working in the area of prison and probation and to institutions working with twinning in other areas as well.

1.4 Methodology

We have made a design for the evaluation, trying to operationalize the basic parameters that we have used. The relevance is assessed in the light of the objectives’ coherence with the Baltic countries’ policies and needs, with Swedish policy, with the European Prison Rules and the requirements of EU alignment. The assessment of effectiveness, which is based on a review of the results, is about the attainment of the objectives of the cooperation. We assess the sustainability by reviewing the

development of a viable capacity, commitment, expenditure and other things. The efficiency is about the relationship between input and results but also about professionalism in the use of the resources allocated to the twinning cooperation. Gender aspects are discussed in terms of general gender awareness, treatment of women prisoners, women staff etc. Regarding the methods of the cooperation we put emphasis on twinning as a method but we also give much attention to 'local ownership' and other methodological issues mentioned in the terms of reference.

1.5 Scope and limitations

Our evaluation comprises the period of Sida funded co-operation, that is the cooperation in 1998–2002. The cooperation that took place before 1998, which was funded by Kriminalvårdsstyrelsen (The Swedish Prison and Probation Administration; SPPA), falls outside our terms of reference, but admittedly it is not possible to draw a sharp line between the two periods. – For a list of the project decisions that fall inside our terms of reference, see Annex 1 to the Terms of reference (Annex 1 to this report).

We do not evaluate every single twinning arrangement but have focused on general issues and conclusions. There are certainly differences between the various twinning arrangements and between the countries. For this reason not all statements we make are necessarily applicable to all three countries or all twinning arrangements.

1.6 Evaluation team

Andrew Barclay is Projects Director of the International Centre for Prison Studies, King's College, University of London. He is a former prison governor in the Prison Service of England and Wales. Claes Sandgren is professor of law and dean of the Faculty of Law, Stockholm University. He is a former official with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Sweden; he has inter alia served as ambassador and head of the Secretariat for Analysis of Swedish Development Assistance.

2 The Evaluation

2.1 Visits

Visits have been made to the three Baltic States and to Sweden. We have visited a number of prisons and training centres that are partners of the twinning arrangements in the Baltic States and in Sweden. In this way we have been in a position to talk with a number of persons and to see ourselves the tangible results of the cooperation. The following institutions of the prison administrations were visited:

Estonia

Central Prison (Tallinn)

Maardu Prison

Tallinn Prison

Tartu Prison

Latvia

Cesis Colony for Juveniles

Ilguciema Prison for Women (Riga)

The Staff Training Centre in Dzintari (Jurmala)

Lithuania

Kaunas Juvenile Education and Pre-Trial Colony

Lukiskiu Pre-Trial Prison (Vilnius)

Marijampoles Colony of Strong Regime

Pravieniskes Colony of Normal Regime

Vilnius Colony of Strong Regime and Pre-Trial Colony

The Prison Staff Training Centre (Vilnius)

A visit was also made to “Lietuvos Kaliniu globos Draugija” (Prisoners’ Aid association), an NGO in Vilnius primarily helping discharged prisoners resettle into society.

Sweden

Kronobergshäktet

2.2 Interviews

We have conducted a number of interviews with heads of the prison administrations, prison directors and members of prison staff; officials of ministries, embassies and Sida; and other key persons involved in the cooperation or familiar with it. A list of persons interviewed is enclosed (Annex 2). Due to logistical problems a few visits to Swedish institutions that were planned had to be cancelled. But they were replaced by telephone interviews (see the list of persons interviewed). There was no time to collect information from the target group, that is the prisoners themselves, for instance via questionnaires. We do not think, however, that such questionnaires would produce another result than we have now obtained.

2.3 Documentation

Our findings are also based on a large number of reports and other types of documentation of the cooperation. A list of major documents is enclosed (Annex 3). Among reports of great value we would like to mention the following:

- Council of Europe, THEMIS PLAN. Lithuania, (The Lakes/Colliander Report), February–March 1995
- Council of Europe legal co-operation with the countries of central and eastern Europe. Nord-Balt Prison Project for the development of the Prison Systems of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, 1997 and later
- Council of Europe, Nord-Balt Prison Project. Estonia (The Lakes/Grönholm Report), May 1997
- Dito. Latvia (The Lakes/Engesbak Report), July/August 1998
- Progress Reports and Guidelines for the Future approved by the Swedish and each of the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian Ministers of Justice and Interior, March 2000
- Follow-up reports on development cooperation between the Swedish and each of the national Baltic Prison Services (all three reports produced in 2001)
- Final Reports on the Development cooperation between the Swedish and each of the Baltic Prison Services June 2000–December 2001, prolonged to April 2002 (all three reports produced in March 2002)

3 The Development Co-operation

3.1 History and development

The prison systems in the three Baltic States had their basis in imprisonment and forced labour. Prisoners were expected to work and were organised in divisions for this purpose. Prisons did not cost money, rather they made money. With the arrival of democracy and the acceptance of international human rights standards, the fundamental basis of the system had to be transformed from top to bottom. There was a need to create a prison system based on human rights standards and democracy. Specific problems which had to be addressed were, among others, poor facilities and living conditions, overcrowding, lack of activities for prisoners, relations between staff and inmates, diseases (TB and eventually HIV) and alternatives to imprisonment.

This was the back-ground for the Swedish cooperation with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the field of prisons and probation. The cooperation has had a uniform approach in so far as content, objectives and forms have basically been the same in all three countries. It has focussed on the types of problems that were just mentioned and it has been implemented through twinning cooperation between Swedish institutions on the one hand and institutions in the Baltic States on the other.

The co-operation is carried out within the framework of The *Nord-Balt Prison Project* which is the working name of a Council of Europe regional project which focuses on co-operation between Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, on the one hand, and Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, on the other. The overall objective of the Project is to improve and develop the prison systems in the Baltic States. The cooperation is based on Council of Europe reviews of the Baltic States prison systems written as part of the Nord-Balt Project. The role of the Project is to keep a record of the ongoing co-operation between the Baltic and Nordic States, to assist and give advice on the co-operation activities and to fill the gaps between existing activities, i.e., by engaging additional European expertise and support. The Project favours twinning arrangements as a channel for support, know-how as well as material assistance.

The cooperation has been regulated by agreements on ministerial and lower levels. In the spring of 2002 agreements were concluded between Sweden and each of the three cooperation countries about the cooperation during 2002.

3.2 Partners

Policy, funding and coordination

Authorities at the central level are in charge of policy and coordination and – in the case of Sweden – funding. These authorities are the following:

Sweden: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

Estonia: Office of European Integration

Latvia: Ministry of Finance

Lithuania: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

The major bodies for policy and coordination of these programmes are, however, the prison administrations of each of the four countries with the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration (SPPA) at the core of the whole cooperation. The main responsible person in Sweden during the whole period of co-operation has been the International adviser to the Director General of SPPA. The co-

operation has had a strong continuity in terms of persons in charge also at the level of the prison administrations in the Baltic States.

Implementing agencies

The implementation of the cooperation has been the responsibility of the directors of the twinned institutions which have to a large extent decided on the activities of the cooperation. These institutions are the following.

Sweden – Estonia

KVM Stockholm Kronoberg – Central Prison, Tallinn (due to close at the end of 2002)

KVM Hall – Tallinn Prison (began in 2002)

KVM Norrköping – Rummu Prison (finished 1st of January 2001)

KVM Norrköping – Maardu Prison for Pre-trial Juveniles (recently begun)

KVM Stockholm Kronoberg/KVM Hall – Tartu Prison (a new twinning arrangement for 2002)

Sweden – Latvia

KVM Kumla – Jelgava Prison

KVM Eskilstuna, incl Mariefred – Cesis Colony for Juveniles

KVM Örebro incl Hinseberg – Ilguciema Prison for Women

Training Centre Norrköping – Staff Training Centre Dzintari (Jurmala)

Sweden – Lithuania:

KVM Jönköping and Tidaholm – Vilnius Colony of Strong Regime

KVM Malmö Kirseberg and KVM Malmö Norr – Kaunas Colony for Juveniles

KVM Göteborg Hisingen/Förorter – Marijampole Colony of Strong Regime and Panevezys Prison for Women

KVM Göteborg Centrum – Pravieniskes Colony of Normal Regime

KVM Jönköping and Tidaholm – Lukiskiu Pre-Trial and Closed Prison (recently begun)

Training Centre Norrköping – Lithuanian Prison Service Training Centre Vilnius

3.3 Objectives, content and activities

Several *objectives* are mentioned in the documentation. An overriding objective is to have well functioning State institutions for upholding the rule of law and the respect for human rights. More specific is the objective of bringing the prison systems of the Baltic States in conformity with European standards, that is in conformity with the European Prison Rules in the first place but also with the European Convention on Human Rights and other international instruments in as much as they concern prisoners' rights. Still more concrete is the objective of improving staff-inmate relations and the treatment of prisoners.

An objective of another character mentioned is capacity building, presumably building capacity of the Baltic institutions to achieve themselves the overriding objectives just mentioned. A number of "sub-objectives" are also mentioned in various documents. Examples are higher level of competence of staff; improved hygiene; improved work and training in prison; more alternatives to imprisonment. These objectives coincide with the areas of work of the cooperation.

The basic components of the cooperation programmes are the following: twinning between prisons; twinning between training centres; supply of (used) material; alternatives to imprisonment; and “ad hoc assistance”. The *content* of these components have, however, varied dependent upon the needs of each institution involved on the Baltic side. Frequent topics of the cooperation are staff-inmate relations; dealing with violent prisoners; staff “debriefing”; health (TB and HIV) and hygiene; drug awareness and drug prevention; work and vocational training; security and control; psychology and social work; preparation for release; probation service; teaching methods and programmes; and others.

The co-operation has basically consisted of two types of *activities*:

(a) provision of information and knowledge; (b) provision of used equipment. The focus has been on the intellectual part (a), which has included study visits, seminars and other formal training courses; and on a limited scale on the job training. The material part (b) has become greater than originally planned and it could well be that the economic value of the material, if it had been bought at the open market, would have exceeded that of the intellectual part. A variety of material has been supplied, for instance work tools and machinery, computers, fax machine, furniture, security equipment, school equipment, ventilation equipment, laundry equipment, kitchen machines, clothing, vehicles etc.

3.4 Methods

The basic method of the cooperation is so called *twinning* of institutions. Prisons in Sweden on the one hand and in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania on the other have been “twinned”. Likewise the training centre in Sweden has been twinned with its counterpart institutions in Latvia and Lithuania. There has been no twinning between institutions of the three Baltic States. Core features of twinning as a method for cooperation are – or should be – its basis in a partnership, its emphasis on sustainable organizational capacity building and its long-term commitment. A major element of the initiation of each twinning have been efforts to create a relationship of mutual understanding and trust between the institutions and staff involved on both sides.

3.5 Budget

The total amount allocated by Sida in 1998–2002 is 22,721,800 SEK (see Annex to our terms of reference). The following table shows expenditure for the cooperation during the period January 1998–April 2002 according to records of SPPA (SEK).

	ESTONIA	LATVIA	LITHUANIA	TOTAL
Salaries, fees	900 000	1 400 000	2 180 000	4 480 000
Reimbursable costs	1 490 000	1 920 000	3 300 000	6 710 000
Equipment, freight	200 000	250 000	200 000	650 000
Contingencies	40 000	70 000	130 000	240 000
TOTAL	2 630 000	3 640 000	5 810 000	12 080 000

If we add expenditure during the period May–November 2002 total expenditure is 14,500,000 SEK. As can be seen there is a discrepancy between the sums allocated by Sida (22,7 million SEK) and expenditures (14,5 million SEK). The partners of the twinning programmes have used only about two thirds of the resources made available by Sida..

4 Estonia Project Review

Andrew Barclay spent three days in Estonia. The National Director, Peeter Näs, is extremely committed to the twinning programme, and has close knowledge of the activities and results. At the Headquarters level, I was told that there had been a strong team in Estonia developing the co-ordination prior to 1998 and up to a re-organisation in 1999. At that time the group was disbanded and the new arrangement was not effective in co-ordinating the different twinning programmes until the appointment of Lauri Kuusing earlier this year. A significant improvement since his appointment is the drawing up of a detailed annual activity plan for each partnership. Whilst there were agreements, they do not appear to have been formal.

The Director of Central Prison was able to give a detailed report of all the activities, dating from February 1998 through to this year. He was clearly extremely supportive of the programme and could offer no adverse criticism of it. He identified the most important result from the programme as the changing of staff attitude towards prisoners, which had developed from each of the different activities; and observations of the Swedish system over the length of the programme. In terms of specific activities, the training on debriefing, and on HIV and drugs has been particularly important.

At the beginning of the programme, there had been no prediction of the explosion that took place in the increase of the drug problem in prisons in Estonia and the spread of HIV amongst the prison population. The flexibility of the contract between the national prison administrations meant that the partnership could respond to the needs of the Central Prison by offering training in recognising drugs, preventing access to the drugs, and treatment of drug-takers. As these issues are the same in the other prisons, joint training took place.

In addition, there has been important work surrounding security and control, and the specialisms of Psychology and Social Work.

The frequency of activities, (one every month to six weeks), has enabled trust to build up between the partners and, subsequently, openness in exchanges.

It was difficult during the visit to observe or measure the results because the prison was in the process of shutting down, and thus the staff were hardly motivated for development of ideas. However, I did observe the change in policy towards HIV prisoners to meet International standards, and the increased awareness of the needs of drug-takers. In my discussion with a former member of staff from Central Prison in Maardu Prison, it was evident that he had gained considerably from the training in the partnership, and that he is now implementing the learning in his new setting.

The material support given by the Swedes had been a valuable support to the programme. The Director mentioned a vehicle, clothing, and security equipment.

My impression from my visit, is that Central Prison is a very old, conservative and traditional prison where it would take a long time for new ideas to be accepted. There are such prisons in every country. This project would have needed a lot of time to build up trust and to have any impact. It has been known for a year or so that the prison will close and this fact will have been a major influence in reducing staff motivation. Whilst, clearly, change could not have been sustained within the prison, I am confident that the learning will have gone with those members of staff who have been transferred to other prisons and will have an impact on the change in those establishments.

The twinning programme at Rummu Prison ended with its closure in January 2001. It had concentrated on helping improve staff attitude and staff/inmate relationships, developing a room for IT training for prisoners, helping develop a carpentry workshop and learning relating to security, psychology and social work. The reports we read state that the results were very positive.

We were told that the new partnership between Norrköping and Maardu is not to start officially until 2003, although early preparation for the twinning is written into the contract for 2002. There has already been an interchange of visits to establish relationships. During my visit, I was impressed by the openness and positive attitude of Valeri Kravets, the Director, and with two of his staff who had experience at Headquarters and at the Central Prison. In my discussions with Lasse Lukane, it was very clear that the learning they gained in their respective posts is being integrated into their work in Maardu, and will be invaluable in the development of the new twinning partnership with Norrköping.

There is a positive management team with whom I can envisage a very fruitful twinning partnership developing.

I was able to directly observe the fruitful results of the twinning partnership in Tallinn Prison. I discussed with the Deputy Director, the training and development of the “contact person”. The Estonians have learned the principles of the scheme from Sweden. However, the Swedish scheme is very staff-intensive, so they have developed their own in which each unit is allocated one Contact Officer who works a day shift, five days per week, and who takes all requests from prisoners on his/her unit. The Contact Officers work in liaison with the Psychologists and Social Workers. I spoke to, and observed in action, one such Officer in Tallinn.

The training in drugs awareness and HIV has had a direct impact on the policies in the prison in Tallinn. HIV prisoners are now housed in normal accommodation with confidentiality. Although that is not fully possible at present, because all prisoners know that HIV prisoners have come from a particular unit, the principle is established and will be effective in due course. Both the security element and the treatment element of drug offenders have been improved as a direct result of the twinning.

The other key area has been in debriefing and the training of staff to debrief other staff after a major incident. The “spin-off” of this approach is the improvement of management attitudes towards staff.

The fourth significant result is the development of professional methods of dealing with violent prisoners, minimising injury to both staff and prisoners. These procedures are used in Sweden and the United Kingdom. Some equipment has been donated to Tallinn for this.

Fifthly, there has been material support to the prison, such as providing clothes for prisoners who do not have families or friends to send them clothing.

The Deputy Director was pleased that there is now an annual plan. Previously, he said, there had not been specific plans – people had just “gone with the flow”. Whilst, clearly, this has not affected the beneficial results, the introduction of annual plans is an improvement.

The visit to Tartu Prison which has just begun to receive prisoners, gave me a clear indication of the positive twinning arrangement with KVM Kronoberg and KVM Hall. It is evident that this partnership has begun with a great deal of momentum and enthusiasm, and there is clear evidence of the results of the other partnerships having been incorporated into the planning, e.g., the design of the buildings, the contact person, and policies and staff training relating to drugs and HIV. Also, the design is such that the perimeter security is strong enough not to require armed guards. The Director explained very specifically and positively how he regarded the prison staff and prisoners can benefit from future twinning.

However, I was a little disturbed to hear that the induction training of newly-joined staff for Tartu Prison had not included elements of learning from the Swedish twinning programme. This may reflect the fact that the Training College is not involved in the programme. In terms of sustainability, the training should include all the new learning but clearly it does not. For example, I was told that the drug training during the induction training for staff is not the same as the drug training received from the Swedes, despite the fact that the staff trained by the Swedes are certificated to teach other people.

I was impressed with the agreement of the plan for the co-operation between Kronoberg, Hall and Tartu prisons for 2002.

Finally, the overall improvement in knowledge and the broader outlook of staff has enabled the introduction of new policies to be made more easily. Often, when policies are developed at Headquarters, staff are too blinkered to understand the benefits of such approaches, whereas the experience of these staff through the twinning has “opened their eyes” and made them more receptive to change.

As to the future, the important elements are seen as sharing knowledge about management, planning and finance, and improvement of health-care systems.

5 Latvia Project Review

Andrew Barclay and Claes Sandgren spent three days in Latvia, (7–9 November). At Cesis Educational Colony for Juveniles, we met the Director, Jurijs Baidaks, who had been Director there since 1985 and worked for several years prior to that in the same establishment. The twinning partnership with Mariefred dates back to 1995. Mariefred is an adult prison and it is a limitation that there has been no contact with staff who work with children in Sweden because closed juvenile institutions are run by different agencies. It was very clear from his personal enthusiasm and dedication that the Director and many of his staff had established a close, trusting relationship over the years with the staff at Mariefred. As someone who had worked within the former Soviet system and, indeed, had been trained and visited other juvenile colonies in that system, his assessment of the changes are particularly relevant.

He stressed the importance of the early exchanges to build up trust and friendship, and the recognition of the commonality of the problems in Sweden and Latvia. A whole range of staff had been involved in the exchanges: managers, security workers, specialists, etc.. As did everybody else, he said that the most significant changes had been the change of attitude in staff and the building up of relationships between staff and the children. He highlighted the development of vocational/educational training for children and we saw the direct assistance that had been given in developing the traditional metalwork training workshop, and the new woodworking and computer-based training. Most recently equipment for the kitchen has been donated and the kitchen is now the pride of the prison. He also highlighted the exchanges around the management of the institution.

During our visit we were able to directly observe the results as he had described them. In the Colony itself there were significant signs of positive and constructive environments within a whole mixture of buildings in which there was a considerable amount of refurbishment occurring. The new Health Care Centre, a refurbished old building, was an excellent example of the improvements in delivery to prisoners. The school was a hive of industry. The children were engaged in what they were doing, and enthusiastic teachers, who had participated in the twinning programme, were speaking of the positive benefits they got from it.

Although dissemination is not written into the objectives, (and perhaps it should have been), we were disappointed that there was no contact between the juvenile colony and the second juvenile institution in Latvia.

The Ilguciema Colony for Women and the KVM Hinseberg Prison for Women in Sweden, are the only two female establishments involved in the twinning programmes in all three countries. As there is only one female prison in Sweden this is all that is possible. We were not able to meet with the Director but met with two Deputies who have been closely involved in the twinning arrangements. When asked about the results of the twinings we were enthusiastically told that the programme had enabled “20 years development in 7 years”, and “We knew things had to be changed, but we did not know how to do it and we have learnt that from the Swedes”. Once again they emphasised the significant change in attitude and behaviour of staff towards one another and between staff and prisoners. As with so many other prisons this was the most powerful impression left upon staff by their first visit to Sweden.

In a very quick tour of the prison we observed the positive use being made of the material support given by the Swedes, e.g., school equipment and furniture, computers, laundry equipment, kitchen equipment and workshop equipment etc. In terms of direct results, the 12-step programme for alcohol and drug addicts was highlighted as one of the most beneficial developments from the twinning. Staff had been trained by the Swedes, and Prison Fellowship International had helped to restore a building in

which the course could take place. There have been direct developments in education, vocational courses, and in particular, computers. Computers have also been provided for staff.

There was a good communication within the prison about the twinning and the prisoners to whom we spoke were fully aware of what had been happening and had been involved in talking to staff from Sweden on their visit. We were particularly impressed with the juvenile unit where the “Educator”, who had previously been a Psychologist, was operating a very humane and dignified regime. She wore civilian clothes as opposed to a uniform and clearly had a very effective relationship with children who carried with them many difficulties, both emotional and social. This member of staff had been involved closely with the twinning programme and was clearly operating much closer to the Swedish model than to a former Soviet model.

In contrast with the Juvenile Colony, the Deputies informed us how they had disseminated the results of the twinning in a variety of ways through contacts with different parts of the prison system in Latvia. In contrast to our observations of the male pre-trial prison, there seemed to be a lot more reform in the female pre-trial section in the prison. For example, a pre-trial mother with a child would be held in the sentenced mother-and-baby unit and not separately in the pre-trial section. The Deputies explained how they were trying to develop more activities for pre-trial prisoners. Whilst small, the development is a significant beginning. In terms of the future, the women were very positive about training staff as contact persons, and also developing a more humane approach to pre-trial detainees.

We visited the Staff Training College in Dzintari where we met Leonid Yefremov. This was our final visit to a twinning institution and was the only one in which we were disappointed. There had been only one activity, as far as we understood from the Principal, in the previous two years. In the last year, there had been no contact whatsoever. Mr Yefremov clearly expected any initiative to come from Sweden, and did not see himself in the position of taking an initiative. (He explained he could not do this because the Swedes were financing the partnership). This partnership was one of the earliest, dating back to 1994 when the college was being established, and there appeared to have been a lot of interchange in those early years. We were informed that there had been two visits to Sweden and three or four visits to Estonia during 1998 when the emphasis had been on training for Trainers, and the use of training equipment. We were not informed of any other recent results from the twinning. In our quick walk around the Training Centre, (there were no students as there was a break to enable refurbishment), we were shown material aid that had been given to the College by Sweden. This consisted of furnishings and classroom equipment, and this had clearly made a significant contribution to the College.

Our conclusion from our visit was that, after the initial enthusiasm of exchange in the late 1990's, the College had reached a point beyond which it had not developed. We felt that the College in Lithuania, although much newer, is at a more advanced stage of development and is more involved in learning from the Swedish twinning institution than this College.

6 Lithuania Project Review

Andrew Barclay and Claes Sandgren spent three days in Lithuania, (4th–6th November). It should be noted that there had been significant changes in the senior management at national level, and at several prisons as a result of a major incident at the colony in Alytus.

The twinning programme between Sweden and Lithuania was the last of the three to be established. While in Estonia and Latvia, contact had been established several years before Sida's involvement in 1998, it was only during 1997/8 that the twinning in Lithuania formally began. It was agreed at the Council of Europe "Nord-Balt Partnership" meeting that Sweden would take the lead in the twinning with Lithuania.

The new Acting Director, Mr Agurkis, was extremely positive about the results of the twinning programme. He had been promoted to his current post from being Director of Pravieniskes Colony and thus had been closely involved in their twinning with KVM Göteborg Centrum since it began in 1998. His predecessor as National Director had interpreted the "local ownership" philosophy of the project literally, and left the detailed involvement to the Colony Directors, without himself becoming closely involved. Mr Agurkis now saw that the benefits of the twinning programme could be effectively used by himself at national level in his new post.

We learnt from the National Director about policy and legislative measures that had recently been put in place, (or were about to be put in place), to ensure that the prison service was more in accord with International Standards. He described the move from the Ministry of the Interior to the Ministry of Justice two years ago; the new penal code which is due to come into effect in 2003 and the expected resultant decrease in the prison population; the ending of amnesties; the expected increase in financing for the next financial year; and the closing of the grossly inadequate buildings of the Vilnius Strong Regime Colony. Whilst none of these major changes can be attributed directly to the twinning programme, it is clearly indicative that the activities and the results from the twinning programme are taking place within an overall framework of legislative and policy reform to meet international standards.

The National Director and the Prison Directors whom we met, all emphasised two very important results of the twinning programme. The first related to the change in attitude of staff towards prisoners and the subsequent improvement of prisoner/staff relationships, and the essential training of staff in relation to the management and treatment of drugs and HIV in prisons. Throughout our visits we were given examples, and observed the positive impact, of greater professionalism of staff and the more humane approach of staff towards prisoners. The failure to effectively manage the drug and HIV problem at Alytus has been a hard lesson in learning that prisons have to get the right balance between security, control and justice – i.e., a more humane approach to prisoners does not mean that good security should be forgotten.

The beginning of the twinning in 1998 corresponded with the planning for the opening of the training centre for prison staff in Vilnius in November 1999. The twinning with the training centre at Norrköping maximised the benefit of this timing. We were impressed with the information that we were given by the Director, Mr Demitrij Usik. It was very clear from his description of the activities that the staff at the training college have learned a lot in terms of process, curriculum content, and teaching methods from their contact with the training college at Norrköping. There have been active and constructive exchanges of ideas, materials, and training of staff during the preparation for the first course in November 1999, and a continuing exchange of more specialised subjects such as drugs and

HIV, and the cognitive skills programme. We were shown the practical assistance in terms of furnishings and equipment that had been supplied by the Swedes to support the college. It was also clear that the personal contact between Demitrij Usik and his counterpart in Norrköping (they both speak English), has enabled exchanges to take place between activities. The biggest changes in the training approach have been in relation to attitude towards prisoners, a change to a social work approach from that of securing convictions, a reduction in the military training, and an increase in the psychological training. The training college concentrates on an initial foundation training course for staff. They have currently managed to train 330 of the 1250 supervisors in the system. They also provide short developmental training courses and training for the Correctional Inspectors.

It is clear from our discussions that the international standards set out in the European Prison Rules are a key part of the training programmes.

The Strong Regime and Pre-trial Colony in Vilnius is planned to be closed in the near future. It is housed in a former 17/18th Century monastery and clearly is not suited to be used as a prison, which it has been since the Second World War. One section of the prison has already been handed back recently to the Church and the plan is to continue this process until it is finally shut. Adjacent to the old prison a former hostel is being refurbished to house pre-trial prisoners. The Director, Mr A Maknickas, and his staff spoke enthusiastically about the benefits and the direct results from the twinning with KVM Tidaholm. Highlighted during our visit was the impact on staff attitude and staff/inmate relationships, the physical improvement of living conditions, (very well equipped small kitchens now exist adjacent to dormitories), added security through CCTV, and education for staff about drugs awareness and HIV. Drug testing equipment, ("ABBOTT"), had been introduced. During 2000 and 2001 real practical help had been received, e.g., an electric baking table, ventilation equipment, a polishing machine, a welding machine, kitchen equipment, hospital beds and clothing, and roofing materials. Clearly in a prison of this age and dilapidation such aid was essential.

The feedback from the Swedish side was that the twinning has been important as competence development for the Swedish staff, that language has been a barrier, that it is difficult to know what has really been achieved, and that on-job training has proven a very good activity.

We were shown the progress in the refurbishing of an old hostel in the new pre-trial prison. It was clear from walking around the institution that much of the learning from Sweden had been incorporated into the planning of this unit, particularly in terms of programme space for prisoners, and the smaller size of cells for 2/3 persons.

During our visit to the juvenile education and pre trial colony in Kaunas we were accompanied by the recently appointed Director and his Deputy. The latter was much more familiar with the twinning programme, as he had been involved in it since it began in 1998. Both expressed their enthusiasm for the programme and it became clear during the visit that the partnership was very active in delivering positive results, and that close relationships had been built up over the years between the staff.

The main results are the change in attitude of staff and improved staff/inmate relationships with the result of less violence and administrative offences within the institution. The cognitive skills courses are clearly the outstanding achievement.

We had the opportunity to spend an hour with a course being lead by two instructors in cognitive skills from Malmö. They were conducting a course for a group of 11 staff, to train them to train other staff to deliver cognitive skills courses to the juveniles in the institution. This was the next stage in an ongoing programme. Over the last year sixteen, 20-hour courses have been delivered to groups of juveniles. These programmes are recognised in a number of Western European and Northern

American countries and any prison in the West would be very pleased to be able to deliver that quantity of courses in one year.

Another result identified by the management and staff, and observed by us, was that the exchanges had involved all ranks and specialisms of staff so that the experiences and learning had been spread throughout the institution. The main topics related to selection and qualification of staff, effective communication amongst the staff and between staff and prisoners, developing occupation for prisoners, and developing secondary and vocational training programmes. Material support had been given in terms of laundry equipment, sewing machines, carpentry equipment, all of which we observed to be in productive use.

Our time was limited during the visit so we were not taken into the pre-trial detention centre because, we suspect, the major outcomes of the twinning have been in the colony rather than with the unconvicted. The fact it is still referred to as an “Isolator” (the Soviet description) led us to think there were limited advances there.

While there were many positives in the establishment, we were surprised at the very spartan and cold atmosphere of the boys’ dormitories which consisted only of beds neatly made up, but no other furniture, personal possessions, pictures or softening of the atmosphere. This did not match the statements about increased humanity and improved sensitivity to the dignity of the child. However this has to be balanced with the positive developments referred to above.

Within the Swedish prison service there are no juvenile prisons (they are managed by a different agency). As children clearly have different needs to adults, it is regrettable that staff who are trained to work with children in Sweden were not able to participate in this exchange.

The twinning programme between Marijampole Strong Regime Colony and KVM Göteborg H/F began at the end of 1999. The young Director had recently been appointed but we were accompanied by the long-standing Deputy Governor for Education, who had been the co-ordinator for the twinning programme. Since the individual contract was signed, there has been a very active exchange between the two prisons.

It is clear from examining the activities that have taken place, that there has been an impact on the staff in terms of understanding and practising different approaches to prisoners. The staff here were prepared to critique Sweden’s approach and felt they put more essential emphasis on the responsibilities of prisoners as well as the rights of prisoners.

An incident a few months ago, when prisoners refused to obey, suggested that there is still much work to be done re staff/prisoner relationships and that a hierarchical relationship between management and staff is still there.

Marijampole had clearly received a lot of assistance in terms of reconstructing toilet and bathing facilities and receiving assistance in the medical area and with computers. This was the only area where we came across donated equipment not being able to be used, i.e. the dentist chair. (The Governor was looking forward to the new unit at Göteborg being opened as there was a lot of material in the old buildings that they could use.)

The content of the exchanges has included staff training in hostage negotiation, employment of prisoners, preparation for release, probation service, the use of NGO’s, and drug/HIV and cognitive skills programmes. It is clear that all this information has been received with great enthusiasm within Marijampole, but it was not so clear during our brief visit how much of it had actually had direct

results, other than the material support which had been given and the clear impact on the thinking of the management and their aspirations for change.

The twinning between Pravieniskes General Regime Colony and KVM Göteborg Centrum began formally in March 2000. We met the new acting Director, along with his two Deputies for Security & Surveillance and Education. There was very clear evidence of great enthusiasm for the twinning, with photographs and gifts from Sweden very much on view and in a central place within the boardroom. The personal contacts that had been established through both social and professional exchanges have clearly been successful in introducing changes in the prison.

Four major impacts were identified: the improvement in staff/inmate relationships was the most important, the training of staff about drug awareness and HIV, assistance with security issues, (cameras and searching), and the material aid that has been given, including a fax machine which has proven invaluable. However, it was very evident from the written material we have been given and from the way the staff spoke to us, that many other topics have been addressed during the exchanges. We observed during our visit the CCTV cameras working effectively, the excellent improvement in the refurbishing of the housing units, the upgrading of the punishment units, (including new cell doors built to a Swedish specification), which improved both humanity and security aspects. A drug-free unit for prisoners has been established, based on a Swedish model. A carpentry workshop has been established using machinery from a Swedish businessman, the links with whom came about through the twinning. The Swedish side identified the development of probation as central to future cooperation.

We paid a brief visit to the Lukiskiu Pre-Trial and Closed Prison. This prison did not appear to be part of the twinning programme contract and during our visit it was not clear to us whether or not it had begun a twinning arrangement or was about to begin a twinning arrangement. We were later informed by the Swedish side that it is part of the twinning project. However what was very evident was that the senior staff knew all about the twinning and had visited Sweden. In particular, the Director had significantly changed the quality of life for life sentence prisoners. Whilst contact between life sentence prisoners was still restricted by law, the Director had made every effort to enable life sentence prisoners to constructively and productively occupy themselves in their cells. He had also made efforts on a small scale to enable life sentence prisoners to mix with each other. Compared with our experiences in other former Soviet countries, conditions and attitudes towards life sentence prisoners are now moving towards international standards far more than elsewhere.

We also took the opportunity to visit the small women's pre-trial section. They were being held in a depressing room in a converted workshop. Our impression was that the women were the poor relations of the establishment. However, the female staff to whom we talked clearly were sensitive to the prisoners' needs and were responding to a very distressed person who had just returned from court. We observed a male guard, unaccompanied by a female, sitting directly outside the cell door of a high security female prisoner supervising her. This caused us to query why a female member of staff could not carry out that role, and management's respect for the female prisoner's privacy. (We were very surprised to encounter a large party of some thirty, 16–17 year old school children who were being given a tour of the prison. Apparently the philosophy is to acquaint school children of the conditions in prisons as a deterrent).

We visited the Head of Development Assistance Division, Gediminas Levickas, in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Lithuania. It was explained to us that the role of the Ministry was to focus on issues most important to the EU accession, and therefore to ensure co-ordination of bi-lateral agreements so there is no overlap. The prison twinning programme between Sweden and Lithuania had, from their perspective, been a great success and all the feedback on it had been highly positive.

We visited the Prisoners' Aid Association. We were shown around the complex by the Director, Jonas Stasinskas. The premises, which have been provided by the Catholic church and renovated by former prisoners is an extremely impressive resource. With grants from OSI, it has all the facilities of a day centre with workshops, interview rooms, overnight rooms, etc.. Any NGO working with former prisoners anywhere in the world would be most grateful for the facilities. However, it is clearly under-used by the prison authorities and illustrative of the need to build up greater integration of the work of the governmental agencies and non-governmental agencies.

The general framework of objectives is set out in the contracts between the national prison administrations, and the activities that we learned about taking place in the colonies are within that contract. However, almost everywhere we visited in Lithuania, the next activity was not planned until the end of the current activity. We have described the positive results, but there is little annual planning of the results that they wish to achieve in that year.

7 Findings

7.1 Relevance of the programme objectives

In the majority of documents received relating to the three twinning programmes, the overall objective is stated as:

“One main goal for the Swedish co-operation with the Baltic countries is to deepen the democratic culture. An important element of a democracy is to have well-functioning State institutions for upholding the rule of law and the respect for human rights.”

Some of the documents we studied had a different overall objective. However, it is fair to say that the one given above is relevant and clearly accords with the policies of the EU, Sweden and the Baltic countries.

Within that overall objective, a framework of objectives was agreed between the respective Ministries of Justice for each of the partnerships between Sweden and the three Baltic countries in each of the years between 1998–2002. The framework of objectives differed from country to country but were drawn from the principles of the European Prison Rules, and from the findings and recommendations of the Council of Europe reports into the prison systems of the Baltic countries written as part of the “Nord-Balt Prison Project”. As the projects developed, so the needs for the countries became more clearly identified and the annual framework of objectives modified accordingly. The objectives for each country partnership mirrored one another much more recently. Nevertheless, there were specific country needs addressed.

Each twinning partnership developed activities within the agreed framework. Thus, each twinning partnership was not expected to achieve every objective set in the contract but, rather, to ensure that the activities and results were within that framework of objectives.

Our assessment is that the framework of objectives was completely relevant to the needs of the countries to meet the overall objective, and that all the activities that we learned about were within that framework.

In our interviews with key staff in the Baltic countries, the general pattern seemed to be that at the end of each twinning activity a decision would be made by the Prison Directors as to the content of the next activity. Although the results of these activities have clearly been positive, we welcome the initiative this year in Estonia for an annual programme to be drawn up for each twinning partnership and agreed by the Prison Directors at the beginning of the year. This gives a much clearer set of local objectives and plans against which to measure results.

There has been a clear advantage in this approach. Allowing the twinning prisons to develop specific activities within a broad framework gives them the flexibility to respond to needs as they arise and are identified. The particular example is the growth of drugs and HIV problems within the prisons in the Baltic countries. The rate of growth could hardly have been predicted when setting out the objectives in 1998/9, but as the framework allowed for flexibility the twinning programmes were able to respond very rapidly to the need when it arose in the years 2000–2002.

The main target groups of the twinning are the prisoners and the staff. During the early years of the twinning, priority had been given towards improving prisoner conditions. However from 1998, the emphasis was changed to training staff, changing their attitudes and improving management. In turn,

there has been improvement in the treatment of the prisoners in accordance with International standards.

7.2 Effectiveness

In the visits we made to the prisons involved in the programme, we were able to hear about and observe specific results from the twinning activities. For the reasons explained in the previous section, it is difficult to measure results against specific objectives because of the flexible setting of the objectives. However, other than the Staff Training College in Latvia, we were impressed by the results of all the twinning partnerships.

The country reviews in the previous sections explain the details of our visits. We are satisfied that these visits were a fair representation of the prisons and training colleges involved in the twinning. In Estonia, because of the state of change between old and new partnerships, that between Tallinn and Hall is the only one against which we could measure results directly, although this does not invalidate our wider evaluation there.

The consistent and major objective of the twinning programmes was to change the attitude and behaviour of staff towards prisoners, to treat prisoners with humanity and dignity, and improve the relationships between staff and prisoners. Without fail, this was perceived by every person we spoke to in the Baltic countries as a major change and result of the project. On such short visits, it was difficult to assess the depth of change. However, the consistency with which it was reported, the strength of the feeling expressed about it by the managers of the institutions, and our limited observations, make us confident that this has been a major result of this project. Our own knowledge and experience of the former Soviet prison system enables us to observe that there is a significant change in the way prison staff at all levels are being trained, and are behaving towards prisoners. These improvements are in accord with the philosophy of the European Prison Rules.

Other activities and results varied from one twinning partnership to another. Of particular significance has been the education and training of prison staff in relation to drug abuse amongst prisoners and the spread of HIV in prisons. These have been problems that were relatively minor when the projects began and have grown to be a major problem now. The flexibility of the projects has enabled the Swedish twinning partner to respond to the real need of the Baltic partner. Through the twinning methodology of visiting Sweden, observing methods, exchanges of training materials, and training seminars for staff in the Baltic countries, there has been direct assistance in the management of these problems through improvement in both security and treatment.

Another example of a very positive result was the introduction of the Contact Officers in Tallinn Prison as a result of the twinning with Hall Prison. We were able to observe the work of one of these Officers in the pre-trial section of the prison. The management and staff had learned directly about the principles of the contact person system in Sweden and transferred those principles to a model that can be delivered within the resources of Tallinn Prison. The Contact Officer scheme is also being introduced into other prisons.

An example of an impressive result of the twinning in Lithuania was our observation of a “Training for Trainers” course being run by two members of staff from Malmö in Sweden for a group of staff in Kaunas Juvenile Pre-trial and Educational Colony. This was a development from the highly successful training of Lithuanian staff to deliver cognitive skills courses to the juvenile prisoners. In the previous year, sixteen 20-hour courses had been delivered within the colony. These courses are recognised and run within Western European and North American countries, and, by any standard, the delivery within this prison is of the highest order.

In Cesu Juvenile Prison in Latvia, we observed the improvement in the vocational training and education that has resulted from the twinning. There had been practical assistance in the form of machinery from the Swedes, but, more importantly, the workshops and education programmes had been developed to improve the boys' preparation for their return to the community.

We have highlighted above some examples of the positive results of the projects. It is difficult to give an exhaustive list in this short evaluation, but worthy of mention amongst other positive results have been training staff for "debriefing" after serious incidents, implementation of a variety of procedures and techniques for improving security and control, improvement of curricula and teaching methods in the staff training Colleges, improvement of living conditions for prisoners and hygiene standards, training in IT for staff and prisoners, etc..

Another element of the project was to provide material support where relevant. In each of the establishments we visited, there was evidence of such support, and, mostly, effective use of it. In particular, furnishings, machinery for vocational training/workshops, computers for both staff and prisoner use, vehicles, staff training equipment, kitchen equipment, and ventilation equipment. Our assessment is that the donation of this equipment was an important support to the training of staff and the exchange of ideas that we have previously described. It was clear that the recipients were most grateful for this material support, but saw it very much within the context of assisting them in their change of approach towards prisoners and not as the main element of the exchange.

An essential element of the methodology of the programmes is to establish trust, understanding and friendships between the partners. We believe that this was the correct approach and was key in the main objective of changing the values of the prison staff, and thus, in turn, their attitude and behaviour towards prisoners. At the start of the projects, priority was given to achieving this. It took a substantial time to build up, but our assessment is that such investment was essential and valuable to the project. We were told of several examples where the Directors of the twinning prisons contacted each other between activities, although there were other examples where the language difference made this very difficult. However, there was clearly an overall result of a great deal of trust and friendship between the partners. Most activities included social events, and some activities were solely social events. While direct results may be difficult to measure from such activities, we were satisfied that through such events, there was greater trust and understanding of one another, and greater understanding of the value system, ethos and social context in which staff employed in the prison administration should work.

7.3 Sustainability

With only one exception, everyone with whom we met and discussed the projects was committed to the twinning programme. There was not one dissenting voice or doubting voice about the value of the programme. All the messages, from junior staff through to senior prison officials, from Government Offices, and from the Embassies, gave very positive feedback consistently.

Our assessment is that the great majority of the improvements and changes that have occurred as a direct or indirect result of the twinning programmes should be able to be sustained. The majority of these improvements and changes have been achieved largely within the current resources of those prisons. Most have received some material support from the twinning partner in Sweden, but this has been "supportive" rather than central to the results. There may be problems in the future, depending on whether or not those material standards can be maintained. However, there is now an expectation amongst the Ministry officials, prison management and staff that these are the standards that are required, so our belief is that these higher standards are the ones which the prison system will wish to maintain or better and will not wish to be reduced. However, several senior officials on both sides of the

twinning programmes expressed doubts concerning sustainability without the continuation of the partnership with Sweden and other countries.

One of the limitations of the twinning programme is that the objectives did not include dissemination of results to other prisons not involved in the project, and to Headquarters' policy. Thus, sustainability in the wider context, we think, is variable from country to country. In Latvia and Estonia, the National Directors were very closely involved in the projects, and the results of the projects have clearly influenced policy in legislative change, and have been disseminated to other prisons. In Lithuania, the previous National Director saw this as local initiatives and there was limited evidence of dissemination or impact on central policy. However, the new National Director, who was previously the Director of a prison involved in the twinning, may well change this perspective.

We spoke to the National Directors of the Prison Services in all three countries. Clearly, the major item on the agenda of each of these countries is membership of the EU. There is a powerful recognition that managing prisons in accordance with European Prison Rules and International Standards on the management of prisons has to be the goal for prison administrations as their contribution to their governments' quest for membership. There is a clear recognition that the contributions from Sweden, as well as Norway, Finland and Denmark, in giving support to improve those standards is of central importance to them. Thus, there is no question that there is commitment at a political level.

There is evidence in Estonia and in Latvia that there is going to be an increase in expenditure within their prison systems in the next financial year, compared with this year. The investment in the new prison in Tartu in Estonia is indicative of that country's desire to meet international standards with financial investment. In all the countries there is financial investment in upgrading the physical conditions for prisoners. In Estonia there is a salary rise planned for prison staff, which is very important in their quest to recruit appropriate staff and prevent the current very high turnover of staff. In Latvia, we were told that the budget is to be increased back up to the level of three years ago.

There is no doubt that the twinning partnerships stimulate consistently the managers and staff in the Baltic countries to improve standards and create positive change in their prisons. They recognise the value of this, and all with whom we spoke wanted the programme to continue and develop. It may be that there is an anxiety with some that without the stimulation, progress will be slower and more difficult to maintain. We shared their belief that the continuation of the programme would help ensure long term sustainability.

7.4 Efficiency

We comment about not using all the financial resources available in para 8.2 below. The results of the twinning programme that we have described in preceding paragraphs have come from the expenditure of 14,500,000 SEK between January 1998 and November 2002. (see para 3.5). In our experience this is good "value for money". To have achieved these results in 3 different countries over a period of over 4 years with that amount of money is very worthwhile. We doubt if another approach could have achieved an equal amount with a similar budget.

A significant aspect of the budget is that given for salary of Swedish prison staff. This is clearly a significant contribution to supporting the twinning programme within the Swedish Prison and Probation Service. It clearly contributes to enabling the release of staff to participate in activities, particularly those in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Our understanding is that for such twinning programmes, (developed like these, from the Council of Europe), it is unusual for the government to give additional funds for compensation, i.e., any time given by staff comes from the budget country's

prison service. This contribution to salary is a significant boost to the twinning arrangement. On the other hand, the fact that there is no significant contribution to either party from their own funds, suggests rigorous analysis of the value of the results has not been deemed necessary.

7.5 Gender aspects

All prisons throughout the world are male dominated and the Baltic countries are no different. Typically only 4–6% of the prison population of any country are female. It has to be remembered that issues of equality of opportunity and special needs for women within the prison service, (whether staff or prisoners), have only been addressed relatively recently in Western European countries. Thus, it is hardly surprising that we found a relatively conservative approach generally within the Baltic countries. Having said that, we also found evidence to show that gender issues are beginning to be addressed.

In relation to prisoners, there is a twinning of prisons for women between Ilguciema in Latvia and KVM Hinseberg in Sweden. (There is only one female prison in Sweden). Whilst within that specific twinning the special needs of women in prison are being addressed, we were not aware of any other specific gender issues which formed the basis of an activity in the other twinning partnerships.

In several of the male prisons we visited there was a small section for women. Whilst they were housed separately, in accordance with International Standards, ideally they should be held in a separate institution. In one prison, they were held in a converted workshop, which is illustrative of the problems that a small minority group who have to be kept separate encounter i.e. they have poorer facilities.

The employment of women to fulfil security roles directly supervising male prisoners is one measure of equal treatment of women in a system. Practice varied from country to country but we were particularly impressed in the new Tartu Prison in Estonia where we observed newly-recruited women supervisors carrying out duties which brought them into direct contact with prisoners in the housing units. We were told that 30% of the uniformed staff were female. Elsewhere in prisons in Estonia we observed the same practice. Our observations in Lithuania and Latvia revealed a much more conservative approach towards women carrying out security functions within the prison. There were many teachers, psychologists, social workers and perimeter guards who were female, but there appears to be still a largely traditional view of women not working directly with prisoners in the housing units. We were not informed of any activity in the twinning programmes that specifically addressed this issue.

Accepting the limitations of our assessment, our overall conclusion is that gender awareness has not been a high priority for the projects, but that there is a gradual and significant improvement in the area, and that this is a policy issue that can be developed in future twinning activities.

8 Methodology

8.1 Twinning

(a) *General.* Twinning is considered to offer enhanced possibilities for organizational learning and sustainable capacity building in contrast to traditional technical assistance, e.g. use of short-term or long-term experts. The institutions describe the twinning in other terms, though. They regard as the main features of twinning the mutual trust and understanding which are created but also its long-term character. They generally claim that the twinning as a method has been most helpful. We agree; it has worked well. We also find the decision to concentrate initially on building up professional understanding, mutual trust, and friendship justified. The investment has to be made in creating the relationships on which activities can be built and changes implemented. Often it has been because of trust and personal relationships that practical changes of policy have occurred within the prisons.

(b) *Dissemination.* A disadvantage of the twinning has been the insufficient dissemination to other institutions and use of the knowledge in those institutions (spread of “best practice”). This is so with respect to the policy level in two of the countries but also, and still more so, the prisons which are not twinned. Nor have we found much exchange of knowledge with institutions that are twinned with other Nordic prisons. We have also noted that the training centres in a limited way are used for dissemination of the experience and knowledge gained in the cooperation. It is true that formal teaching cannot replace on the spot learning but it should be possible to transfer more knowledge in the courses of the training centres than is now the case. We have also found that the dissemination of knowledge within prisons that are part of the twinning could be more active, even though there are many fine exceptions.

Reasons for the failure to share knowledge and experience with others may be a lack of incentives to do so and the fact that not all members of staff who have participated have the ability to instruct their colleagues. It should also be kept in mind that several prisons are involved in twinning with other Nordic countries and for this reason probably are less interested in other twinning arrangements.

(c) *Institutional capacity.* Twinning is meant to be a form of institutional capacity building. Nonetheless, it has proven that the cooperation often becomes dependent on a few key persons. A consequence has been a temporary stand-still in at least one case of change of directors. This is a sign that the cooperation should be designed in a way to reduce such dependence on one or two persons, but it also demonstrates that twinning not necessarily differs from traditional technical assistance. The twinning may also centre for a long time around one or two key persons who come to regard the cooperation as “theirs”. It might create a lack of renewal and of incentive to disseminate best practice to other institutions.

A general observation is that the representatives of the twinned institutions in all three Baltic States are doers rather than theorizers. They accomplish quite a lot but have difficulties to report what they do and to explain what they do. Such an approach has its obvious advantages – things are being done – but knowledge is not systemized and institutionalised in a satisfactory way to the detriment of building a sustainable capacity of the prison concerned. Also the informal way of making decisions – with a recent exception in Estonia – reduces the institutionalisation of knowledge.

(d) *Work methods.* The long-term cooperation has made it possible to use a variety of methods, most of them or all of very suitable as far as we can judge. Examples are study visits, formal teaching and some on the job-training. Various working methods have been introduced such as Problem Based Learning and methods for problem solving.

Some interviewees would have liked to have more on the job training, although we understand that the language barrier and other reasons may make such training difficult to arrange. We also think that it would have been useful to have more visits to Sweden (they have been more frequent in the opposite direction).

(e) *The personal relationship.* It is generally stressed that the twinning creates personal relationships of great value. The closeness varies of course. There are examples of personal relationships which facilitate informal contacts between the visits while in other instances there are no contacts between the formal visits. Anyway, a good feature of the twinning is that it brings together in direct contact also staff at a low level.

Does twinning as a method go contrary to bringing up sensitive issues, e. g. corruption (which has not been an issue dealt with)? We do not know. On the one hand, nobody would like to damage the good atmosphere. On the other, the mutual confidence of the parties may be a good basis precisely for bringing up sensitive issues.

(f) *Exchange.* Twinning is a dual exercise. It is obvious that also the “donor side” has learnt from the co-operation. Examples are that Swedish members of staff have become more familiar with human rights standards, that they have developed their competence and become aware of the commonality of problems. In some instances Swedish staff have learnt concrete things, such as dealing with women prisoners with small children, sports and social activities. Swedish staff have also learnt how a small staff can handle a big prison population and do without a wide range of technical means.

(g) *Used material.* It is well known that isolated supplies of (used) material are a difficult type of support. Lack of spare parts and maintenance capacity is one fallacy, another that the material does not fit into the facilities and a third one that there is no genuine need for what happens to be available in terms of used material. Nonetheless, we are fairly confident that most of the material support has proven to be valuable in this case. The twinning arrangement has made it possible to assess what is needed and what can be used. So, the programmes, by and large, have managed to balance the intellectual part and the material assistance.

8.2 Decision making and planning

The planning has been highly facilitated by the fact there is a common ground for the cooperation, that is the European Prison Rules, the reports of the Council of Europe, various human rights instruments etc. Thanks to these documents planning of the cooperation has been comparatively easy; the general direction of the cooperation has had its clear prerequisites.

There are agreements on the cooperation at the national level which are rather general in the sense that objectives are wide and that activities mentioned are examples. In reality, almost no possible activities are excluded by the agreements. There are also Nord-Balt Steering Committee meetings taking place every year – under the chairmanship of Council of Europe – which are very useful for exchanging experiences and ideas. The specific content of the various twinning arrangements is decided by the twinned institutions, in most cases in an informal way without any agreement in writing. The substance of the cooperation is in other words decided in a rather decentralized and informal way, the annual activity plan in Estonia being a recent exception.

As pointed out above, the mode of work has allowed for a high degree of *flexibility*. An example is that measures against the spread of drug abuse and HIV could be incorporated into the co-operation even though this was not foreseen at the time of the planning. As hinted above, a drawback may be a lack of structure of the cooperation which results in arbitrariness and difficulties to measure what is accomplished.

As mentioned above (3.5) there is a considerable discrepancy between the financial means made available by Sida and the use of the funds. About one third of the means have not been used but have been “returned” to Sida. There seems to be a planning problem that explains this failure to use the funds, since directors we have met would have liked to have more resources at their disposition. The participants did not have a full view the funding arrangements and figures.

The role of the funding agency, Sida, in the decision making (and other matters such as monitoring) seems to be unclear to some of the actors involved. We do not think that this is harmful to the co-operation. But it would be helpful if Sida would explain its role as clearly as possible.

8.3 Co-ordination

For several reasons coordination has not caused any major problems. The Nord-Balt project has laid down a clear framework for the cooperation, including a distribution of the twinning arrangements between countries on both sides. The annual meetings of the Nord-Balt Steering Committee are a means for coordination at a policy level and for exchange of experiences. The continued participation over the years of a number of the same key persons has also been very helpful. The central development authorities have had an overview of the activities and have approved the agreements with Sweden. No overlapping has occurred. Other countries offering cooperation in this field are very few, Canada being the major exception, working primarily with juvenile justice on the policy level. Nor have there been any problems of coordination within the countries. Each twinning cooperation has had its own life.

8.4 Monitoring and reporting

It does not seem to be quite clear who is in charge of the monitoring of the co-operation. The best instances for this task are the central prison authorities, that is in Sweden the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration and in the Baltic States the Central Prison Administrations. This distribution of responsibility has worked in Estonia and Latvia whereas the involvement of the central administration in Lithuania has been weak.

There have been few, if any, efforts to measure progress in a systematic way. There are for instance no indicators elaborated to establish whether results are reasonable or to measure whether objectives are met. It should be a task for Sida to encourage twinning institutions to discuss possible indicators. Such indicators reduce arbitrariness in assessing the progress and forces the institutions to reflect on the effectiveness and efficiency of the cooperation. It would also facilitate for Sida – that now has limited knowledge about the development – to follow the programmes.

The reporting has mainly been a matter for the Swedish side. The twinning institutions in the Baltic States have not written reports. Their contribution has been oral reports to the central administration of their respective countries. This mode of work has reduced their administrative workload but also reduced their involvement and not forced the institutions to reflect on factors of success or to systemize their knowledge.

8.5 Local ownership

Local ownership – to some degree national ownership – is of importance for several reasons. It is inter alia a means to ensure the relevance of the cooperation and of the sustainability of results and activities. The picture of the local ownership is mixed.

- (a) The commitment at the political level in the Baltic States to allocating funds to the prison system is not high. On the other hand, we feel convinced that several objectives of the twinning cooperation meet with full acceptance, such as humanizing the prisons, finding alternatives to imprisonment etc.
- (b) The initiative has rested with the Swedish side who has proposed areas of work, ways to organize the co-operation and so forth. But this is not to say that the co-operation has been supply-driven. The needs and problems of the Baltic institutions have been fed into the co-operation which makes the cooperation demand-oriented in a satisfactory way.
- (c) Local costs have been covered by the Baltic institutions to a degree that is much lower than desired, the reasons being that the Baltic institutions have not received funding for the twinning from their States and have not been pushed by Sida to contribute. The small contribution of the Baltic partners tends to move the initiative to the Swedish side. It reduces the degree of partnership and has also negative repercussions on the sustainability of the co-operation and its results.
- (d) The Swedish side controls the budget. No director on the Baltic side that we met had seen the budget for its twinning cooperation or had any idea of the magnitude of the budget or its break-down on sub-items.
- (e) As was mentioned reporting has been a matter for the Swedish part, basically SPPA. The limited participation of the Baltic twinning institutions reduces their ownership of the cooperation.

Summing up, the Baltic twinning institutions' ownership of the cooperation has its limitations, more so than is a consequence of the fact that the Swedish side is funding the activities. In addition, the SPPA makes no budgetary sacrifices since Sida fully covers its costs. A consequence is that neither side has sufficient interest to bring the cooperation to an end even if the results are not satisfying. There are limited reasons as well to think about "value for money". The limited ownership has, however, not had negative effects of significance on the relevance of the activities but there is evidence of a lack of sustainability and it is difficult to assess the cost efficiency.

9 Conclusions and Recommendations

9.1 General conclusions

We find that the co-operation over-all has been very successful. As we have pointed out repeatedly, a number of important results have been obtained, for instance significant change in attitude and behaviour of staff towards prisoners and of management towards staff; more humane treatment of prisoners; training of staff in relation to drug abuse and the spread of HIV; informal contacts between management in various countries; provision of material that is effectively used etc. One area, though, where the speed of progress has been limited is the development of alternatives to imprisonment.

Over-all we find that the objectives of the programmes have been highly relevant and that they have been met. We also think that the resources have been used in a reasonably efficient way, as far as we have been able to judge.

The only part that we find partly doubtful is the sustainability of activities and results after the Sida funding has come to an end. It is well known that also successful twinning programmes, which produce good benefits in professional and technical development, often have unsatisfactory outcomes at the level of sustainable institutional capacity building. In this case we have some doubts that there is sufficient preparedness and domestic capacity to ensure the sustainability without continued external contacts and other types of international cooperation.

9.2 The future

As we understand it the Sida funding of the twinning cooperation will come to an end when the Baltic States accede the European Union, that is on 1st of May 2004. We find it important that international cooperation can continue at a minimum budgetary level and that also other measures by the Baltic institutions are taken in order to sustain and develop the activities and results of the twinning programmes. Hence, there is need for a *strategy* for the future. We think that such strategy should be elaborated by the prison administrations themselves in the Baltic States and Sweden, but we will offer some suggestions.

The Baltic States should

- (a) strengthen the *sustainability* of ongoing activities and results. One way of doing so would be to improve the dissemination of knowledge and experience of the twinning cooperation (spread of “best practice”) within the whole system in each Baltic country. The staff training centres should play a role in this area of work;
- (b) appropriate *budgetary means* necessary to finance some activities of external cooperation, for instance for travel to other countries that is necessary to maintain an international cooperation;
- (c) reinforce the capacity to manage aid resources from EU, that is the administrative capacity to design and implement EU-funded projects of use to the prison and probation system, including funding of non-governmental organizations that carry out work in this area;
- (d) involve *non-governmental organizations* complementary to the State. Such organizations are well equipped to deal with pre-release preparation, aid to newly released persons (work training, studies, social contacts, food etc) and other tasks. They can perform some of these tasks better than State institutions and may also have the possibility to raise money in addition to the State budget;

- (e) develop *tools* for cooperation that work on a low-budget basis. Internet communication and e-learning are tools that could be used in efforts that are joint for all three Baltic States; and
- (f) prepare for a *transition* to a regular international cooperation concerning prison and probation.

9.3 2003

We recommend Sida funding at the present financial level during the next year (2003). A reason to continue the cooperation is not only that it has had good results but also that the Progress Reports of the EU Commission point at the justice sector – for instance the magnitude of pre-trial detainees – as one of the weakest of the Baltic candidate countries. In addition, there are several twinning arrangements of recent date (Maardu, Tartu and Lukiskes), which must have a chance to develop.

With regard to the content of the cooperation in 2003 there are many needs to meet and, hence, many areas of activities that deserve attention. Examples are prevention and combat of drugs; prevention and combat of HIV; probation and other alternatives to imprisonment; prison management; and material. As has been the case in the past, every twinning arrangement should be fairly free to determine the content of its own cooperation. This decentralised way of decision-making is a way to ensure a high degree of relevance of the activities. But there could also be some elements of cooperation at the policy level that could be continued in the future. A possible topic could be attitudes of the general public towards prisoners and ex-prisoners.

In addition to the continuation of such activities we recommend that the elaboration and implementation of the strategy for the future starts as soon as possible. We find it reasonable that part of the funding available for 2003 be used for the kind of strategic activities that were mentioned above (9.2). In this way the last period of Sida funding will be used to lay the basis for continued cooperation on a low budget basis.

9.4 After 2003

As already stressed, we find it important that some kind of cooperation can continue also after the date of the Baltic States' accession to the European Union. Otherwise much of what has been created may be lost. It should be kept in mind that several activities do not require much funding. Examples are legislative work to create alternatives to imprisonment, dissemination of best practice through out the prison system of each of the countries involved, methodological development including increased awareness of gender aspects and supply of used material. Also some on-job training of Baltic staff in Sweden would be appreciated. A continuation is, however, conditioned on the strategy suggested above.

Such a strategy may pave the way for the *transition* to a regular, non-subsidized cooperation with other countries and also between the Baltic States themselves. We want to point out that these States must be prepared to make modest contributions of their own for the regular international cooperation. Such contributions may have considerable impact since they make possible informal contacts, visits, e-mail counselling and e-learning, transport of used material etc. It should be a natural thing in the future for Baltic prisons to have exchange with neighbouring countries. Such activities, even though sporadic, are already going on, for instance with Poland and Russia. In addition, it could be beneficial for SPPA to include prison management from the Baltic States in future international cooperation with other States in eastern Europe.

Whilst many Swedish authorities have a self-interest in cooperating with their Baltic counterparts, e.g. police and customs, the interests of Kriminalvårdsstyrelsen (SPPA) are less pronounced but, nonetheless, we find it justified for SPPA to allocate some budgetary means for a regular cooperation in the future, i.a. allowing for a continuation of some of the activities that are now funded by Sida.

Annex 1

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the Swedish Bilateral Assistance in the Field of Prison and Probation

1 Background

The development co-operation with the Baltic States within the field of Justice and Home Affairs was initiated in 1991. The major part of the co-operation has been implemented through the Swedish National Police Board and the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration.

Swedish development co-operation with the Baltic States is guided by country strategies. In December 2001, Sida presented proposals for country strategies for the period 2002–2004 to the Swedish Government. The new strategies are to be established in June 2002. As from 1998, Swedish co-operation with the Baltic States in the field of Justice and Home Affairs (including other sources of financing than Sida), has been based on bilateral agreements between the Ministry of Justice of Sweden and the Ministries of Justice and Interior of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Between 1998–2001, action plans and guidelines accompanied the agreements. The projects were then assessed and financed by Sida. New governmental agreements for the period 2002–2003 were signed in January 2002.

Swedish bilateral development co-operation with the Baltic States will be phased out as the countries become members of the European Union. A gradual transition to a regular co-operation between neighbouring states is foreseen.

The Swedish Prison and Probation Administration has co-operated with the Prison Administrations of the Baltic States since the mid 1990-ies. In February 1995, on the initiative of the Swedish government, agreements on legal assistance were reached between, on the one hand, the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian Ministries of Justice, National Courts, Prosecutor Generals and Prison and Probation Administrations, and on the other hand, the Swedish National Courts Administration, the Swedish Prosecutor General and the Swedish National Prison and Probation Administration. During autumn 1995 there were draft agreements on co-operation between the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration and the Prison Administrations of the Baltic States. Until the end of 1997, the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration mainly financed the co-operation. Thereafter the activities have been financed by Sida.

In 1996, the Council of Europe initiated a regional co-operation project between the Nordic and the Baltic countries called the *Nord-Balt Prison Project*. The main part of the activities is financed by bilateral co-operation projects of each Nordic country. Within the Nord-Balt Prison Project, an allocation of priorities among the Nordic countries with regard to the support rendered to the Baltic countries has been agreed upon. Sweden was to continue its activities in Estonia and Latvia without extending the scope of the activities, and prioritise Lithuania when comes to support in the penitentiary field.

Twinning between Swedish and Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian establishments has been the main method for co-operation. This has been recommended by the Council of Europe. The support has gradually developed from financing of separate twin co-operations between Swedish and Baltic prisons, to financing of co-operation programmes, including support to the establishment of Prison Service Training Centres in Latvia and Lithuania and ad hoc assistance on the central level. The co-operation is based on recommendations of the Council of Europe. The aim is to support the Baltic Prison Administrations in bringing the Prison Services in conformity with international standards, especially

the European Prison Rules. Adapting the prison conditions to these requirements is important from an Human Rights perspective as well as the process of EU-alignment. Approximately SEK 22 721 800 has been allocated by Sida 1997–2002 to development co-operation with the Baltic States in the field of prison and probation.

In conjunction with the phasing out of the Swedish bilateral assistance to the Baltic countries as the countries become members of the European Union, it is deemed timely to conduct an evaluation of the support provided, to serve as an input as regards content and form of a strategic continued support during the year 2003.

2 Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is:

- to assess relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, local ownership, cost-efficiency and methods of the Swedish support to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania within the field of prison and probation financed by Sida.
- to make recommendations regarding content and form of a strategic continued development co-operation 2003 between the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration and the Prison Administrations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Scope of work

The evaluation shall cover the assignments carried out by the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration in the Baltic States as listed in annex 1.

3 The Assignment (Issues to be Covered in the Evaluation)

The evaluation shall:

- a) Assess the *relevance* of the co-operation in terms of needs and priorities of the recipients, the recommendations of the European Council, EU-alignment and the goals of the Swedish development co-operation with the Baltic States.
- b) Assess whether and to what extent the *objectives and goals* of the co-operation, as outlined in project plans and the goals of the Swedish development co-operation, have been achieved. Discuss the reasons for high or low achievements, with regard to administrative, organisational, financial and other factors within the Swedish as well as recipient institutions.
- c) Assess the *results* of the co-operation to date.
- d) Assess the *sustainability* of the projects as well as the transition to a regular operative co-operation.
- e) Assess the *local ownership* in the initiation, planning, implementation and follow-up phases of the projects. Discuss the consequences of high/low degree of local ownership on the projects and their effects.
- f) Discuss the *cost efficiency* of the projects to the extent possible. Discuss whether the same results could have been achieved with fewer resources or an alternative approach.
- g) Discuss how the *gender perspective* has been taken into account within the co-operation.
- h) Comment on the *co-ordination with other major donors* in this field.
- i) Discuss possible priorities and methods of co-operation for future Swedish bilateral support and make recommendations to changes regarding content and form, taking into consideration the foreseen phase out of development co-operation with the Baltic States and a transition to a regular co-operation between neighbouring states.

- j) Discuss the method of twin partners as a tool for development co-operation within the field of prison and probation.

4 Methodology, Evaluation Team and Time Schedule

Methodology

- Identification and study of relevant documentation in Sweden.
- Interviews with relevant actors in Sweden.
- Field visits in all three Baltic States and interviews with relevant actors.
- Completion of the written report and presentation of the findings to relevant parties.

Evaluation team

The evaluation team will consist of two persons, one experienced evaluator with good knowledge of Sida, and one expert with international experience of prison and probation issues.

Time schedule

The estimated time for the fulfilment of the assignment is 11 man-weeks. A draft report shall be presented to Sida no later than November 22, 2002.

Undertakings

The Consultant will be responsible for the practical arrangements in conjunction with international missions and other visits and meetings. Sida will make available written material considered to be of relevance to the evaluation by the Consultant and Sida. Responsible officer at Sida will inform the Swedish counterpart and the national authorities of the Baltic States of the forthcoming evaluation.

5 Reporting

The evaluation report shall be written in English and should not exceed 25 pages, excluding annexes. Format and outline of the report shall follow the guidelines in **Sida Evaluation Report – a Standardised Format** (see Annex 2). The draft report shall be submitted to Sida electronically and in 5 hard copies (air-/surface mailed or delivered) no later than November 22, 2002. Within 1 week after receiving Sida's comments on the draft report, a final version shall be submitted to Sida, again electronically and in 5 hard copies. The evaluation report must be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing. Subject to decision by Sida, the report will be published in the series *Sida Evaluations*.

The following enclosures shall be attached to the final report:

- Terms of reference
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documentation

The evaluation assignment includes the completion of **Sida Evaluations Data Work Sheet** (Annex 3), including an *Evaluation Abstract* (final section, G) as defined and required by DAC. The completed Data Worksheet shall be submitted to Sida along with the final version of the report. Failing a completed Data Worksheet, the report cannot be processed.

Annex:

1. List of project decisions in the field of prison and probation
2. Sida Evaluation Report – A Standardised Format
3. Sida Evaluation Data Work Sheet

Annex 1. List of project decisions – prison and probation co-operation

Country	Title	Decision no.	Agreed amount
Estonia	Twin Prison Co-op.	Öst 126/98	SEK 1 195 000
Estonia	Twin Prison Co-op.	Öst 420/99, 461/99	SEK 976 600
Estonia	Support in bringing the Estonian Prison system into conformity with European Standards 2000–2001	Öst 405/00, 252/01 (275/02)	SEK 1 672 000
Estonia	Support in bringing the Estonian Prison system into conformity with European Standards 2002	Öst 275/02	SEK 761 100
Latvia	Twin Prison Co-op.	Öst 7/98	SEK 2 185 300
Latvia	Twin Prison Co-op.	Öst 422/99, 460/99	SEK 1 618 000
Latvia	Support in bringing the Latvian Prison system into conformity with European Standards 2000–2001	Öst 404/00, 251/01, (276/02)	SEK 2 643 000
Latvia	Support in bringing the Latvian Prison system into conformity with European Standards 2002	Öst 276/02	SEK 850 000
Lithuania	Pre study	Öst 359/97	SEK 440 000
Lithuania	Twin Prison Co-op.	Öst 361/97	SEK 1 020 000
Lithuania	Support to Lithuanian Prison Training Centre	Öst 28/99	SEK 1 084 000
Lithuania	Twin Prison Co-op.	Öst 421/99	SEK 780 000
Lithuania	Twin Prison Co-op.	Öst 469/99	SEK 400 000
Lithuania	Twin Prison Co-op.	Öst 78/00	SEK 500 000
Lithuania	Pre study	Öst 79/00	SEK 241 800
Lithuania	Support in bringing the Lithuanian Prison system into conformity with European Standards 2000–2001	Öst 437/00, 253/01, (277/02)	SEK 4 993 000
Lithuania	Support in bringing the Lithuanian Prison system into conformity with European Standards 2002	Öst 277/02	SEK 1 362 000

Annex 2

Persons interviewed

Skirmantas Agurkis, National Prison Administration, Vilnius
Vytautas Aleknavicius, Colony of Normal Regime, Pravieniskės
Jurijs Baidaks, Colony for Juveniles, Cēsis
Antanas Baliukevicius, Colony of Strong regime, Marijampolė
Litija Bashlakova, Ilguciema Prison for Women, Riga
Thomas Bennedicks, Sida, Stockholm
Gintautas Binkulis, Colony of Normal Regime, Pravieniskės
Lars Bårdne, KVM Göteborg-Hisingen/Förorter (telephone)
Per Colliander, formerly with SPPA, Norrköping
Aleksandras Davidonis, Pre-Trial Prison, Lukiskės
Kerstin Egonsson-Larsson, KVM Hinseberg (telephone)
Maria Gärtner, Swedish Embassy, Riga
Irina Isajeva, Latvian Prison Administration, Riga
Algirdas Jakimonis, Colony of Normal Regime, Pravieniskės
Bo Johansson, SPPA, Norrköping
Ramūnas Kalendra, National Prison Administration, Vilnius
Valeri Kravets, Maardu Prison, Maardu
Lauri Kuusing, National Prison Administration, Tallinn
Marie Larsson, Sida, Stockholm
Gediminas Levickas, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vilnius
Regina Liakstutienė, National Prison Administration, Vilnius
Peter Lindkvist, Kronobergshäktet, Stockholm
Lasse Lukane, Maardu Prison, Maardu
A Maknickas, Colony of Strong Regime and Pre-Trial Colony, Vilnius
Lisbeth Malmqvist, KVM Jönköping/Tidaholm (telephone)
Rimas Miskeliavicius, Colony of Strong Regime, Marijampolė
Aleksas Morozovas, Juvenile Education and Pre-Trial Colony, Kaunas
Leif Nordén, KVM Mariefred (telephone)
Peeter Näks, National Prison Administration, Tallinn
Violeta Patackaitė, National Prison Administration, Vilnius
Kaj Persson, Swedish Embassy, Vilnius
Mailis Pukonen, Office of European Integration, Tallinn
Uno Rhodin, KVM Göteborg Centrum (telephone)
Jonas Stasinskas, Lietuvos Kalinių Globos Draugija (Prisoners' Aid Association), Vilnius
Bård Ivar Svendsen, Norwegian Embassy, Riga
Markas Tokarevas, Colony of Strong Regime, Marijampolė

Andreas von Uexküll, Swedish Embassy, Tallinn

Virginija Umbrasienė, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vilnius

Dmitrij Usik, Prison Staff Training Centre, Vilnius

Leonid Yefremov, Prison Staff Training Centre, Dzintari/Jurmala

Vitolds Zahars, Latvian Prison Administration, Riga

Annex 3

Documentation

All countries

Council of Europe legal co-operation with the countries of central and Eastern Europe
Nord-Balt Prison Project for the development of the Prison Systems of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania

2nd meeting, Strasbourg 9–10 January 1997

Secretariat Memorandum and Addendum to the Secretariat Memorandum
(Directorate of Legal Affairs, 17 January 1997)

Kriminalvårdens verksamhet i de baltiska staterna – pågående och planerad
(Kriminalvårdsstyrelsen, Per Colliander, 1997-03-05)

“Twin prison” cooperation on the Nord-Balt Prison Project Frame
(1997-10-28)

Report from the Baltic Conference on Staff Training organized in Lithuania 26–27 April 1999
A Basic Training Framework
(Bo Johansson, Project Steering Meeting, Latvia 22–23 June 1999)

Estonia

Nord-Balt Prison Project Estonia

Report of a Council of Europe Expert Mission to Prisons etc in Estonia (the Lakes/Grönholm Report)
(Directorate of Legal Affairs Council of Europe, May 1997)

Ankom Sida 2000-05-24

Dnr 2000-003659/10

Support in the process of bringing the Estonian Prison System into conformity with European standards – continued twinning programme for prisons (DRAFT Version 2)
(Kriminalvården 1999-04-06)

Dnr ÖST-1997-0676/10

Progress Report and Guidelines for the Future under the Agreement on Development Co-operation and Technical Assistance in the Area of Justice and Home Affairs
(approved by the Swedish and Estonian Minister of Justice and Interior in Stockholm on 29 March 2000)

Dnr 2000-003659/10

Support in the process of bringing the Estonian Prison System into conformity with European standards – continued twinning programme for prisons (DRAFT)
(2000-05-22)

Ankom Sida 2000-05-24

Dnr ÖST-1997-0676/10

Follow-up Report on development co-operation between the Swedish and Estonian Prison Services
(Bo Johansson, carried out 19–22nd of March 2001 in Estonia and 7–10th of May 2001 in Sweden)

Ankom Sida 2002-05-07

Dnr 2000-003659/240

Support in the process of bringing the Estonian Prison System into conformity with European Standards – continued twinning programme for prisons and additional intensified development co-operation

(2002-02-27)

Ankom Sida 2002-04-10

Dnr 2002-001288/70

Final report on the development co-operation between the Swedish and Estonian Prison Services June 2000 – April 2002

(Kriminalvården 2002-03-15)

Comparison between the NBPP Basic Training Framework the syllabus for basic training of prison staff in Estonia

Ankom Sida 2002-05-07

Dnr 2000-003659/240

Latvia

Draft Proposal of co-operation between the Latvian Prison Administration and the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration

(Kriminalvården, 1997-02-07)

Ankom Sida 1997-08-10

Dnr ÖST-1997-0076

Support in the process of bringing the Latvian Prison System into conformity with European standards – a cooperation project between the Latvian Prison Administration and the Swedish Prison and Probation Administration (DRAFT)

(Kriminalvården 1997-06-25)

Nord-Balt Prison Project Latvia

Report of a Council of Europe Expert Mission to the Latvian Prison System

(The Lakes/Engesbak Report)

(Directorate of Legal Affairs Council of Europe, July/August 1998)

Ankom Sida 2000-05-24

Dnr 2000-003647/190

Support in the process of bringing the Latvian Prison System into conformity with European Standards – continued twinning programme for prisons and for training centre for prison staff (DRAFT)

(Kriminalvården 1999-04-06)

Ankom Sida 1999-04-12

Dnr ÖST-1997-0631/10

Utvecklingssamarbete mellan den svenska och den lettiska kriminalvården – Tvillingutbytet med lettiska anstalter och det lettiska träningscentret under januari 1998 – mars 1999 (RAPPORT)

(Kriminalvården 1999-05-21)

Dnr ÖST-1997-0469/90

Progress Report and Guidelines for the Future under the Agreement on Development Co-operation and Technical Assistance in the Area of Justice and Home Affairs

(approved by the Swedish and Latvian Ministers of Justice and Interior in Stockholm on 28 March 2000)

Support in the process of bringing the Latvian Prison System into conformity with European Standards
– continued twinning programme for prisons and for training centre for prison staff and additional intensified co-operation (DRAFT)
(2000-05-22)

Follow-up report on development co-operation between the Swedish and Latvian Prison Services
(Bo Johansson, carried out 15–19th of January in Latvia and 26–30th of March in Sweden)
Ankom Sida 2002-05-14
Dnr 2000-003647/210

Support in the process of bringing the Latvian Prison System into conformity with European Standards
– continued twinning programme for prisons and for training centre for prison staff and additional intensified co-operation
(2002-02-21)
Ankom Sida 2002-04-10
Dnr 2002-001287

Final report in the development co-operation between the Swedish and Latvian Prison Services June 2000 – April 2002
(Kriminalvården 2002-03-15)

Lithuania

Report of a Council of Europe Co-operation Visit to Prisons in Lithuania February and March 1995

Project Proposal “Support in the process of bringing the Lithuanian Prison System into conformity with European Standards”
(Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1997-07-16)
Ankom Sida 970901 resp 970903
Dnr ÖST-1997-0631 resp ÖST-1997-0396

Recommendation No. R (97) 12 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on Staff Concerned with the Implementation of Sanctions and Measures
And explanatory memorandum
Ankom Sida 2000-05-30
Dnr 2000-000917/40

“Support in the process of bringing the Lithuanian Prison System into conformity with European Standards” – Förstudie för projektet Prison Service Training Centre
(KVS Ulrika Lindberg)
Ankom Sida 971109
Dnr ÖST-1997-0396

Support in the process of bringing the Lithuanian Prison System into conformity with European Standards – a feasibility Study concerning the Establishment of a Lithuanian Prison Service Training Centre
(Ulrika Lindberg 1998-03-15)
Ankom Sida 1998-03-27

Support in the process of bringing the Lithuanian Prison System into conformity with European Standards – continued twinning programme for prisons (DRAFT version 2)
(Kriminalvården 1999-04-06)
Dnr ÖST-1997-1631/150

Project Proposal “Support in the Process of bringing the Lithuanian Prison System into Conformity with European Standards”

(Ministry of Foreign Affairs, June 1998)

Ankom Sida 1998-06-29

Dnr 1998-03460/10

Action Plan on development co-operation and technical assistance in the area of Justice and Home Affairs between Lithuania and Sweden

Ankom Sida 1999-08-08

Support in the process of bringing the Lithuanian Prison System into conformity with European Standards – continued twinning programme for prisons

(Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1999-08-25)

Ankom Sida 1999-09-08

Dnr 1998-003460/210

Progress Report and Guidelines for the Future

Under the Agreement on Development Co-operation and Technical Assistance in the Area of Justice and Home Affairs

(Approved by the Swedish and Lithuanian Ministers of Justice and Interior in Stockholm on 30 March 2000)

Ankom Sida 2000-05-30

Dnr 2000-3660/5

Support in the process of bringing the Lithuanian Prison System into conformity with European Standards – continued twinning programme for prisons, training centres and additional intensified co-operation (DRAFT)

(2000-05-26)

Ankom Sida 2000-05-30

Dnr 2000-3660-5

Follow-up Report on Development Co-operation between the Swedish and Lithuanian Prison Services (Carried out 10–14th and 24–29th of September 2001 in Lithuania and continuously during 2001 in Sweden)

Ankom Sida 2002-05-14

Dnr 2000-003660/280

Support in the process of bringing the Lithuanian Prison System into conformity with European Standards – continued twinning programme for prisons, training centres and additional intensified development co-operation

(2002-03-06)

Ankom Sida 2002-04-10

Dnr 2002-001289/120

The Regulations of the Prison Department of Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania

(Confirmed by the Minister of Justice by the order No 184 of the 1st of September 2000)

Recent Sida Evaluations

- 03/05 Zimbabwe National Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS**
Shingaidzo Mupindu, Itayi Muvandi, Pascal Changunda
Department for Africa
- 03/06 Village Based Support for HIV/AIDS Orphaned Children in Zimbabwe through Rural Unity for Development Organisation (RUDO)**
Nontokozo Mugabe, Phatisiwe Ngwenya
Department for Africa
- 03/07 Professional Activists or Active Professionals?: An Evaluation of Diakonia's Development Cooperation in Latin America 1999–2001**
Anna Tibblin, Örjan Bartholdson, Agneta Gunnarsson, Jocke Nyberg, Birgitta Genberg, Mikael Roman, Teresa Valiente
Department for Latin America
- 03/08 Strengthening the Rule of Law in Lao PDR, 1992–2000**
Miomir Serbinson, Anna Collins-Falk, Björn Birkoff
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 03/09 Contract-financed Technical Co-operation and Local Ownership: Synthesis Report**
João Guimarães, Raymond Apthorpe, Peter de Valk
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/09:01 Contract-financed Technical Co-operation and Local Ownership: Botswana and Mozambique Country Study Report**
Gasper Cuambe, Annet Lingen, Gloria Somolekae, Peter de Valk
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/09:02 Contract-financed Technical Co-operation and Local Ownership: Egypt Country Study Report**
Maha Abdelrahman, Raymond Apthorpe
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/09:03 Contract-financed Technical Co-operation and Local Ownership: Guatemala Country Study Report**
João Guimarães, Guillermo Lathrop, Mayra Palencia
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/09:04 Contract-financed Technical Co-operation and Local Ownership: Lithuania Country Study Report**
João Guimarães, Raymond Apthorpe, Peter de Valk, Algis Dobravolskas
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/09:05 Contract-financed Technical Co-operation and Local Ownership: Mongolia Country Study Report**
Nils Öström, Max Spoor, Tsagaach Geleg
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/09:06 Contract-financed Technical Co-operation and Local Ownership: Ukraine Country Study Report**
João Guimarães, Raymond Apthorpe, Oleksander Stegny
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 03/10 Fideicomiso para el Desarrollo Local en Guatemala: Evaluación de avances y resultados**
Roberto Samayoa, Ingrid Faulhaber, Nils Öström, Karin Dahlström
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Co-operation

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 506 423 80
Fax: +46 (0)8 506 423 52
info@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0)8 698 56 10
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>