Performance Assessment and Evaluation Report (PAER) of Formed Police Units (FPUs)

Contact Information

Please enter the contact information for the person completing this evaluation report:

Full Name ________________________________
Position ________________________________
Email Address ________________________________

Please enter the names of all evaluation team members:

Evaluator 1 ________________________________
Evaluator 2 ________________________________
Evaluator 3 ________________________________
Evaluator 4 ________________________________
Evaluator 5 ________________________________

Was this evaluation conducted in-person or in the case of exigent circumstances, remotely / virtually?
☐ In-person
☐ Entirely remotely / virtually (Please explain: ________________________________)
☐ Combination / other (Please explain: ________________________________)

Evaluation Information

Mission
☐ MINUSCA ☐ UNAMID
☐ MINUSMA ☐ UNISFA
☐ MONUSCO ☐ UNMISS

Police Contributing Country (PCC) ________________________________

Rotation Number
Please respond with rotation number.

______________________________
Unit Name
Please enter name as per Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

______________________________

Unit Location(s)

______________________________

Unit Strength
Please respond with number of personnel in the unit.

Authorized: ________________

Actual (Male): ________________

Actual (Female): ________________

Entry on duty of this rotation

______________________________

Evaluation Date

______________________________

Expected end of tour of duty of unit

______________________________
Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation of Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Performance Significantly Below Required Standards(^1). Displays serious and systemic performance issues(^2) in this area. Engagement by mission and UN HQ with unit and PCC required to urgently resolve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs Significant Improvement</td>
<td>Below Required Standards. Displays at least one systemic performance issue in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Meets most minimum expectations in this area but has at least one issue requiring improvement to meet required standard/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Achieves Required Standards. Meets performance expectations in this area and is fully operational on this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Meets all required standards in this area and exceeds expectations on at least one point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Exceeds Performance Standards. Displays good practices and exceed expectations in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outstanding(^3)</td>
<td>Displays exceptionally good practices and far exceeds expectation in this area. Note: A unit that receives “Outstanding” ratings in multiple / all areas is understood as displaying practices, standards, and outcomes that are exceptional and well above normal unit performance in UN peacekeeping. <strong>A clear explanation should be provided as to how the unit substantially exceeds the performance of most FPU</strong>s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 1. Comprehension and support of the Mission mandate

---

1 See SOP para.5 - Compliance with the SUR, along with undertaking the Mission mandated tasks in accordance with all United Nations requirements, including respective plans and guidance, represents the Required Standards of operational performance.

2 Serious & systemic performance issues are shortfalls in one area that have a serious and lasting negative impact and that cannot be resolved ahead of the next evaluation (i.e. within 3 months).

3 “Outstanding” as used here are for quarterly ratings in specific areas. These are distinct from “Outstanding” as used for Unit/s nominated for recognition of Outstanding Performance to the UNHQ, which should be done by the HOPCs in line with Annex 3B, including within the purview of the exclusion criteria stipulated in the DPO Integrated Peacekeeping Performance and Accountability Framework (IPPAF). Any unit rated as extraordinarily high (such as 7 on all dimensions with very positive commentary), could also prompt the mission to ask if the unit would deserve a recognition of Outstanding Performance by the UNHQ.
1.1 To what extent do the FPU members understand the Mission mandate?
Some considerations: (1) Have steps been taken to convey the mandate/situational awareness to unit commanders and officers upon induction to mission area, and to maintain this knowledge (e.g. briefing sessions)? (2) Are pocket memory cards detailing mandate and background to the peace process available with unit commanders and officers? (3) Are unit commanders organising periodic sessions in order to ensure FPU members understand mandated tasks and situational awareness including gender and women, peace and security considerations? (4) Are key mandated tasks translated in languages all FPU members can understand?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

1.2 How willing is the unit to implement the Mission mandate/assigned tasks?
Some considerations: (1) Are tactical plans directly related to the Mission plans? (2) Are units’ operational activities formally tasked and recorded? (3) Are these records analysed by unit leadership against mandated tasks?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

1.3 How well do the Officers and the NCOs adhere to the Mission's Directive on the Use of Force (DUF)?
Some considerations: (1) Are pocket memory cards detailing DUF available with all FPU members? (2) Are DUF pocket memory cards translated for FPU members? (3) Are field training exercises organised in order to acquaint FPU members with aspects of the DUF?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Section 1 Overall: Please enter the overall rating for the section "1: Comprehension and support of the Mission mandate."

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

(Optional) Comments on Section 1
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 1 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.
Part 2. Command & control

2.1 To what extent are orders followed in a timely manner?
Some considerations: (1) Are orders formally recorded? (2) Does the unit display preference for reviewing the orders with national authorities before taking action? (3) To what extent do FPU members show willingness to execute assigned tasks/orders?
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

2.2 Are any operational caveats affecting the performance of the unit?
☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes: Please explain the caveat(s), its operational restriction and impact(s) and mitigation measures required by the mission and / or UN HQ. Please also describe the action(s) already taken to address the issue with the unit and / or the mission.

2.3 How is the individual involvement of the Command Staff of the unit in its daily operations?
Some considerations: (1) Is information effectively shared across the unit at different levels both vertically and horizontally? (2) Are the internal communication functions adequate to keep the Unit informed of relevant operational, social, and administrative matters? (3) Is the ‘Leadership’ of the Unit visible/accessible to all members?
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Section 2 Overall: Please enter the overall rating for the section "2: Command & control."
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

(Optional) Comments on Section 2
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 2 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.
Part 3. Protection of Civilians (POC)

3.1 To what extent has the unit engaged regularly with the local population and other relevant actors in its area of operations to understand the threats faced by civilians, including the specific threats faced by women and children?

In evaluating the unit, consider:
(1) The ability of the unit to demonstrate an understanding of the local civilian population and the nature of potential threats and vulnerabilities including gender considerations.
(2) The frequency of meetings held with the community, including the number of meetings with women, youth and different ethnic and religious groups.
(3) Processes for engagement and information sharing on POC threats with local and international organizations where appropriate.
(4) The number of operations carried out to protect civilians which are gender responsive4.
(5) The number of patrols which included direct engagement with local populations and civilian authorities. Please consider the mission context, gender considerations and operational environment.
(6) Inclusion of information received from civilian components (and community liaison assistants) in threat assessment and response planning.
(7) The use of joint patrols or assessments with other mission components where possible.
(8) The active participation of unit leadership in meetings with civilian and military mission components, sharing of information and participation in joint planning on protection of civilians.

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

3.2 To what extent has the unit taken appropriate and proactive measures to prevent and deter potential threats to civilians?

In evaluating the unit, take into account whether:
(1) The unit has adopted a credible deterrent posture.
(2) The unit has ensured a presence in areas under greatest threat to prevent and deter potential threats to civilians.
(3) The unit has engaged with key protection actors and potential perpetrators to address security and protection concerns faced by the civilian population.
(4) Where a potential threat to civilians has been identified, the unit has intensified its activities and taken proactive measures to prevent the threat from materializing, including through increased patrolling and presence in areas under greatest threat, advocacy and key leader engagement, and other confidence-building measures or interaction with government and non-state armed groups.

4 See definition of Gender Responsive Operation in the SOP
(5) The unit has alerted police headquarters and/or civilian components of information related to any increased threat to civilians, including information that could inform civilian-led approaches/actions.

(6) The unit has supported activities by national actors, other mission components or other civilian actors, including communities, to prevent and deter threats to civilians.

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

3.3 To what extent does the unit respond timely and appropriately to threats of violence against civilians which have or are likely to occur in its area of operation?
In evaluating the unit, take into account whether:

(1) Contingency plans to respond to threats to civilians are in place and rehearsed (including through tabletop and other exercises).

(2) At the tactical level, the unit has responded quickly and appropriately to credible alerts of imminent threats of violence against civilians (whether with or without resorting to use of force).

(3) When and where necessary, the unit has demonstrated proactive posture when faced with imminent threats of violence against civilians.

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Section 3 Overall: Please enter the overall rating for the section "3: Protection of Civilians (POC)."

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

(Optional) Comments on Section 3
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 3 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.
Part 4. Operational readiness and capability

4.1 To what extent is the unit capable to perform mandated tasks in line with the current Mission’s operational challenges?
Some considerations: (1) Is there accurate mapping with main concentration of population? (2) Does the mapping capture the hot spots including location of all spoilers and threats in the Area of Responsibility (AoR)? (3) Does the unit have processes and systems to effectively collect and interpret information, including, as required, sex disaggregated data. (4) Is the unit capable of undertaking and implementing operational assessment and planning, including on gender analysis? (5) Is intelligence being utilised efficiently to inform evidence-based decision making? (6) Has the unit commander deployed appropriate FPU resources to meet operational demands? (7) Does the unit commander have plans for reinforcement if needed? (8) What is the percentage of women peacekeepers participating in the FPU operations?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement
☐ 3 Needs Improvement
☐ 4 Satisfactory
☐ 5 Good
☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 7 Outstanding

Please detail elements that led to this rating for Question 4.1:

4.2 How does the unit ensure its “rapid response capability”?
4.3 Does the unit have “additional capabilities” not required as per its Statement of Unit Requirements (SUR)?
If none, please enter "None". If Yes, please explain in detail.

4.4 How does the unit conduct its activities? Is the unit performing as a “solo operator” or is it engaged with “partners” in its daily activities (UN military, allied forces/ and other international organisations, Host State Police)?

4.5 How is the interaction of the unit with the civilian population?
Some considerations: (1) Do activities take place to engage communities, including the women population, both proactively and reactively, that contribute to delivery of mission mandated tasks? (2) Have external relationships been established with local stakeholders, including, as relevant, women leaders and women’s civil society organizations that benefit the Unit’s operating capability?
Note: All criteria must be considered against the mandated tasking and security limitations (excluding national caveats) of the Unit.

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Please detail elements that led to this rating for Question 4.5, including explanation of any relevant mandated tasking and / or security limitations:
4.6 How is the perception of the local population\(^5\) towards the unit?

4.7 How well is firefighting capability maintained?
Some considerations: (1) Do response plans for fire emergencies exist? (2) Are drills or exercises conducted? (3) Are there dedicated fire wardens/marshals? (4) What is the condition/status of firefighting equipment as per the VR?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Section 4 Overall: Please enter the overall rating for the section "4: Operational readiness and capability."

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

(Optional) Comments on Section 4
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 4 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.

\(^5\) All members of the local population including women, men, girls, boys, and gender-diverse people, as well as persons with disabilities, older persons, those economically disenfranchised, ethnic, political, or religious minorities.
Part 5. Administration

5.1 How well does the unit adhere to UN administrative functions and processes?
Some considerations: (1) Do daily plans and administration of personnel (Duties, Leave Regime) exist? (2) Are logs and registry (weapons & ammo registration, entry-exit log, files, etc.) in place? (3) Are reporting mechanisms (Flash, MOP, DSR, AAR, etc.) established?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

5.2 How efficient is the internal organizational administration of the unit?
Some considerations like: (1) Is there clear lines of the administration for the unit? (2) Do updated contingency plans (like back-ups) exit at the sub-units (at platoon) levels? (for example if a platoon has been asked to detach – what would be the plans for administrative issues?) (3) Is the Unit commander aware of all relevant guidance? (4) Is the unit familiar with the MOU and SUR requirements? (5) Are there good systems for record keeping within the unit?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Section 5 Overall: Please enter the overall rating for the section "5: Administration."

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

(Optional) Comments on Section 5
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 5 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.
Part 6. Sustainment, Logistic and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) compliance

6.1 Are there any Contingent Owned Equipment (COE) shortfalls that are adversely impacting the operations of the unit? If so, please describe both the shortfalls and the impact. If none, please enter "None". If Yes, please explain in detail.

6.2 Is the unit able to sustain itself in line with UN requirements?
Some considerations: (1) What is the status of the unit logistics? (2) Are there sufficient holdings of specialist equipment? (3) What is the standard of training of logistical staff? (4) What is the logistical backup capacity of the unit?
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

6.3 Is the Statement of Unit Requirements (SUR) adequate vis-à-vis the operational engagement of the unit?
6.4 Is the Statement of Unit Requirements (SUR) of the unit aligned with the MOU?
If No, please explain in detail.

6.5 Are any of the causes for Contingent Owned Equipment (COE) deficiency beyond the control of the Police Contributing Country (PCC)?
If not, please enter "No". If Yes, please explain in detail. If no COE deficiencies, please enter "Not Applicable".

Section 6 Overall: Please enter the overall rating for the section "6: Sustainment, Logistic and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) compliance."
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

(Optional) Comments on Section 6
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 6 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.
Part 7. Training aspects

7.1 Is the UN-specific pre-deployment training requirement sufficiently evident in the performance of the unit/personnel of the FPU?
Some considerations: (1) Of the FPU members, how many can describe the content of UN pre-deployment training? (2) From their perspective, has this pre-deployment training provided the information required to delivering mandated tasks? (3) How well are gender and women, peace and security mandates, including SGBV and CRSV, known by all personnel of the unit?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Please detail elements that led to this rating for Question 7.1:

7.2 Based on the performance of the unit, is the unit's level of specific policing (police techniques and tactics) training sufficient?
Some considerations: (1) Is the unit's policing tactics and techniques compliant with the standards of Strategic Guidance Framework (SGF)? (2) Are the standards established in the Assessment of Operational Capability (AOC) still evident? (3) Does the Unit’s preparedness, including its pre-deployment training on police techniques and tactics, support the operational performance? If not, are appropriate steps being taken to address this?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Please detail elements that led to this rating for Question 7.2:
7.3 Has the unit developed and maintained an adequate in-mission training regime (skills maintenance training)?
Some considerations: (1) Is regular training conducted on core FPU skills? (2) Is specialist training regularly done to meet the unit’s specific operational role? Is it effectively implemented (e.g. specialist instructors)? (3) Is the training fit for purpose, i.e. does it maintain operational fitness?
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Please detail elements that led to this rating for Question 7.3, including details on types of training conducted (e.g. scenario-based, online):

7.4 Has the unit established sufficient force protection measures within its Area of Responsibility (AoR)?
Some considerations: (1) Are FPU command staff aware of threats to their FPU members in the AoR? (2) Are unit commanders able to show plans for protection of their officers and FPU members? (3) Are unit commanders able to explain the protection in place in their facilities? (4) Are FPU members deployed and equipped in line with the plans?
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Please detail elements that led to this rating for Question 7.4:
7.5 How well are the UN Conduct and Discipline rules, including on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA), known by all personnel of the unit?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement
☐ 3 Needs Improvement
☐ 4 Satisfactory
☐ 5 Good
☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 7 Outstanding

Please detail elements that led to this rating for Question 7.5:

---

Section 7 Overall: Please enter the overall rating for the section "7: Training aspects."

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement
☐ 3 Needs Improvement
☐ 4 Satisfactory
☐ 5 Good
☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 7 Outstanding

(Optional) Comments on Section 7
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 7 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.
Part 8. Conduct and Discipline

8.1 What steps are FPU commanding officers taking to prevent and address misconduct by their subordinates, including to ensure that risks of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) are identified and prevented?

Please also explain if there are any steps that FPU commanding officers are not taking, but should be, to prevent and address misconduct by their subordinates (including on SEA risks).

8.2 How is internal discipline and performance management being administered by the Command Staff?

8.3 What are the disciplinary measures being taken by the Commanding Officer(s) in such cases?
(Optional) Comments on Section 8
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 8 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.

Part 9. Health and welfare

9.1 How is the unit’s overall health and fitness?
Some considerations: (1) Does the Level 1 hospital provide a sufficient level of care? (2) What percentage of the personnel are sick and what are the causes? And does the daily rate of personnel not available due to health problems exceed the threshold agreed for the Mission? (3) Are personnel trained in essential first aid? (4) What is the hygiene level of the unit? (5) Are services and facilities gender appropriate?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory

9.2 How are the issues of “stress resilience” being handled appropriately by the unit’s medical services and command staff?
Some considerations: (1) Are support services in place for staff? (2) Are accommodation/welfare provisions adequate?

☐ 1 Unsatisfactory ☐ 5 Good
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement ☐ 6 Excellent
☐ 3 Needs Improvement ☐ 7 Outstanding
☐ 4 Satisfactory
9.3 What measures are in place to minimize illness and sickness of peacekeepers?
Some considerations: (1) Are measures in place to ensure: General camp cleanliness, sanitary conditions, PPE, environmental protection, early warning systems, isolation options, etc. (2) Formal EVAC plan in place? (3) Are measures gender responsive?

9.4 What are the levels of medical awareness and medical prophylaxis in the FPU camp?
Some considerations: (1) Are rates and causes of sickness/illness recorded and reported to the Chief Medical Officer? (2) Are police personnel trained in and aware of the health force protection measures relevant to their area of operations – e.g. prophylaxis for endemic conditions, use of mosquito nets, etc.?
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good  
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent  
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding  
☐ 4 Satisfactory

Section 9 Overall: Please enter the overall rating for the section "9: Health and Welfare."
☐ 1 Unsatisfactory  ☐ 5 Good  
☐ 2 Needs Significant Improvement  ☐ 6 Excellent  
☐ 3 Needs Improvement  ☐ 7 Outstanding  
☐ 4 Satisfactory

(Optional) Comments on Section 9
Please provide any written comments from the evaluation team on Section 9 issues, not written elsewhere in the evaluation.
Part 10. Commentary

10.1 Executive summary of key issues, if any, hampering the unit’s capability to implement the Mission mandate and assigned routine tasks, including shortfalls in support provided by the UN?
If none, please enter "None". If issues exist, please explain in detail.

10.2 Major findings or shortfalls in the evaluated unit (details to cover personnel strength / operations / conduct and discipline / logistics / communications)?
Required. Please explain in detail.
10.3 Observed good practices of the unit?
Required. Please explain in detail.

10.4 Please explain any changes in the unit’s performance and evaluation since the last evaluation for this unit:
The evaluation team should familiarize themselves with the last evaluation for the unit prior to conducting this evaluation. Please explain any areas where the unit’s evaluated rating increased or decreased, with specific discussion of what factors led to the new rating and implementation of PIP activities.
(Optional) 10.5 Other observations by evaluation team
Part 11. Performance Improvement Plan

11.1 Prior to this assessment, was a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in place for this unit?
☐ Yes ☐ No

11.2 If No, please explain why no PIP was put in place. Note they are mandatory for each unit following the evaluation.

11.3 If Yes, was the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) completed or is it within the timeframe indicated in the PIP?
☐ Yes ☐ No

11.4 If answered Yes to 11.1 (was a PIP in place), please comment on progress
Please also indicate the date when the PIP was put in place. If no Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) was in place, please enter "Not Applicable".
11.5 Please provide the unit’s new Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), developed after this evaluation:
Please enter the plan in plain text in the space below. Please note that the PIP should be signed by both the PAER Team Leader and by the FPU Commander. Please use the following format for each action:

**Section:**
Area(s) requiring improvement:
Action required:
Person responsible for completion:
Date to be completed by:
11.6 Does the Performance Improvement Plan cover issues that are expected to require more than one evaluation cycle (3 months) to be resolved and / or require action by UN HQ?
☐ Yes    ☐ No

If answered Yes to 11.6, please comment on the issues
Please also indicate the recurrent/ residual issues, whether they are endemic to the unit and what actions are required. If no issues, please enter "Not Applicable".

---

**PAER Team Leader Endorsement**

This evaluation has been endorsed by the PAER Team Leader for submission to UN headquarters:

Signature ______________________________________

Full Name ________________________________

Position ________________________________

Endorsement date ____________________________
FPU Commander Comments & Signature

Comments by FPU Commander:

This evaluation has been reviewed by the FPU Commander before submission to Head of Police Component / Police Commissioner:

Signature __________________________

Full Name __________________________

Position __________________________

Endorsement date ____________________
Head of Police Component / Police Commissioner Comments & Endorsement

Comments by HOPC / PC, including on unit strengths, weaknesses, areas for improvement, and recommendations for UN headquarters attention:

This evaluation has been endorsed by the Head of Police Component / Police Commissioner for submission to UN headquarters:

Signature ______________________

Full Name ______________________

Position ______________________

Endorsement date _____________________