



UNITED NATIONS
Office on Drugs and Crime

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT: 2008
Covering activities from April 2007 to March 2008

Independent Evaluation Unit

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT: 2008
Covering activities from April 2007 to March 2008

Independent Evaluation Unit



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2008

The 2007 Annual Evaluation Report was prepared by Backson Sibanda, Chief of the Independent Evaluation Unit; Mahbub Alam, Evaluation Officer; Barbara Torggler, Evaluation Specialist; Cecile Plunet, Associate Expert; and Fiona Hlavka, Programme Assistant.

The Independent Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime can be contacted at:

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 500
1400 Vienna
Austria

Tel.: (+43-1) 26060-5773
Fax: (+43-1) 26060-6724
E-mail: ieu@unodc.org
Website: www.unodc.org

A copy of the present report is available at:
<http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/annual-evaluation-reports-.html>.

The information contained in this report comprises extractions and syntheses from project and thematic evaluations undertaken in 2007 that have already been approved and published. Hence, the information contained has already been made available to the public. Further, project evaluations were commissioned and accepted by programme and project managers. The Independent Evaluation Unit is responsible only for the analysis and synthesis of that information.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	1
Summary	3
I. Introduction	5
A. Independence of the evaluation process	5
B. Follow-up to the 2006 Annual Evaluation Report	5
C. Position and activities of the Independent Evaluation Unit in 2007.....	6
D. Challenges	8
II. Synthesis and analysis of thematic evaluation findings.....	10
A. Thematic Evaluation of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism	10
B. The Use of Evaluation in UNODC: Learning and Improving through Evaluative Thinking	15
III. Analysis of project evaluation findings.....	17
A. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime projects ongoing or completed in 2007	17
B. Status of project evaluations in 2007	18
C. Assessment of projects.....	21
D. Major issues	26
IV. Evaluation policy and guidelines.....	29
V. Training in project cycle management and evaluation.....	30
VI. Conclusions and recommendations	32
Annex	
List of thematic, project and self-evaluations.....	36

Foreword

The Independent Evaluation Unit is pleased to present its fourth annual evaluation report, which is based on evaluations completed in 2007. This year, the report has four major components: (a) an analysis of thematic evaluation findings; (b) a summary of project evaluation findings; (c) the new evaluation policy and guidelines; and (d) training in project cycle management and evaluation.

Programmes and projects are increasingly subject to scrutiny by Member States, donors and partners because of the demand for accountability by those providing resources and those receiving assistance. The competition for resources requires that agencies demonstrate that they have attained results and achieved an impact. Thus, measuring performance and impact has become a major issue for both donor Governments and those receiving assistance. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is thus required to provide evidence-based programme performance and impact reporting. Evaluation has come a long way in the past four years in providing that independent accountability. Evaluations also provide tremendous opportunities for learning from experience.

While the execution of evaluations took priority as soon as the Independent Evaluation Unit became operational, it became clear that the Unit needed tools and instruments to help staff develop a common understanding of what evaluation was about. Thus, the development of a new evaluation policy and the updating of evaluation guidelines took centre stage in 2007. Furthermore, training in evaluation at headquarters and in the field became the vehicle by which the guidelines and the new policy were institutionalized. The Independent Evaluation Unit also evaluated its own work in order to learn and improve through evaluative thinking. All those efforts have resulted in the reinforcement of a culture of evaluation, a more thorough understanding of the role of evaluation, better-quality evaluations and greater confidence among field staff in handling evaluation matters.

These developments have been positive; however, 2007 was not without challenges. It remained difficult for the Independent Evaluation Unit to satisfy the demands of all stakeholders, given the differing expectations and the delicate issues of objectivity and impartiality.

On a positive note, the self-evaluation undertaken by the Unit revealed that over 75 per cent of all evaluation recommendations had in fact been accepted and adopted and that more than 80 per cent of those accepted recommendations had been implemented. These results are a partial indicator of the usefulness of evaluation to UNODC. Obviously, evaluation utility goes beyond just the implementation of evaluation recommendations. Caution should therefore be taken in interpreting the statistics on implementation. Nonetheless, Member States should be encouraged by this evidence, as there has always been a question with respect to the utility of carrying out evaluations and to whether the resulting recommendations were implemented or not. The resources that have been spent on evaluation can thus be considered to have been a worthwhile investment.

It is my hope that this report will stimulate discussion on ways to increase the effectiveness of UNODC and on the broader challenges and opportunities related to drugs, crime and terrorism.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Backson Sibanda', written in a cursive style.

Backson Sibanda
Chief
UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit

Summary

In developing and implementing its workplan for 2007, the main objective of the Independent Evaluation Unit was to produce evidence-based results that the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) could use to respond to and meet the needs of Member States. The present report is thus not about whether the findings are positive or negative; rather, it is about providing credible and useful information that can assist UNODC in better carrying out its mandates.

The key messages of the 2007 Annual Evaluation Report demonstrate that a culture of evaluation is taking root within UNODC. Senior management and programme managers are utilizing the evaluation results in making decisions, formulating policy and improving the design and management of programmes and projects. The improvements in programme and project design can be attributed to both the utilization of evaluation products and the training in project cycle management and evaluation that was undertaken by the Independent Evaluation Unit and the Strategic Planning Unit in 2007. The report also acknowledges improvements in the following areas: increased understanding of the role of evaluation, increased familiarity with evaluation guidelines, better-formulated terms of reference and reduced demand for backstopping from field offices.

The findings of the evaluations carried out in 2007 indicate that UNODC projects and programmes contribute to the development and strengthening of national expertise. Further, through its technical assistance activities, UNODC has established effective partnerships at the national, subregional, regional and international levels. Those partnerships have created synergies and hence strengthened the work of UNODC. The report also shows that the more economically developed countries possess greater human and governmental capacity to absorb and better utilize the technical assistance provided. However, countries with fewer resources are faced with the serious challenges of lack of permanent personnel and weak human and institutional capacity. Thus, UNODC development assistance to build human and institutional capacity is considered to be making a major contribution to increasing national capabilities to better utilize technical assistance.

As the present report shows, UNODC programmes and projects have also made great progress in bringing sustainable benefits to countries through the provision of many training activities and the incorporation of some of the training into ongoing, institutionalized national efforts and into projects adopting the train-the-trainer approach. But the report also encourages UNODC, in providing technical assistance, to develop stronger and more binding agreements with Governments to ensure that those receiving training remain in their positions for a significant period of time. That step would address the main challenge currently posed by the fact that many trainees leave the posts for which they have been trained in search of better opportunities.

The evaluations also show that when project results and indicators are better formulated at all levels, monitoring and evaluation tasks are easy to perform. The responsibilities of stakeholders should be clearly articulated, as this promotes better management and results. One of the major problems identified in some project evaluations stems from poor planning of the different project phases. New projects

and project phases are developed and approved before the last phase or project has been evaluated. Evaluations of past projects and phases are conducted after new projects have been approved or started. Hence, the results of the evaluation are not incorporated into the new project or phase. That not only limits the value of evaluations but also allows the same mistakes to be repeated. UNODC should learn from past mistakes in order to improve programme delivery and prevent recurring problems.

This evaluation report shows that much has been achieved and that the work of UNODC has had both positive and negative, intended and unintended impacts. The 2007 Annual Evaluation Report concludes that the strength of UNODC lies in its ability and willingness to accept and learn both from the mistakes and weaknesses and from the successes and strengths mentioned in this report.

I. Introduction

1. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) operates in an era in which programmes and projects are subject to intense scrutiny by donors, partners and Member States. Moreover, there is stiff competition for funds and expectations have shifted from reporting on output attainment to outcomes and impact verification. The evaluation strategy of UNODC is thus formulated to satisfy the demands of Member States for accountability to ensure that the Independent Evaluation Unit provides evidence-based performance reporting to assist UNODC in securing continued funding and to enhance organizational learning. The strategy promotes continued improvements in programme delivery and hence ensures improved services to Member States.

2. The main objective of the 2007 Annual Evaluation Report is to produce evidence-based findings and to draw lessons that can assist UNODC to be more responsive to the needs of its clients. The report is thus not about positive or negative findings but about making a contribution to the improved delivery of UNODC.

A. Independence of the evaluation process

3. The independence of the evaluation process that is set out in the Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System and the Norms for Evaluation in the United Nations System published by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) is a fundamental prerequisite for ensuring the credibility of evaluation results. The issue of independence of evaluation, however, continues to present a challenge for the Independent Evaluation Unit and UNODC as a whole, given differences in perceptions of what independence means. The Unit used the definition, and the spirit, of independence of evaluation contained in the UNEG norms and standards for evaluation to guide its work during 2007.

B. Follow-up to the 2006 Annual Evaluation Report

4. The 2006 Annual Evaluation Report made four major recommendations.

5. With respect to the recommendation that management should adopt responsive approaches in dealing with human resources issues in field offices, some actions have been taken. The Human Resources Management Service has made efforts to address personnel matters in the field, as demonstrated by its active participation in the training offered in Bogotá in 2007 and in Belgrade and Cairo in early 2008. Those efforts included a better dissemination of information, videoconferencing and physical participation in the project cycle management and evaluation training offered by the Strategic Planning Unit and the Independent Evaluation Unit. Such efforts are obviously a work in progress and have yet to encompass all field offices.

6. Another recommendation was to strengthen strategic partnerships. Work by the Strategic Planning Unit and the Co-financing and Partnership Section is aimed at strengthening both internal and external partnerships. The new project document template attempts to systematize internal and external partnerships. This is a further work in progress that has yet to produce concrete results.

7. Work has begun on developing and establishing a knowledge management system in UNODC. A study of best practices was undertaken, and a company is being hired to develop the knowledge management system. The Strategic Planning Unit now has access to the Knowledge Management System of the United Nations Development Programme. A broader United Nations network is also being established, and UNODC, as a member, will benefit from that network.

8. UNODC has made some progress in developing result-based projects and programmes, through the development of the new project document template and the project cycle management and evaluation training provided jointly by the Strategic Planning Unit and the Independent Evaluation Unit. A total of eight training workshops have been held in field offices and at headquarters, and more than 120 staff members have been trained. Further training is scheduled for 2008 as part of the process of improving project and programme design. However, that training has yet to produce impact in the form of better-designed projects and programmes. This issue has been raised in the annual evaluation reports of the Independent Evaluation Unit since 2004. UNODC management is thus commended for having taken action to implement this recommendation. Efforts to create sufficient staff capacity to improve programme and project design will certainly result in improved programme delivery.

C. Position and activities of the Independent Evaluation Unit in 2007

9. In April 2007, the Executive Committee of UNODC decided that the Unit should monitor the implementation of evaluation recommendations and report to senior management and Member States on this issue. Since then, the Unit has been working towards the development of a monitoring system and has begun to monitor the implementation of evaluation recommendations in preparation for reporting.

10. The evaluation carried out by the Independent Evaluation Unit on the use of evaluation in UNODC concludes that a culture of evaluation is taking root in UNODC and that more than 75 per cent of evaluation recommendations have been accepted. Of the accepted recommendations, 80 per cent have been implemented. That is evidence enough that UNODC is taking evaluation recommendations seriously and implementing them (see paras. 53-63 for details).

11. In 2007, the workplan of the Independent Evaluation Unit included the following activities: (a) producing the Thematic Evaluation of the Technical Assistance Provided to Afghanistan by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; (b) producing the Thematic Evaluation of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism; (c) producing the report entitled "The Use of Evaluation in UNODC: Learning and Improving through Evaluative Thinking"; (d) backstopping project evaluations in the field; (e) preparing the 2007 Annual Evaluation Report; (f) organizing workshops for developing evaluation capacity and for evaluation training; (g) developing a new evaluation policy for UNODC; (h) updating and streamlining evaluation guidelines; (i) synthesizing lessons learned from evaluations and best practices; (j) updating the website of the Independent Evaluation Unit; (k) preparing evaluation briefs; and (l) participating in the activities of UNEG.

12. The Unit's workplan, while strategic, was too ambitious, given the human and financial resources available. The thematic evaluations were carried out, the backstopping of project evaluations was completed in accordance with the workplan, and work on the evaluation system was completed. However, progress on upgrading the website of the Independent Evaluation Unit has been slow, as has been work on the synthesis of evaluation lessons and best practices.

1. Thematic evaluations

(a) Thematic Evaluation of the Technical Assistance Provided to Afghanistan by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

13. The Thematic Evaluation of the Technical Assistance Provided to Afghanistan by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime was part of the Unit's workplan for 2007. The Unit faced a number of problems and constraints during the evaluation period. Those factors included the deteriorating security situation in Afghanistan and the difficulties of finding appropriate consultants. Those problems resulted in delays in completing the fieldwork and hence affected the delivery dates of the evaluation report. The report was therefore completed too late to be covered in the 2007 Annual Evaluation Report. The Afghanistan evaluation will be included in the 2008 Annual Evaluation Report.

(b) Thematic Evaluation of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism

14. The Thematic Evaluation of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism followed up and built on the mid-term evaluation of the Global Project carried out in 2006, which had focused on selected countries in Latin America and francophone West Africa. The 2007 evaluation covered countries in Africa and the Middle East, Asia and Eastern Europe. The evaluation was timely and will contribute to defining the future direction of the Global Project.

(c) The Use of Evaluation in UNODC: Learning and Improving through Evaluative Thinking

15. The Independent Evaluation Unit set out to learn how it could improve its work through a self-evaluation. The Unit has already adopted and is implementing the recommendations of the evaluation and is changing some of its business practices in an attempt to improve communication and the quality of evaluation reports and to promote utility-focused evaluations.

2. Project evaluations

16. The Independent Evaluation Unit supported project evaluations by responding to requests from field offices and headquarters, providing substantive guidance on the development of terms of reference, selecting consultants, monitoring the evaluation process and contributing to evaluations as a quality assurance measure.

3. 2007 Annual Evaluation Report

17. The 2007 Annual Evaluation Report was prepared during the first quarter of 2008 and finalized during the second quarter. The Report provides an analysis and synthesis of one major self-evaluation, one thematic evaluation, several project

evaluations, the development of evaluation capacity and the evaluation system. Some of the project evaluation reports included in this analysis were not initially part of the 2007 workplan of the Independent Evaluation Unit. Field offices continue to send project evaluations that were not supported by the Unit and, as a result, the quality of some of those evaluations was substandard. The Executive Committee has now mandated the Unit to return to programme managers all evaluations that do not meet standards of acceptability and to insist that those evaluations be improved before they are published.

4. Development of evaluation capacity

18. As a top priority in 2007, the Independent Evaluation Unit, working with the Strategic Planning Unit and consultants, conducted eight training workshops in the field and at headquarters. The course was designed as a basic evaluation orientation exercise targeting programme and project managers.

5. Evaluation system

19. The updating of the evaluation system was a priority in 2007, after having been postponed in 2006. The new UNODC evaluation policy is now in place. The preparation of the policy benefited from guidelines from the Office of Internal Oversight Services, which had been provided to the entire Secretariat. UNODC evaluation guidelines are currently being updated to be brought in line with the new policy. Lessons learned and best practices have been synthesized and are being incorporated into the website of the Independent Evaluation Unit and the Programme and Financial Information (ProFi) System. The updated evaluation system and the evaluation training are expected to enhance the quality of programme and project evaluations in UNODC.

6. Evaluation briefs

20. The Independent Evaluation Unit continued to prepare and disseminate evaluation results through the production of two evaluation briefs during the year. Both internal and external readers have found that the evaluation briefs are an effective tool for disseminating and promoting evaluations in UNODC. The Unit was not able to produce one brief each quarter, as had been planned.

7. United Nations Evaluation Group

21. The Independent Evaluation Unit continued to play a leading role in the activities of UNEG through its work as member of the management of the evaluation of the “One United Nations” pilot country evaluations, mission leader for the Cape Verde Evaluability Mission and chair of the Evaluation Capacity Development Task Force. The Unit also participated in the evaluation practice workshops and made two presentations at the workshops. Those workshops have become a major source of learning and a forum for exchanging information.

D. Challenges

22. At the start of 2007, three of the four staff members in the Professional category working in the Independent Evaluation Unit were new, and one of the two

staff in the General Service category was new. It was a steep learning curve for the new staff, who were thrown in at the deep end, but they handled the challenges they were faced with extremely well.

23. In its 2007 report entitled “Inspection of programme management and administrative practices in the Office on Drugs and Crime”, the Office of Internal Oversight Services highlighted that the independence of the Independent Evaluation Unit “has been compromised by its organizational set-up, its reporting lines and the conflict of interests between its evaluation mandate and those of the Division it reports to”. As a follow-up response, the Unit was partially moved out of the Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs, to which it still reports on administrative matters, and made to report directly to the Executive Director on substantive matters. Although the new reporting arrangements have enhanced the independence of the Unit, challenges persist even under the new arrangements, as the line separating administrative and substantive matters is sometimes blurred.

24. As is the case with other units of UNODC, funding also remains an issue for the Unit, as it receives no money for its activities from the core budget. The Unit therefore has to invest a certain amount of time in fundraising on its own to be able to fund and carry out its activities.

25. While procedures for handling major evaluations were established in 2004 and revised in 2005, the processing of evaluation reports has continued to suffer from a lack of consistency. Procedures and agreements have not always been applied in the same way in all situations, causing confusion. Management must be consistent in implementing the agreements. Further, despite the fact that guidelines and information on evaluation have been provided online, many managers both at headquarters and in the field continue to be unaware of many such crucial policy and evaluation guidelines. That is an area where the Unit will have to make more targeted awareness-raising efforts.

26. Planned and envisaged follow-up workshops on in-depth evaluations did not take place. Among managers of programmes that were the subject of evaluations, there was a general uneasiness with respect to participating in the rigorous process of developing implementation plans facilitated by the Unit. While the aim of the Unit was to provide evaluation results and products that could usefully reorient or redesign future programmes and projects, that effort was not eagerly embraced. While evaluation products are being used in programme/project development, that process has not yet been institutionalized. The exception is the Central Asia evaluation, in which a fully fledged implementation plan was developed, implemented and reported on. That best practice of the Central Asia evaluation shows the way forward for all evaluations at UNODC.

27. The Unit still faces some challenges when it comes to communicating negative evaluation findings, given the need to balance objectivity and the expectations of managers, who often view the findings as damaging to the image of UNODC. Consideration of image often distract from the facts of the findings and the value that could be derived from those evaluation results.

28. As described in greater detail below (see paras. 53-63), the Independent Evaluation Unit set out to learn how it can improve its work through a self-evaluation undertaken in 2007. Following that exercise, the Unit has realized that it must change certain business practices in order to consolidate the emerging

evaluation culture and enhance the quality of its products. Recommendations include adopting a utilization-focused evaluation approach, improving communications with counterparts and rationalizing its workload. The Unit has already started tackling existing challenges and implementing those recommendations, which will help the Unit contribute even further to the efforts of UNODC to deliver on its mandates.

II. Synthesis and analysis of thematic evaluation findings

A. Thematic Evaluation of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism

29. The overall objective of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism is to support Member States in achieving a functional, universal legal regime against terrorism in accordance with the principles of the rule of law. During the initial years of the Global Project, the primary focus of the Terrorism Prevention Branch was to provide technical assistance to requesting Member States so as to help them ratify and implement the universal instruments against terrorism. Over time, and with the support of Member States, the scope of the Global Project was broadened to include more States and a wider variety of technical assistance options to help Member States meet their counter-terrorism needs. As more States ratified more of the universal instruments, the Branch focused more attention and resources on assistance for implementation.

30. A mid-term evaluation of the Global Project was conducted in 2006 (see the 2006 Annual Evaluation Report), and its findings served as input for the Thematic Evaluation of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism carried out in 2007. The 2007 evaluation broadened the focus of the 2006 mid-term evaluation in terms of geographical coverage and deepened it in terms of the substantive issues examined, with the aim of providing insights to help UNODC increase the effectiveness and impact of its technical assistance to counter-terrorism efforts. The evaluation analysed: the relevance of the Global Project in the context of the United Nations global approach to countering terrorism and the priorities and needs of Member States, and the alignment of the Global Project with the mandate of UNODC; the effectiveness of the Global Project as the primary measure used by UNODC to fulfil its counter-terrorism mandates; the efficiency of the Global Project in delivering technical assistance and of the overall management of the Global Project by the Terrorism Prevention Branch of UNODC; and the sustainability of the benefits generated by the Global Project.

31. The thematic evaluation took into account the entire implementation period of the Global Project, from its inception in January 2003 until June 2007. Its focus was global. Field visits were made to the following countries, which were selected because they represented major world regions: Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Namibia, Philippines, Romania, South Africa, Thailand and Yemen. Field visits to Egypt and Morocco were also planned but did not take place because representatives of those Governments were not available to accommodate the evaluation missions during the periods proposed.

32. The 2006 mid-term evaluation had focused on six countries, in two regions: Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic and the Republic of the Congo, in Africa; and the Dominican Republic, El Salvador and Panama, in Latin America and the Caribbean.

33. In most countries visited by the evaluation team, appreciation was shown for the technical assistance provided by the Terrorism Prevention Branch under the Global Project to ratify and implement the universal legal instruments against terrorism. Regional and subregional activities were considered particularly relevant, because they offered important opportunities for networking and exchanging information among stakeholders from different countries and because they strengthened participants' understanding about the need for their countries to meet their international obligations in the field of counter-terrorism and their commitment to that endeavour. The involvement of regional and subregional organizations was deemed helpful for lending greater regional relevance to the approach of the Branch.

34. Overall, it can be concluded that Member States considered the Global Project to be making a relevant contribution to their efforts to combat terrorism but that they also felt that greater efforts should be made to adapt the Global Project's approach to specific national, subregional and regional circumstances. Factors such as level of development, status of ratification and implementation of the universal legal instruments, political will, leadership to counter terrorism, perception of threat and underlying causes of terrorism need to be better taken into account when designing interventions for a specific country, subregion or region. Some stakeholders pointed out that although the legal technical assistance toolbox of the Terrorism Prevention Branch included human rights protections, inappropriate or insufficient attention was being accorded to local human rights situations. That same issue had also been raised in a couple of countries in the course of the mid-term evaluation carried out in 2006.

35. Clearly, the Global Project continues to be a core element of UNODC efforts to fulfil its counter-terrorism mandates. However, it is only one element of the Office's broader counter-terrorism mandate. The evaluation team found that some Member States were dissatisfied with the lack of coordination between programmes and with the unevenness with which technical assistance was being provided by the various UNODC entities. Greater effort will be required to streamline, create synergies and explore complementarities among the various services that UNODC is able to offer in order to ensure that its counter-terrorism mandates are fulfilled. The evaluation team found that in some of the countries served, the Global Project had had a direct influence on the speed and level of ratification of international legal instruments. In other countries, the technical assistance provided had brought about a common understanding of the need to ratify those instruments but was not reported to have had a direct influence on the level of ratification. With regard to the Global Project's second objective of strengthening national expertise and the capacity of Governments to develop and apply the domestic legislation to effectively implement the universal legal instruments against terrorism, it was found that progress towards this objective had been made in all the countries visited but that additional efforts were needed to provide more specialized capacity development.

36. The Terrorism Prevention Branch has not articulated a clear-cut strategy for sustaining training efforts over the long term, for example through train-the-trainer

programmes or by supporting the development of new curricula and course studies in national academic and legal training institutions. Another challenge for the Global Project has to do with inter-ministerial communication and cooperation in the Member States served. In most of the countries visited, in fact, the evaluation team saw national communication and coordination of counter-terrorism efforts as a continuing challenge given the many cross-functional aspects of this work. This phenomenon directly impacts upon the effectiveness of the technical assistance efforts of the Branch.

37. The Terrorism Prevention Branch has made a conscious effort, especially in regional workshops, to partner with relevant subregional, regional and international organizations. In terms of liaising closely with focal points in ministries and of leveraging the expertise of and including other counter-terrorism entities within and outside UNODC, the work of the Terrorism Prevention Branch was found to be efficient.

38. In some countries, the efficiency of the Terrorism Prevention Branch's training programmes was sometimes hindered by the high turnover or transfer of officials. Working to integrate technical assistance information and concepts into the curricula of national training or academic institutions might mitigate this problem. The Branch should periodically revisit countries where such institutions do not exist and increasingly use train-the-trainer approaches in its capacity-building initiatives. Overall, a more systematic approach or strategy to capacity-building was required. The Branch appeared to have staffing problems both in Vienna and in the field. Those problems stemmed from a number of underlying issues that UNODC senior management and Member States need to address, such as the heavy reliance on extrabudgetary funding for activities and staffing of the Branch, a situation which makes long term planning and hiring extremely difficult. There is also a need to strengthen the Branch at the managerial level. A minimum level of core expertise needs to be in place both at headquarters and in the field to ensure the smooth running of management, planning, delivery and follow-up activities. In addition, the Branch ought to pay attention to building up the institutional memory required for effective management.

39. Assessments of the extent to which UNODC is fulfilling its overall counter-terrorism mandates are still not being carried out systematically. Currently, performance measures are tailored to existing organizational structures, which do not adequately provide senior managers with an integrated assessment of how overall counter-terrorism activities and programmes are helping UNODC to fulfil its mandates.

40. Even within distinct programme areas, such as the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism, an ongoing struggle is under way to develop better performance indicators that measure results at all levels (output, outcome, project objective/impact). The Global Project document contains only a few indicators for measuring results at the level of outcomes and at the level of project objective. Furthermore, it does not clearly specify which results are to be achieved at which level, thus obviously affecting the way in which indicators and measures are formulated. The document ought to be fully aligned with the recently developed format for project documents of UNODC and with international state-of-the-art project cycle management approaches.

41. Data on specific indicators should be collected systematically and progress in achieving project results monitored continuously. In order to adequately fulfil its monitoring requirements, the Global Project needs to put in place a project-wide monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

1. Outcomes

42. The Global Project has produced a considerable number of positive outcomes (discussed in detail in the Thematic Evaluation of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism). Overall, the Global Project has contributed to pushing forward the ratification processes in the countries visited, but the extent of that contribution varies from country to country. In some cases, the technical assistance provided had a direct influence on ratification processes; in other cases, it appeared to have raised awareness and understanding about the need to ratify, but no direct link was established between the Branch's efforts and progress made in terms of ratification. In yet other Member States, officials pointed out that political will had been strengthened through the Global Project but that some of the instruments were still to be ratified.

43. The Global Project has also contributed to strengthening the national expertise and capacity needed to develop and apply domestic legislation for the effective implementation of the universal legal instruments. In that regard, it was found that progress had been made in the Member States visited. Government officials in several countries pointed out that knowledge gained as a result of the assistance provided by the Terrorist Prevention Branch had been used to develop new counter-terrorism legislation for combating money-laundering related to the financing of terrorism.

44. The Global Project has established effective partnerships with many subregional, regional and international organizations. At the international level, collaboration with international organizations such as the Commonwealth Secretariat and the International Monetary Fund has created synergies benefiting subregional and regional partner organizations and workshop participants. Cooperating with subregional organizations such as the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (through its Capacity-Building Programme against Terrorism) and the Southern African Development Community has meant that the expertise of these organizations could be taken advantage of and their counter-terrorism capacities could be strengthened.

2. Impact

45. Impact refers to the long-term effects of an intervention. Since the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism started cooperating with some of the countries visited by the evaluation team only two years ago, it is in many cases premature to make any final judgments about the long-term effects of the technical assistance provided by the Global Project.

46. Building a functional universal legal regime against terrorism is a work in progress in almost all the countries visited during this evaluation exercise (including in the countries visited during the 2006 mid-term evaluation). Nevertheless, the Global Project has produced numerous positive outcomes (see above) that will certainly have a positive impact in the long run. Progress made in terms of

implementing the universal legal instruments against terrorism and strengthening the capacity required to apply new counter-terrorism legislation is especially likely to have a positive impact in the future. What the exact impact will be and what unintended effects might result from the Global Project cannot be ascertained at present.

3. Sustainability

47. Whether the benefits of the Global Project will be sustained in the long run will be determined by a number of factors, including the following: the extent to which Member States consider the contribution of the Project to be relevant; the extent to which national capacity is strengthened to implement the universal legal instruments against terrorism and to apply the new counter-terrorism legislation; the extent to which stakeholders coordinate their efforts and cooperate with each other; and the extent to which the knowledge provided through and accruing from the Project is managed and exchanged.

48. Through the 2006 mid-term evaluation, it was found that countries that were more economically developed and that possessed greater human and governmental capacity to absorb and institutionalize the legal assistance provided by the Terrorism Prevention Branch generally demonstrated greater success at sustaining progress. Countries with fewer resources faced serious challenges to achieving sustainability.

49. The latter countries suffered, in particular, from a higher turnover of personnel, weaknesses in terms of human, institutional and technical capacity, weak or underdeveloped legal structures and a lack of basic infrastructure. While, in general, good progress has been made in terms of national ratification and the adoption of implementing legislation, officials in many Member States visited pointed to an ongoing and critical need to bolster human capacity in both the executive and judicial branches.

50. The Terrorism Prevention Branch is constantly working on improving and intensifying collaborative relationships with various regional and international organizations. Most of those relationships have evolved around issues related to counter-terrorism and only to a lesser extent around larger developmental issues such as the high rates of turnover of Government officials and the lack of basic infrastructure. Additional efforts will be required of the Global Project to establish relationships that help mitigate the negative impact of such issues on the work of the Branch and on the counter-terrorism efforts of Member States served by the Global Project.

51. Another issue that might impact on the sustainability of the benefits brought by the Global Project is the presence, or absence, of sufficient political will to combat terrorism. As mentioned above, political will, leadership and threat perception can all act as driving factors in counter-terrorism cooperation. The level of development is not the only factor affecting the rate of ratification and implementation of counter-terrorism legal instruments.

52. Another critical factor in achieving sustainability is the counter-terrorism capacity of subregional, regional and international organizations to support or complement the work of the Global Project. The Terrorism Prevention Branch has actively sought to strengthen collaborative relationships with organizations in virtually all relevant regions and areas of specialization. The success of this effort

can have important repercussions for the development of counter-terrorism capacity in these organizations and for the sustainability of the Global Project.

B. The Use of Evaluation in UNODC: Learning and Improving through Evaluative Thinking

1. Background

53. The Independent Evaluation Unit became operational in late 2003. In the past four years, it has published 66 evaluation reports. In 2007, the Unit decided to engage in a self-evaluation exercise to assess how UNODC has used evaluation products in order to learn from the past and improve its future work. Thus, the self-evaluation was aimed at promoting learning and improvements within the Unit through a review of the evaluation activities conducted since its inception.

54. The evaluation report, entitled “The Use of Evaluation in UNODC: Learning and Improving through Evaluative Thinking”, presents data collected through questionnaires, interviews, a review of relevant documents and a survey. Particular attention was devoted to collecting data on ways to increase the use of evaluation with a view to improving the Unit’s business practices.

55. Evidence from this evaluation suggests that an evaluation culture is taking root in UNODC. The Office has used evaluations to its benefit, and respondents have valued the quality of the reports. Evaluations have been used to improve project and programme performance, to provide decision-makers with information and to prompt an internal debate.

2. Major findings

56. The major findings resulting from that evaluation can be summarized as follows:

- (a) In 2004, the evaluation culture of UNODC was virtually non-existent, but in 2007, an evaluation culture was taking root;
- (b) Evaluations were used even before reports were published;
- (c) 50 per cent of respondents made use of lessons learned and best practices;
- (d) 75 per cent of recommendations made were accepted, 80 per cent of which were fully or partially implemented;
- (e) Over 70 per cent of respondents viewed evaluation reports as useful;
- (f) Communication between the Independent Evaluation Unit and counterparts was weak;
- (g) Evaluations tended to focus on compliance and, thus, did not always meet the needs of their primary intended users;
- (h) The workload of the Independent Evaluation Unit was too heavy, given the human and financial resources available;

(i) Evaluation planning was constrained by time and other resources, as a result of which it was not always rigorous.

3. Recommendations

57. The evaluation report contained the following major recommendations:

(a) The Independent Evaluation Unit should adopt a utilization-focused approach in conducting evaluations of UNODC activities;

(b) Unit staff should undergo training in effective communication and facilitation;

(c) The Unit should, in each cycle, conduct one in-depth evaluation and closely support two other evaluations, in addition to producing the annual evaluation report, monitoring implementation of recommendations and assisting project evaluations, in order to better match the workload with available financial and human resources;

(d) The Unit should design a system to monitor implementation of recommendations, based on instruments already in place, and monitor implementation of the recommendations proposed in the self-evaluation.

4. Lessons learned

58. It is clear that an evaluation culture is taking root in UNODC and that the Office is using evaluations to improve its programmes and projects. However, more work needs to be done to consolidate those gains. The Independent Evaluation Unit needs to improve certain business practices in order to contribute to UNODC efforts to fulfil its mandates. Above all, the Unit needs to be supported by senior management in carrying out its work and in enhancing its professional development.

59. The self-evaluation concludes that the Unit, by engaging in this evaluation, has learned a great deal about how it can improve its work. The Unit has started a learning process that does not end with the publication of the report entitled “The Use of Evaluation in UNODC: Learning and Improving through Evaluative Thinking”. Evaluative thinking has become an everyday practice that is helping the Unit to deliver a better quality service.

60. Evaluations carried out at UNODC had been designed by the Independent Evaluation Unit based on the assumption that UNODC as a whole had a basic understanding of evaluation and its uses and benefits. However, the Unit overestimated the readiness for evaluation and the level of acceptance that the revitalized evaluation function would encounter among UNODC colleagues. The Unit also overestimated its capacity to effectively promote an evaluation culture. The Unit has learned that some of the difficulties it has experienced are directly due to such wrong assumptions, which have adversely affected the evaluation function as a whole.

61. Some senior managers have viewed the Independent Evaluation Unit as a kind of “police body.” While that is unfortunate, the Unit has learned that it too has at times been counterproductive in promoting a culture of evaluation, despite its good intentions. Further, the Unit has learned that it needs to redouble its efforts to explain what evaluation is and what it is not, and that it must improve its

communication style, engage colleagues in dialogue and listen more, while preserving its independence.

62. While the percentage of evaluation recommendations accepted and implemented is impressive, equating those statistics with actual evaluation use can be misleading. The Unit is learning that those impressive statistics may not necessarily reflect a high level of utility and that it needs to find ways of measuring intangible issues, such as knowledge acquired through evaluation, in order to better measure the utility of its evaluations.

63. Another major lesson learned from this evaluation is that focusing exclusively on percentages of recommendations adopted and accepted is seductive and encourages a passive-reactive mindset towards evaluation. The primary intended user waits for the evaluation to happen, reacts to the report – often defensively – and soon moves on to another task. The Unit is learning that promoting partnership, learning and evaluative thinking can produce better dividends than can the mere adoption of recommendations.

III. Analysis of project evaluation findings

A. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime projects ongoing or completed in 2007

64. In 2007, UNODC projects covered multiple thematic areas and regions. The internal project management system indicates that, in 2007, there were 349 projects with the status of “ongoing” or “completed” (see table 1). The thematic areas with the largest number of projects were counter-narcotics enforcement (91 projects, or 26 per cent) and prevention, treatment and rehabilitation (77 projects, or 22 per cent).

Table 1

Programme and Financial Information Management System: distribution of projects, by thematic area and region, 2007

Thematic area	Region						Total
	Global	Africa and the Middle East	Latin America and the Caribbean	South and East Asia and the Pacific	Central and Eastern Europe	West and Central Asia	
Advocacy	3	4	1	2	1	1	12
Anti-corruption	1	7	2	1	0	1	12
Anti-human trafficking	4	10	4	5	5	0	28
Anti-money-laundering	1	1	1	1	0	0	4
Anti-organized crime	1	3	3	0	2	2	11
Counter-narcotics enforcement	4	17	14	16	5	35	91
Criminal justice reform	2	10	0	0	0	9	21
HIV/AIDS	1	3	9	12	5	2	32
Information technology	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Laboratory and scientific	4	0	0	0	0	1	5

Thematic area	Region						Total
	Global	Africa and the Middle East	Latin America and the Caribbean	South and East Asia and the Pacific	Central and Eastern Europe	West and Central Asia	
services							
Legal advisory services	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Normative work	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Prevention, treatment and rehabilitation	7	23	22	12	1	12	77
Research and trend analysis on illicit drugs and crime	5	1	0	2	1	0	9
Research and trend analysis on illicit crop monitoring	1	0	4	1	0	2	8
Sustainable livelihoods	2	0	14	10	0	3	29
Terrorism prevention	2	0	0	1	0	0	3
Total	45	79	74	63	20	68	349

Source: The table contains information collected in the Programme and Financial Information Management System (ProFi) from 1 April 2007 to 31 March 2008. It takes into account ongoing projects and projects whose operational component was completed in 2007.

B. Status of project evaluations in 2007

1. Number of projected evaluations compared with number of evaluations conducted

65. Based on the information available at the beginning of 2007, the Independent Evaluation Unit expected 51 independent project evaluations, 18 self-evaluations and 8 projects to be included in two thematic evaluations (that is, a total of 77 evaluations) to take place during the year (see tables 2 and 3). However, in the course of the year, those plans did not proceed as anticipated. Of the expected 77 evaluations, only 32 were carried out as planned, and it was decided to postpone the evaluations of 30 projects until 2008 or, in some cases, 2009. Evaluations of 11 projects were not accounted for, despite repeated attempts to establish their status. The final evaluation of one completed project was not carried out due to financial constraints. The report of one of the 32 completed project evaluations was received but was not in line with UNODC evaluation guidelines, and it was therefore not included in the assessment of projects presented in the 2007 Annual Evaluation Report. Finally, two projects submitted only summary evaluation reports to the Independent Evaluation Unit and were therefore not considered to be completed.

Table 2
Projects planned to be evaluated versus projects evaluated, by region, 2007

<i>Region</i>	<i>Projects planned to be evaluated</i>				<i>Actual number of projects evaluated</i>			
	<i>Independent evaluation</i>	<i>Self-evaluation</i>	<i>Thematic evaluation</i>	<i>Total Projects</i>	<i>Independent evaluation</i>	<i>Self-evaluation</i>	<i>Thematic evaluation</i>	<i>Total</i>
Africa and the Middle East	10	10		20	5	3		8
Europe and West and Central Asia	14	2	8	24	5		8	13
Latin America and the Caribbean	12	5		17	2			2
South and East Asia and the Pacific	14	1		15	9			9
Global projects	1			1				
Total	51	18	8	77	21	3	8	32

Table 3
Projects planned to be evaluated versus projects evaluated, by thematic area, 2007

<i>Thematic area</i>	<i>Number of projects planned to be evaluated</i>				<i>Number of projects evaluated</i>			
	<i>Independent evaluation</i>	<i>Self-evaluation</i>	<i>Thematic evaluation</i>	<i>Total evaluations</i>	<i>Independent evaluation</i>	<i>Self-evaluation</i>	<i>Thematic evaluation</i>	<i>Total</i>
Anti-corruption	1	3		4				
Anti-organized crime		1		1				
Anti-trafficking	4	2		6	1	2		3
Counter-narcotics enforcement	11	1	4	16	4		4	9
Criminal justice reform	4			4	2			2
HIV/AIDS	8	2		10	7			7
Illicit Crop Monitoring	1			1				
Laboratory and scientific service		1		1				
Prevention, treatment and rehabilitation	15	8	4	26	5	2	4	10
Sustainable livelihoods	7			7	1			1
Total	51	18	8	77	20	4	8	32

66. As mentioned in previous annual evaluation reports, there are many reasons for the discrepancy between the projected number of evaluations and the number of evaluations actually carried out. However, such discrepancies could have been avoided through more careful planning and better communication between the Independent Evaluation Unit and the project teams. In order for the Unit to be able to better prepare its workplan and provide more efficient services, it is essential that it receives, well in advance, accurate information from project teams concerning the proposed timing of their project evaluations.

67. The 32 projects evaluated included 20 independent evaluations, 4 self-evaluations and 8 projects covered in two thematic evaluations (see annex).

Type of assistance provided by the Independent Evaluation Unit

68. In 2007, the Independent Evaluation Unit was requested to provide assistance with evaluations on 34 projects. That number includes projects for which evaluation activities had been completed in 2006 but for which additional assistance from the Unit was required (for example, in the preparation of the final reports); projects that had fully completed the evaluation exercise in 2007; projects for which evaluation exercises were conducted in 2007 but whose evaluation was not completed that year; and projects for which evaluations were being prepared commencing in early 2008.

69. The Unit provided the following types of assistance:

- (a) Provision of general information on procedures and guidelines;
- (b) Review of the terms of reference used for the evaluation;
- (c) Review of the curricula vitae of proposed consultants (evaluators) for independent evaluations;
- (d) Review of draft evaluation reports;
- (e) Review of final evaluation reports.

Table 4

Projects for which the Independent Evaluation Unit provided assistance, 2007

<i>Type of assistance provided</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>
Provision of general information	34
Review of terms of reference	34
Review of curricula vitae	24
Review of draft evaluation reports	21
Review of final evaluation reports	22

Note: A project may have received more than one type of assistance.

70. The level of involvement of the Unit in project evaluations varied from project to project. For some projects, the Unit provided assistance during the entire evaluation process, that is, from the preparation of the terms of reference to the finalization of the reports, including assistance in the selection and recruitment of consultants. In those cases, the Unit was well informed of the background and status

of the evaluations and was able to provide timely guidance and assistance for the implementation of the evaluation exercises.

71. As highlighted in past annual evaluation reports, the Unit's assistance was not always requested throughout the entire cycle of the project evaluation. Some project evaluations were conducted without the Unit being fully informed, with the result that the draft evaluation reports were received only after all the other evaluation activities had been completed, including the preparation of the terms of reference. Thus, potentially important opportunities to provide suggestions and guidance on methodology and implementation strategies may have been missed. The Unit reiterates its recommendation that, in order to ensure that an evaluation is carried out systematically and is fruitful in terms of quality, corporate memory, lessons learned and knowledge generated and managed, the Unit should be involved as much as possible in all phases of the evaluation until field offices have developed their own evaluation capacity.

C. Assessment of projects

72. A total of 32 independent project evaluations were completed in 2007, for which 22 final documents were made available to the Independent Evaluation Unit. Not all of those evaluation documents were sent to the Unit for approval, as required: they were sent only after the evaluation had been finalized. The results of the approved project evaluations are summarized below. The analysis also includes findings from quality evaluation reports not approved by the Unit. Results from evaluation reports that did not meet standards have not been included in the following analysis.

1. Outcomes

73. Many of the projects analysed produced considerable outcomes.

74. Joint projects in Jordan (project JOR/R56, on the juvenile justice system in Jordan, and project JOR/S21, on the criminal justice system in Jordan), for example, succeeded in focusing the attention of those working in the area of criminal justice and society at large on the issue of juvenile justice. The Ministry of Justice and the Judicial Council of Jordan expressed their intention to move towards specialized juvenile courts with specialist judges, and the Public Security Department of Jordan announced that specialist units would be set up within all police stations, to be staffed by police officers and social workers with specialized training. Project staff also worked with the Government of Jordan to draft juvenile justice legislation, which is considered to be of a good standard. If approved by the Parliament, that legislation might serve as a model for other countries in the region. The project also contributed to strengthening cooperation between Government institutions, including between the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Social Development. That cooperation has resulted in joint initiatives in the area of multidisciplinary training.

75. The Ecuador segment (project GLO/G80) of the UNODC and World Customs Organization Container Control Programme established a positive collaborative relationship between customs and police services at the port of Guayaquil, Ecuador, demonstrating increased trust between those two entities, and involved the private

sector in the operations of the project. This model of cooperation was found to be applicable to other ports in the country, which would ultimately result in a truly national control system. The evaluation also pointed out that one of the two joint port control units supported by the project had confiscated considerable amounts of cocaine, precursor chemicals and smuggled goods.

76. Evaluators of a pilot project in Costa Rica focusing on drug prevention in schools (project CAM/F17, the Subregional Programme for Prevention, Rehabilitation and Social Reintegration) reported that the project had produced didactic guides that were successfully used in the schools involved. The guidelines had contributed to strengthening, among other things, self-esteem, critical thinking and the decision-making ability of students. The project had also influenced the families of the students and communities in which they lived, contributing to their discovering and solving problems as a community. It was also noted that the parents of the students, especially the fathers, had become more interested in issues related to the prevention of drug abuse and in the general education of their children. Further, the use of the didactic guides had enabled teachers to gain a better understanding of all aspects of a truly integrated education.

77. Project RAF/R98, on law enforcement and trafficking in persons, achieved its objectives of designing a training curriculum and piloting a training scheme on issues related to trafficking in persons for police officers and prosecutors in Southern Africa. In addition, a good working relationship was established between project staff and the Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organization (SARPCCO). Project staff are now ready to embark on phase two of the project, which involves training police officers in all SARPCCO member States using the manual developed during phase one.

78. Project KEN/I08 is not only appropriate, relevant and effective in contributing to solving problems related to injecting drug use and HIV/AIDS in Kenya, it has also developed excess capacity that could be used for other activities aimed at countering drug abuse and at raising awareness.

79. Project RAF/F85 has also largely achieved its targets of preparing a comprehensive training manual, building needed infrastructure, improving inter-agency relationships to unprecedented levels and improving border control procedures. In addition to those expected outcomes, the project has also created capacity, in all beneficiary countries, to train others in border control techniques by using a train-the-trainer approach. Overall, the countries involved have benefited from improved operational cooperation both between agencies and between countries.

80. Several projects, while achieving most of their outputs, did not, however, achieve all their expected outcomes, owing to shortcomings. For example, project SAF/R99, entitled "Stop Child Trafficking", raised awareness about trafficking in persons in the Western Cape province of South Africa but did not provide any further substantive assistance to service providers on how to deal concretely with the issue. Project RAF/F85, on illicit drug trafficking, made virtually no progress during phase two. Although harmonized standard operating procedures were put in place at the border, it was not possible to codify those practices in written form for use across the whole area, as had initially been planned, owing to funding constraints.

81. The evaluation of project NIR/I24, entitled “Upgrading of the NDLEA Jos Training Academy to a Regional Law Enforcement Training Center”, which was aimed at creating a leading regional institution for training in drug law enforcement, clearly showed that the project had made virtually no progress during its phase two and that, as a result, the outcomes fell far short of what was envisaged. The evaluation report even went so far as to recommend that there should be no further expenditure on the project, that a detailed analysis of funds remaining from all three phases of the project should be conducted and that UNODC should reconsider and agree on the priorities for any future activity.

82. Project CPR/G75, which aimed at raising awareness among law enforcement officials of the manufacture, trafficking and use of amphetamine-type stimulants, has largely achieved its objectives. The project contributed to improving the working capabilities of front-line officers and their managers in enforcing laws against illicit drugs. It was found that project PAK/HO7, on enhancing intelligence capacity, had also enhanced the capacity of law enforcement agencies to carry out intelligence-led operations against drug traffickers and organized criminal groups. As a result, the proportion of operations that are intelligence-led has increased. However, the project fell short of expectations with regard to promoting subregional cooperation.

83. Project F97, on improving ATS data and information systems, achieved its objectives of establishing a data exchange infrastructure for better understanding patterns with respect to amphetamine-type stimulants in the South-East Asian and Pacific region and of facilitating the exchange of information on the abuse and control of such stimulants. Member States participating in the project access information generated by the Drug Abuse Information Network for Asia and the Pacific and share that information and lessons learned through the regional forum on amphetamine-type stimulants.

84. Projects TDRERF77RUS and RER/F75, on the diversification of HIV/AIDS prevention, and project MYA/H08, on reducing injecting drug use, contributed to the development of innovative approaches for the provision of rehabilitation and reintegration services, which have become more accepting, attractive, diverse and wide-ranging, as well as more psychologically oriented and targeted to recipients’ needs. As a result, drug users and their partners have increased access to comprehensive services, including access to substitution therapy, to reduce the risk of HIV infection. Evaluators also reported that promoting a balanced approach that includes harm reduction and providing comprehensive services that took into account HIV-related issues worked well and contributed to success.

85. Project VIE/68, on treatment and rehabilitation, raised awareness among beneficiaries of the need for and availability of voluntary counselling and testing services and HIV/AIDS treatment care and facilities and improved the knowledge of case managers in areas such as counselling and the understanding of the psychology of addiction. However, owing to the lack of baseline and follow-up studies, it was not possible to measure changes in areas such as relapse prevention and use of medical services by drug users.

86. The objectives of project RER/H37, on drug abuse and HIV/AIDS prevention, were partially met. Not all intended beneficiaries benefited from the project. Many participants from Government offices, non-governmental organizations, media

outlets and schools later left their positions. However, the project made significant progress on its education-related objectives because of its policy advocacy and negotiation at the highest level. The evaluation recommended that the UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia consider taking on the role of “honest broker” between Governments in Central Asia and donors, a role requiring the credibility enjoyed by a United Nations agency.

87. In most of the project evaluations, concern was expressed about the possibility that, in the absence of resources and continued reinforcement and further investment, there was a risk that the constituencies created or service facilities established could become fragmented, thus jeopardizing the progress made to date.

2. Impact

88. The evaluation report on project RAF/F85 noted that a constant lack of reliable data collection and collation in the region made it difficult to assess the impact of the training at the ports of entry. This was because most of the beneficiary States did not submit reports on drug seizures to UNODC.

89. The evaluation report on project RER/F77 confirmed that the rate of HIV infection among injecting drug users in project sites tended to decline at a greater rate than national and regional trends. For example, in Soligorsk, Belarus, the rate of new infections among injecting drug users decreased by 36 per cent over a one-year period compared with the countrywide decline of 18 per cent. In the evaluation report of project RER/F75, it was reported that fewer service recipients engaged in behaviour that put them at risk of HIV infection; that the percentage of service recipients who were injecting drugs had fallen in some locations; and that a less punitive approach towards drug users had been adopted.

90. In the evaluation reports of several projects, it was reported that the impact of project interventions would be realized only after the time frame of the project. For example, the availability of methadone treatment in Moldova was a major breakthrough (project RER/F77) that would eventually enable the use of substitution therapy in the country; a community-based approach towards drug treatment and rehabilitation developed in Viet Nam (project VIE/H68) had the potential to become a model at the national level; and the development of a drug control policy in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic adopting a balanced approach has had an impact on how the drug problem is addressed in that country (project LAO/F13, entitled “A Balanced Approach to Opium Elimination in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic”).

3. Sustainability

91. By adopting a train-the-trainer approach, project RAF/F85 created capacity for sustainable in-country training. It is further recommended that facilitation and training skills in the area of law enforcement be retained and disseminated by developing toolkits for trainers in the various countries.

92. In the evaluation report of project CAM/F17 in Costa Rica, it was reported that the success of the project was to a large extent due to the support and cooperation of the Ministry of Education of that country, which would also contribute to ensuring the long-term continuation of the project’s activities. The

evaluation also pointed out, however, that support of and cooperation with mid-level management and with Government stakeholders at the district level was weak.

93. Endorsement by the Government of Myanmar of a national strategic plan on HIV/AIDS was considered to be a commitment to further enhancing the efforts of project MYA/H08 and to scaling it up at the national level, as a key area of sustainability. However, there is a high risk that the success achieved could atrophy in the absence of continued support to advocacy, capacity-building and resource mobilization efforts.

94. The evaluators of project RER/H37 found the formal approval by the Ministry of Education of Uzbekistan of the project's drug education programme to be a strong indication of institutional sustainability. That programme called for 16 hours of drug education for students from grade 5 to grade 9 through the "healthy generation" programme.

95. Similarly, through the efforts made in the framework of project RAS/G22, States in South-East Asia and the Pacific used their national strategies to make a sustainable attempt at standardizing their joint approach to addressing drug use and HIV and strengthened national legislation in order to formalize harm reduction approaches through public policy.

96. Nonetheless, several projects had not established sustainability mechanisms.

97. In project SAF/R99, aimed at providing initial support and guidelines for raising awareness of human trafficking, a special additional provision had to be made by the local non-governmental organization implementing the project to hand some of the reports produced over to the Department of Community Safety of the Government of South Africa in order to involve other relevant Government departments and have them endorse some of the materials produced by the project, thus ensuring sustainability.

98. The evaluation report on project RAF/R98 noted that no mechanism had been put in place to follow up on action taken by participants to disseminate information acquired during the training to other service providers or to ensure that the manual developed by the project would be adopted by all Member States for continuous training at the national level. Commitment and a sense of ownership from Member States should have been secured earlier to assist with continuity, sustainability and ownership of the project.

99. In the case of project KEN/I08, the sustainability of some project components is questionable, as participating non-governmental organizations have expressed serious concerns regarding their ability to sustain the work of staff engaged in outreach activities, mainly due to limited financial resources.

100. In the case of project RAS/F97, evaluators identified two key concerns affecting sustainability: the lack of attention given to the question of sustainability in project design, and the lack of continuous funding.

101. Measuring the sustainability of project outputs remains problematic, in some cases because the issue is not addressed comprehensively and in other cases because not enough assistance is being delivered to make meaningful change. The training delivered is far from sufficient (as is the case with projects AFG/S47 and LAO/F13). For instance, ministries dealing with women who have been detained or released

from prison still have insufficient capacity to deal with those issues. More technical assistance is needed in order to have a meaningful effect in this area.

D. Major issues

1. Design and management of programmes and projects

102. In several evaluation reports, the project design was found to be relevant and specific in terms of the immediate objectives and outputs to be achieved, and in terms of the activities to be undertaken (for example, see the Ecuador segment of project GLO/G80 and project KEN/I08).

103. However, improvements were required in several projects, and the following issues were highlighted, some repeatedly:

(a) One project was designed without consideration being given to how little information was available on trafficking in persons in Southern Africa (RAF/R98). Another project was designed despite the absence of initial baseline data with a high validity (KEN/I08);

(b) In one case, the interval between project conception and implementation was very long (projects JOR/R56 and JOR/S21). A hurried reassessment was then undertaken shortly before implementation, resulting in insufficient consultation with stakeholders. Factors that would impact on the project implementation were not identified. This led, for instance, to the duplication of work already undertaken by other entities involved;

(c) The absence of a start-up or inception phase in which to prepare the implementation of activities resulted in lengthy delays at the start (project KEN/I08);

(d) Better formulation of results at all levels and of indicators would help to improve the overall monitoring of a project (see project GLO/G80). In one case, it was expected that outputs could be reached much faster than they were, quantitative targets were not properly set, and the design of the project and proposed outputs were initially influenced by one main donor, which withdrew when the project did not progress as anticipated, creating unnecessary and serious upheavals (project KEN/I08). The evaluators of a pilot project focusing on drug prevention in schools in Costa Rica (project CAM/F17) also uncovered deficiencies related to the project's internal evaluation system, which was found to be not very user-friendly and in need of readjustment in order to expand the sources of the data collected and to systematically capture qualitative data that complemented the quantitative data collected;

(e) The absence of full-time project managers had a negative impact on management capacity and performance, especially in terms of supporting and monitoring the working relationships of the institutions involved (projects GLO/G80 and KEN/I08);

(f) The roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders involved in the project were not clearly defined or explained, which created resistance on the part of some of the institutions involved (project R56/S21);

(g) In at least one case, some participants in expert group meetings who were expected to review a manual were not actually conversant with the topic. Also, States and stakeholders nominated different representatives to attend each meeting, creating discontinuity (project RAF/R98).

104. The most serious design flaws were found to be those of project NIR/I24, which had established a national law enforcement training facility. The evaluator of phase one of this project (project NIR/G73) highlighted that for phase two (project NIR/I24), aimed at upgrading the national centre into a regional centre, to be successful, the shortcomings identified by the evaluation of phase one first had to be addressed. In particular, significant efforts still had to be made to meet the essential and basic infrastructure requirements for establishing a fully functional national facility. However, as shown by the evaluation of phase two, those requirements were never met; several previous recommendations had not been considered and followed up on in designing the successor project, leading to virtually no progress during phase two. Such a situation should never be allowed to happen, because it results in a waste of resources. If evaluations are to be of any value, management must insist that evaluation results be incorporated into future project phases.

2. Implementation of programmes and projects

105. Besides highlighting the initial weaknesses of phase one of the challenging and ambitious project NIR/I24, progress on phase two also demanded that a number of essential requirements be fulfilled in terms of implementation (such as continuous stakeholder commitment, close monitoring and supervision, and adherence to project timescales). Regrettably, the evaluation has revealed major shortcomings in all these areas and, as a result, implementation has been extremely poor. The success of this project, based in three geographically remote locations, was also dependent on clear communication and active project management, both of which were found to be lacking. In addition, failures in implementation and training were not reflected in progress reports, either internally or to the wider donor community, nor did they result in a significant reduction in project expenditure.

106. Other management shortcomings were highlighted in several projects, albeit with less serious consequences:

(a) In the framework of project RAF/R98, based on a train-the-trainers approach, for example, the people to be trained as trainers lacked thorough information and knowledge about regional problems and about the situation of human trafficking in the region, creating additional challenges in delivering customized training. The selection of the right future trainers must be a prerequisite of such activities;

(b) In several projects, UNODC encountered problems with stakeholders involved in the implementation of activities. Evaluators highlighted that some of those problems could have been minimized or avoided had a comprehensive memorandum of understanding been signed and if more time had been spent at the beginning in giving detailed explanations about the activities, participants' respective obligations and United Nations rules and regulations. In the framework of project SAF/R99, for example, the local implementing non-governmental organization experienced problems that slowed down the project, including staff changes and absences and an inadequate understanding of the memorandum of

understanding and of the approval process for UNODC activities, causing delays in payments. Slow progress was also experienced in getting the support of relevant key stakeholders (including key Government departments) and in ensuring their ownership of the project, as trafficking in persons was not yet recognized as a priority. The South African Police Service reneged on its earlier agreement to provide trainers for the implementation of project RAF/F85 and then insisted on providing trainers of its choice, in conformity with the policy of the Government on affirmative action. This resulted in the provision of trainers that were not always up to the task. With proper planning, this situation could have been avoided.

3. Suggested actions and some lessons learned

107. UNODC should ensure that the first phase of a project has been successfully completed before starting a second phase. It should also ensure that the basic infrastructure needed to start the project is actually provided.

108. UNODC should ensure that data on the problem to be addressed by a project are adequate in terms of reliability and sufficient in terms of quantity to form the basis for elaborating and implementing UNODC projects. If this is not the case, a baseline study should be integrated as a project activity to be undertaken at the beginning of the project.

109. Risks, as defined in UNODC guidelines for project design, need to be more carefully analysed and anticipated, and contingencies must be put in place to deal with such risks. More time and effort need to be devoted to analysing possible risks and ways of avoiding and solving related problems.

110. Securing local and national ownership is crucial to the long-term success of a project or programme. One way of strengthening ownership is to involve all stakeholders from the design stage of a project and to create, from the very beginning, a shared understanding of the roles and responsibilities of all involved. As roles and responsibilities undergo constant change during cooperation, they ought to be reviewed and renegotiated periodically to take into account the changing nature of the relationship between the various actors and changes in the external environment.

111. In addition, as highlighted in several project evaluation reports, UNODC needs to enter into strong binding agreements with beneficiary Governments to ensure their continued support and lay out each party's respective obligations. In the event that such an agreement is not fully met, UNODC funding should be withheld immediately. Similarly, when entering into agreements with non-governmental organizations that act as implementing partners, a clear memorandum of understanding (detailing respective obligations and United Nations financial rules and regulations), should be signed at the inception of the project. Finalizing such agreements with the different stakeholders or, in the case of regional projects, with the relevant Governments in the region, usually takes time; therefore, provision should be made in the project timeframe.

112. For complex projects, a full-time project manager should be appointed from the start (and continuity should be ensured) in order to establish constant and direct contact with beneficiaries and to make frequent site visits to monitor whether project activities are being carried out in accordance with the project workplan. A rigorous approach to management and supervision (including proper monitoring and

accurate progress reports) should be introduced from the beginning of the project in order to better identify and avoid problems and to prompt corrective action.

113. Projects should be as comprehensive as possible. For example, a project on treatment, rehabilitation and drug abuse control should integrate, when needed, a review of the legal and regulatory frameworks to ensure that the project conforms with international requirements. If it is not possible to integrate such a review within the framework of one project, a programme approach could be adopted. In addition, staff working on related UNODC projects within a country should closely coordinate their actions in order to avoid the unnecessary duplication of efforts and expenses.

114. Regional projects should be as geographically comprehensive as possible. In one project, the lack of training provided to officers at neighbouring border posts meant that trafficking shifted to those weaker posts. To achieve the best results, all the main border posts in the region should receive assistance simultaneously and officials from adjoining borders should be trained together to enhance cross-border cooperation.

115. Expert group meeting participants and consultants recruited for a specific assignment should have understanding of and experience in the topic in question and specific knowledge of the needs and situation in the region.

IV. Evaluation policy and guidelines

116. Since its establishment in late 2003, the Independent Evaluation Unit has conducted 10 in-depth thematic evaluations, produced 3 annual evaluation reports and supported more than 120 project evaluations. While the execution of evaluation activities took priority as soon as the Unit became fully operational, it became increasingly clear over the past two years that the Unit has lacked up-to-date and hands-on fundamental tools and instruments to help project and programme staff to understand the latest evaluation procedures and guidelines in UNODC.

117. Major documents, tools and guidelines have been prepared by the Unit since 2004, and UNODC adopted the Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System and the Norms for Evaluation in the United Nations System of UNEG. However, the key document, the evaluation policy, had not been revised since it was prepared in 2001, and it was therefore not in conformity with the Standards and Norms for evaluation or with the latest relevant publications. A number of other important evaluation tools that were directly based on the evaluation policy document were also out of date. Additionally, the numerous documents and forms on evaluation existing in UNODC that predated the establishment of the Unit seemed to have been mixed with more recent materials, often confusing staff members who needed to consult them.

118. In a recent report on UNODC, the Office of Internal Oversight Services stated that definitions, guidelines, policies, methodologies and instructions pertaining to the evaluation function should be clarified and refined in accordance with Secretariat practices and in line with UNEG standards and norms. It also noted that

the terms of reference of the Independent Evaluation Unit should be reviewed and clarified.¹

119. With the support of two experienced consultants, the Independent Evaluation Unit undertook the following related activities in 2007:

(a) The Unit gathered and reviewed all definitions, guidelines, policies, methodologies and instructions pertaining to the UNODC evaluation function;

(b) The Unit revised, updated and standardized the UNODC evaluation policy, the evaluation guidelines and relevant tools, in line with UNEG standards and other international standards;

(c) The revised evaluation policy document was submitted to and approved by the Executive Committee of UNODC in March 2008. On this basis, the revision and updating of the evaluation guidelines started in early 2007, and the guidelines are being aligned with the new policy, also incorporating the findings and recommendations from the Independent Evaluation Unit self-evaluation entitled “The Use of Evaluation in UNODC: Learning and Improving through Evaluative Thinking”. The revised guidelines should be completed by June 2008.

120. Complementary to those efforts, the following activities of the Independent Evaluation Unit are being carried out in 2008:

(a) Wide dissemination of the various revised documents throughout UNODC;

(b) Establishment of an online database to collect and share evaluation recommendations, lessons learned and best practices with all relevant stakeholders in UNODC, with the aim of improving internal knowledge management and contributing to increasing the effectiveness of UNODC interventions;

(c) Revamping of the Unit’s website, for an improved dissemination of relevant evaluation documents, lessons learned and best practices to external stakeholders, in order to enhance accountability.

V. Training in project cycle management and evaluation

121. In the past four years, the Independent Evaluation Unit has clearly identified a need to create a common understanding on project cycle management and evaluation in UNODC and to increase and enhance in-house capacities in these areas. Well-designed project documents and evaluation reports are intended for use by the whole Office, but particularly by the project designers and managers at headquarters and in the field offices, who can use the reports to learn from and make adjustments to ongoing operations, as appropriate, and to shape the long-term operational strategy of UNODC.

122. In 2007, eight training sessions were carried out jointly by the Strategic Planning Unit and the Independent Evaluation Unit: pilot training at headquarters; four regional training sessions, held in Yangon, Myanmar, Tashkent, Pretoria and

¹ Final Report on the Inspection of Programme and Administrative Management in the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2007), recommendation 66 (b).

Bogotá; and national training in Kabul. In total, 108 UNODC staff and national counterparts were trained by the Independent Evaluation Unit, with the support of one consultant specialized in evaluation training.

123. The first three days of the training sessions focused on project identification and formulation and effective use of the logical framework approach to designing and managing projects. The final two days of the training sessions, on evaluation, were designed as a basic evaluation orientation exercise covering: (a) evaluation awareness (what is evaluation? why conduct an evaluation?); (b) evaluation utility (how to use evaluation products and benefit from them); and (c) evaluation design and management (planning an evaluation, preparing terms of reference, selecting and managing consultants, reviewing draft reports and receiving backstopping from the Unit).

124. The link between the two sections of the training session was emphasized in order to show how evaluation is fully a part of project cycle management and, in particular, how a clear project document and good monitoring data are essential both for effective project management and project evaluations.

125. The training curriculum was developed based upon a needs assessment, then adjusted and refined between the different sessions, taking into account comments of participants. Additionally, ongoing projects and good quality evaluation reports from the respective geographic areas were used in hands-on exercises.

126. The evaluation part of the course also included pre-course and post-course questionnaires that assessed learning gain, collected background information and obtained participants' opinions of the course. A total of 84 participants completed both questionnaires, and, with the exception of the headquarters pilot course, pre-course and post-course scores showed that all participants had a significant learning gain. As a result of the training sessions, the Independent Evaluation Unit noted the following in the months subsequent to the training:

(a) Increased understanding of the role of evaluation in the overall project cycle management;

(b) Increased familiarity with UNODC evaluation policy, guidelines and tools;

(c) Better understanding of the different steps involved in designing, planning and managing an evaluation exercise;

(d) Better quality terms of reference for evaluation, better selection of experts and better supervision of evaluation missions, resulting in a significant improvement in the quality of evaluation reports;

(e) Reduced general demand from field offices for backstopping by the Unit and more focused requests to the Unit.

127. Based upon the more detailed analysis of the results, it was recommended that the Independent Evaluation Unit should continue to collect course data and track such data from pre-course and post-course tests over time. The multivariate analysis should also be refined and repeated as additional data become available, as that analysis has the potential to provide critical information for the training. Finally, the Unit should consider developing a needs-assessment instrument that can be easily administered, for analysis of needs prior to the training session. Information

obtained from the instrument could then be used to make each individual session and related material more appropriate to the specific audience.

128. Based on the learning experience of the first training phase and on the feedback and demands of participants, the Independent Evaluation Unit, in cooperation with the Strategic Planning Unit, is considering the following steps as a way forward for the period 2008-2009:

(a) To develop a training-of-trainers course on project cycle management and evaluation for focal points, with a view to developing resources based in field offices, enabling cost-efficient training at the local and regional levels and institutionalizing a global UNODC network on project cycle management and evaluation;

(b) To offer, upon request, tailor-made sessions on project cycle management and evaluation for field offices (introductory workshops or hands-on assistance for logical framework matrices, performance indicators, evaluation terms of reference etc.);

(c) To ensure that the UNODC evaluation policy document, guidelines and tools are easily accessible on ProFi and on Intranet and Internet sites;

(d) To involve focal points in the field when conducting evaluations as part of their hands-on training;

(e) To develop a computer-based training course, with project planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation as stand-alone modules;

(f) To introduce the training as a compulsory part of the induction programme for all project and programme managers (including at the senior level), and in the annual field representatives' seminar;

(g) To develop a robust electronic monitoring system, to be part of project implementation and linked with ProFi.

VI. Conclusions and recommendations

129. The following recommendations are for consideration by UNODC management. In the present 2007 Annual Evaluation Report, only a few, but very specific, recommendations are made, in the hope that they can all be implemented.

Conclusion 1

130. The sustainability of many of the technical cooperation assistance efforts of UNODC are threatened by a high turnover of personnel, weaknesses in terms of human, institutional and technical capacity and a weak or underdeveloped basic infrastructure in the beneficiary countries. While most UNODC interventions try to address those constraints by providing targeted training and institutional capacity development, the problems persist. After they have been trained, many professionals leave their posts in search of better jobs or are moved by their Government to perform different functions. That continued loss of skills and trained personnel seriously undermines UNODC efforts.

Recommendation 1

131. This problem requires a multi-pronged response:

(a) In order to create a sustainable, critical mass of skilled professionals, UNODC programme managers should, wherever possible, work with national institutions that provide regular and continuous training and education opportunities and that integrate elements of the training provided by or through UNODC into their curricula. That would ensure that more people are trained on a regular basis and that such training continues after UNODC assistance has ended. Institutionalizing training in that way would guarantee sustainability since the training would be provided through national institutions. For example, those institutions providing continuous education to magistrates, judges, prosecutors and investigators could be used;

(b) Where such national institutions do not exist or are too weak to provide the needed training or capacity development, UNODC should explore the possibility of partnering with other entities to develop or enhance the capacity of national institutions to provide such training on a continuous basis;

(c) Where UNODC continues to provide training using traditional approaches, it should enter into more binding agreements (such as bonding of staff) with Governments as a way of ensuring that trained staff can serve in the field of their training for at least two to three years.

Conclusion 2

132. The self-evaluation report conducted by the Independent Evaluation Unit on the use of evaluation in UNODC shows that programme managers are accepting, adopting and implementing most of the evaluation recommendations. There is further evidence from project evaluations conducted in 2007 that most of the evaluation recommendations are being implemented. However, there is also very strong evidence from those evaluations that the acceptance and implementation of recommendations is not universal. In many cases, evaluation findings, results, recommendations and lessons learned are not being incorporated into new projects, project phases and project extensions. This means that many pitfalls, despite having been identified, are still being repeated in follow-up phases. There are several reasons why this happens:

(a) In many instances, a follow-up project phase is designed and approved before the evaluation of the previous phase has been completed and hence does not include the lessons learned;

(b) Those designing new projects either do not have access to or are not able to find out whether similar projects have already been implemented. As a result, project designers do not know if evaluations have been carried out and what lessons learned can be incorporated into the projects they are developing;

(c) The present project design and approval system does not require programme managers to ensure that lessons learned are incorporated into new projects or require the Programme and Project Committee and the decentralized approval system to reject projects that do not satisfy the criterion of having incorporated lessons learned. Management may wish to include such a requirement in a management instruction and ensure that it is enforced.

Recommendation 2

133. Senior management should enforce the existing evaluation policy and guidelines, which require all projects composed of more than one phase or that have been extended by more than one year to be evaluated before the end of the phase. Management should compel all those responsible for approving new project phases and extensions to ensure that evaluation results, findings and lessons learned are incorporated into the designs of the new project phases. Approval for such projects should not be granted if such conditions are not satisfied.

134. In line with the above, all new project designs must demonstrate that they take into account lessons learned from previous evaluations and the experiences of similar past projects. Management should require all those with project approval authority to reject any new projects that do not satisfy such conditions.

135. UNODC should formally establish focal points to screen all new projects, project phases and project extensions before they are considered by the Programme and Project Committee or are submitted to the decentralized approval process. The screening could be done using a similar model that is already being used for giving project clearance by the legal section and the Co-financing and Partnership Section. In field offices, it is recommended that the focal points being trained in the project management cycle and evaluation by the Strategic Planning Unit and the Independent Evaluation Unit be used for this purpose as a way of guaranteeing high-quality projects. This would help field office representatives when approving project proposals and ease the burden on the Deputy Director of the Division for Operations, who would otherwise have all the responsibility for project quality assurance. The Programme and Project Committee should designate focal points for each thematic area as a way of ensuring a fair distribution of work for screeners.

Conclusion 3

136. Many programmes and projects continue to be designed on the basis of inadequate and sometimes unreliable data on the problem being addressed. This is sometimes due to the fact that such critical data does not exist. But, in other cases, it is because no effort has been made to find the relevant data. As a result, many projects are poorly designed and do not address the real problems. This results in frustration among clients, dissatisfaction and the wastage of resources, negatively affecting resource mobilization efforts.

Recommendation 3

137. The first step is for programme managers to be disciplined enough and devote sufficient time to designing projects and to searching for existing relevant information about the problem being addressed. Proper use of the logical framework approach would greatly help in addressing this aspect of project design. The team approach to project design would also guarantee good quality projects.

138. Where relevant information does not exist or is inadequate for formulating a good project, a baseline study should be carried out at the outset as a project activity. This would allow for the project document to be amended accordingly once the relevant information has become available. Disbursement of further funds would be contingent upon the completion of the baseline study.

Conclusion 4

139. In the subsection entitled “Suggested actions and some lessons learned” (paras. 107-115), details are given on a number of critical issues raised in the course of project evaluations carried out in 2007. Taken individually, those issues may appear minor. Collectively, however, they greatly affect project delivery and the overall performance of UNODC. If not fully addressed, those shortcomings will continue to weaken the efforts of UNODC in delivering technical assistance to Member States.

Recommendation 4

140. It is recommended that the following actions be taken:

(a) *Project design.* Staff members involved in the project quality control process of the Division for Operations (i.e. the Deputy Director of the Division), the decentralized project approval system (i.e. the field office representatives) and the Programme and Project Committee should prepare and agree on procedures for collectively addressing those issues. In establishing such procedures, it is critical that agreement be reached on the roles and responsibilities at each level in addressing these issues and in ensuring that each project meets the agreed criteria before it is approved;

(b) *Project implementation.* The management of the Division for Operations should provide programme and project managers with guidelines and a checklist that cover all the recurring implementation and management issues covered in this report. Programme and project managers should be required to complete the checklist for each project and use it as part of the project monitoring and management tools.

General conclusion

141. The present Annual Evaluation Report concludes that much has been done and accomplished in 2007. UNODC programmes and projects have produced intended and unintended results and had both positive and negative impact. The present report also concludes that the strength of UNODC lies in its ability to accept and learn from both the strengths and weaknesses highlighted in the report. Evidence gathered through the self-evaluation shows that where recommendations have been adopted and where lessons learned have been utilized, UNODC has been able to improve both its delivery and its future programming. The efforts invested in providing training in evaluation and in updating the evaluation system are beginning to bear fruit, as both evaluation planning and management in the field are improving. UNODC still faces the challenge of establishing a knowledge management system that is accessible to all in UNODC.

Annex

List of thematic, project and self-evaluations

A. Thematic evaluations

GLOR35	Thematic Evaluation of the Global Project on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism
IEU/Self	The Use of Evaluation in UNODC: Learning and Improving through Evaluative Thinking

B. Projects evaluations evaluated as part of the Afghanistan thematic evaluation

AFG/H10	Drug Law Enforcement-Interdiction Unit
AFG/H16	Strengthening Afghan-Iranian Drug Border Control and Cross-border Cooperation (SAID)
AFG/G38	Strengthening of Counter-Narcotics Law Enforcement Capacities
AFG/G68	Capacity-building for Drug Demand Reduction in Badakhshan, Nangarhar and Kandahar Provinces
AFG/H09	Capacity-building for Demand Reduction
AFG/H87	Drug Demand Reduction Information, Advice and Training Services, North-West Frontier Province, Pakistan
AFG/G26	Drug Demand Reduction Information, Advice and Training Service for Afghanistan

C. Project evaluations evaluated as part of the 2006 Central Asia evaluation

UZB/H04	Computer Network for the Procurators' Offices in Uzbekistan
---------	---

D. Other project evaluations

CAM/F17	Subregional Programme for Prevention, Rehabilitation and Social Reintegration: Costa Rica Pilot Programme on School Prevention component
GLO G80	Ecuador segment of the UNODC-World Customs Organization Container Control Programme
IND/I49	Reducing Substance-use-related HIV Vulnerabilities in Female Drug Users and Female Partners of Male Drug Users

JOR/R56	Strengthening the Legislative and Institutional Capacities of the Juvenile Justice System in Jordan
JOR/S21	Building the Capacity of the Criminal Justice System in Jordan, Including Juvenile Courts, to manage and process cases of children in conflict with the law in accordance with international standards
KEN/I08	Prevention of Drug Abuse and HIV/AIDS among Drug Users, Injecting Drug Users and Vulnerable Populations in Kenya
LAO/F13	A Balanced Approach to Opium Elimination in the Lao People's Democratic Republic: Programme Facilitation Unit
LIB/F71	Strengthening the National and Legal Institutional Capacities of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya through Multisector Drug Control Assistance
MYA/H08	Reducing Injecting Drug use and HIV/AIDS Vulnerability in Myanmar: Technical Coordination Unit
MYA/G54	Reducing Injecting Drug Use and Its Harmful Consequences in the Union of Myanmar
NIR/I24	Upgrading of the NDLEA Jos Training Academy to a Regional Law Enforcement Training Centre: phase II
PAK/H07	Enhancing the Intelligence Capacity of Key Pakistani Law Enforcement Agencies and Promoting Regional Cooperation
RAS/G22	Reducing HIV Vulnerability from Drug Abuse in East Asia
RAS/F97	Improving ATS Data and Information Systems
RAS/H71	Prevention of the Spread of HIV among Vulnerable Groups in South Asia
RER/F75	Diversification of HIV Prevention and Drug Treatment Services for Injecting and Other Drug Users in Central Asia
RER/H37	Drug Abuse and HIV/AIDS Prevention through Mass Media, NGOs and Civil Society
TDRERF77RUS	Diversification of HIV Prevention and Drug Treatment Services for Injecting Drug Users
TUK/F42	Strengthening Border Controls of Turkmenistan
VIE/H68	Technical Assistance for Treatment and Rehabilitation at the Institutional and Community Levels
VIE/R96	Strengthening of Legal and Law Enforcement Institutions in Preventing and Combating Trafficking in Persons: phase II

E. Self-evaluations

RAF/F85	Countermeasures against Illicit Drug Trafficking and Cross-border Crime along Southern and East African Land Borders
RAF/R98	Assistance to Law Enforcement and Prosecution Services in Southern Africa to Implement the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children
SAF/R99	Stop Child Trafficking



UNITED NATIONS
Office on Drugs and Crime

Vienna International Centre, P.O. 500, 1400 Vienna, Austria
Tel.: (+43-1) 26060-0, Fax: (+43-1) 26060-5866, www.unodc.org