



UNITED NATIONS  
*Office on Drugs and Crime*

# **Independent Evaluation Unit**

**Evaluation of tools and toolkits as a modality  
of programme delivery by the United Nations  
Office on Drugs and Crime**

The present evaluation report was prepared by G.P.H.L. Silva, Team Leader, Roger Miranda, Evaluation Officer, Independent Evaluation Unit, and Diyanath Samarasinghe, Consultant.

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  
A-1400 Vienna  
Austria

Telephone: +(43) (1) 26060-5194

Telefax: +(43) (1) 26060-6724

E-mail: [ieu@unodc.org](mailto:ieu@unodc.org)

Web site: [www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

## Summary matrix of findings, supporting evidence and recommendations

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
1. No overall, comprehensive policy for production and dissemination of tools or their application can be observed within the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Fragmentation of tool production and dissemination activities is due primarily to the absence of overall policy guidelines..	There are no policy guidelines available in UNODC regarding tool production. Tools have been produced by each programme or project according to its own procedures.	Policy guidelines should be established to inform the entire process of development and dissemination of tools and toolkits. The preparatory process for tool and toolkits, must include the following: needs assessment, consultation procedures, target audiences, a dissemination strategy, feedback mechanisms and measures of impact. In the context of country-based projects, such information should be provided explicitly in project documents.
2. There is a critical gap between headquarters and the field in tool production (global and local). No concerted strategy to exchange information and experience between headquarters and the field is evident. No institutional mechanism exists to transfer experience from one to the other. The lack of a central source of information on UNODC tools is a critical gap, which needs to be filled.	There was no one place from which the evaluators could obtain information on tools, either global or local.	A central web site that registers all information on tools, whether produced by headquarters or by regional, field and project offices, should be established at headquarters. An obligation should be placed on all those producing tools to post information on the web site according to prescribed guidelines. A model format for this can be the survey on treatment training materials.
3. Global tools on drugs rely heavily on the experience of developed countries and consequently their relevance for resource-poor country situations is diminished. Basing these tools on the experience of developing countries and their best practices should improve their effectiveness and impact.	The global tools examined (i.e. the <i>Drug Abuse Treatment Toolkit</i> , the Global Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse's <i>GAP Toolkit</i> and the Global Youth Network toolkit) have based themselves largely on the experience of developed countries. Developing countries do not have the resource base to adopt practices that are based on such experience. Global tools have not been used extensively in local tool production processes as a result.	Tools developed by headquarters should be based primarily on the experience of developing countries, to suit the conditions and situations in resource-poor developing countries. Excessive dependence on experience in developing countries should be avoided. This is a critical factor in making tools more relevant and effective.
4. Experience and best practices from developing countries are not incorporated to a sufficient extent in many of the UNODC tools.	The argument for producing tools based on the experience of developed countries is that there is little information or knowledge of the best practices of developing countries. There has been no concerted effort to gather information or the experience of developing countries. Tool design has been based on the experience of developed countries.	UNODC should play a more active and initiatory role in collecting, organizing and analysing relevant experience and best practices of developing countries. A research programme that analyses field experience and builds up a corpus of knowledge is vital to technical cooperation effectiveness.

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
<p>5. There is a lack of consistency and resulting deficiencies in the production process of these tools.</p>	<p>Tools produced at headquarters have adopted varying processes of needs assessment, consultation with peer groups and practitioners. These consultation processes have varied in their intensity and the extent of peer group participation.</p>	<p>Tools should be produced in an operationally and user-friendly manner. The design of tools is an important aspect of preparing tools. For tools to be user-friendly and address real needs, there has to be an assessment of what is required, more consultation with practitioners and peer groups and more thought given to the appropriate design of products. The exception to this would be when tools of a more academic nature have to be produced for the guidance of policy makers, and high-level technical personnel.</p>
<p>6. The dissemination of tools is as important as their production. Dissemination is a relatively neglected aspect in many tools, in part because of resource constraints and in part because of a lack of appreciation of the importance of vigorously promoting them. Field offices have not been fully engaged in the promotion of many tools. Tools are produced but are not adequately followed through on to obtain optimal impact.</p>	<p>Many tools have not been disseminated effectively, as there is no planned strategy for their dissemination. Dissemination appears to be more an afterthought once tools are prepared. There has been no target audience in mind to reach out to before the preparation of tools.</p>	<p>Resources should be allocated to the dissemination of the tools at the time that the tools are planned. Optimal outcomes are not obtained as a result of inadequate attention to the dissemination process. The dissemination of tools to promote their relevant application at the country level is as important as the production of the tool.</p>
<p>7. In the production of most tools by headquarters, the feasibility of adapting them to country situations has not been explored.</p>	<p>There is no evidence of any global tool being adapted at the country level. There has been no provision in any of the tools considered for country-level adaptation. The product network approach of the International Trade Centre has aimed at producing global tools, with a view to their adaptation, through a network of local institutions. This approach has been deemed to have been successful by evaluators.</p>	<p>As many tools as feasible should be prepared with the objective of country-level adaptation in mind. The feasibility of arranging for institutional networks at the country level to facilitate such adaptation should be examined. Such a methodology should contribute to capacity-building. The experience of the product network approach of the International Trade Centre is relevant in this regard.</p>
<p>8. While large numbers of local tools are produced by UNODC projects, there is no standard mechanism, in most instances, to control their quality. Each project acts on its own and local tool production appears to be a fragmented process. These are important tools to reach out to a large and relevant practitioner constituency. They are in local languages. Improving their quality and ensuring more consistency (Especially in technical content) across projects and countries should make them more effective.</p>	<p>An inventory of local tools brought to light nearly 100 tools produced by various projects and programmes in the field. There was no evidence that these tools were known beyond an individual project or field office, apart from a few exceptions. In many instances, headquarters personnel were not aware of the tools.</p>	<p>Institutional mechanisms to transfer exchange of experience and information on tool production and dissemination should be in place to bridge the current gap between headquarters and the field. There should be obligations on the technical units at headquarters and regional field and project offices to interact with each other in tool production. When the appraisal of field-level projects is undertaken at headquarters, it should be an obligatory task to ensure that relevant global tools are utilized in these projects.</p>

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
<p>9. There is no evidence that evaluations of projects and programmes have adequately addressed the issues relating to tools and tool production. The UNODC evaluation process can contribute to the production of better and relevant tools and to ensuring that tools are disseminated effectively in order to achieve greater impact.</p>	<p>No evidence has been found that tools have been assessed as an important part of projects and programmes in the course of evaluations.</p>	<p>Evaluations of technical cooperation programmes, whether global programmes or field-level projects, should be obliged to examine the contribution made by tools produced within them for the achievement of programme and project objectives.</p>

## Summary

The production of various types of tools and toolkits as a means of programme delivery within the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has been standard practice since the genesis of the Office, in particular in recent years. (Tools are defined as printed or online/electronic instruments for the transfer of knowledge in an organized manner, in particular instructional material.) The production of these various tools utilizes significant amounts of human and financial resources.

There is a perception that tools and toolkits are the fundamental delivery mechanism of technical cooperation that UNODC possesses and the Office has emphasized their usefulness in achieving specific objectives. One of the purposes of the present evaluation was to determine if this was indeed the case.

The scope of the evaluation included all the tools produced by UNODC since 1999. However, to examine and analyse the entire corpus of tools produced was not feasible. A sample of tools considered representative of the various tasks and mandates of UNODC was therefore selected for closer scrutiny. Eleven tools were selected, representing the broad area of crime and the social, health and economic aspects of drugs. A few tools developed at the field level, including ones produced by regional projects, were included in the selection. The selected tools were examined briefly from several angles: the need for them; the preparatory process, including consultative and design processes; the quality of the final output; strategies for their dissemination; and the outcomes so far.

Two tools (the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* and tools produced by the India projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41) were taken up as case studies and were examined using the same criteria as above, while touching, to a degree, on some substantive matters (see parts two and three of the report).

Broadly, these tools are of two kinds: the global tools produced at UNODC headquarters in Vienna and field-level tools produced by UNODC field offices and projects. A distinction can be drawn between tools within the broad area of crime (including the criminal aspects of drugs) and the tools produced on the social, economic and health aspects of drug abuse. Most tools relating to crime are aimed at obtaining legislative compliance at the country level for United Nations and other international conventions. The prescriptions offered by these tools lend themselves to greater specificity and precision and require little distinction between developing and developed countries. Most of the tools in the area of crime are produced at headquarters. In contrast, tools relating to drugs cannot be as precise in their prescriptions globally, since specific country situations, which vary from one to the other, have to be addressed. Most tools in this area are produced at the field and regional levels and only a few have been produced at headquarters. Tools in the area of crime are mostly linked to training activities, while tools produced at headquarters on drugs are not directly linked to training.

Overall, the tools sampled are of high quality, prepared by subject experts. This applies to tools in the areas of both crime and drugs.

A significant problem with tools in the area of drugs is that they depend largely on experience gained in developed countries. The reason is that there is little knowledge and information on best practices in poor developing countries.

Whatever the cause, such biases make these tools of less operational relevance in poor countries, where prescriptions based on the experience of developed countries cannot be applied, for the most part because of resource constraints.

Tools can be an important mechanism for capacity-building in relevant institutions in developing countries. To achieve this would require involving appropriate institutions in the preparatory process of production of such tools and also in facilitating their adaptation at the country level. The experience of the International Trade Centre in this regard could be valuable: the Centre has developed a product network approach in order to adapt tools to country circumstances.

An important shortcoming with regard to many tools produced at headquarters is that there is no considered strategy for dissemination. Dissemination is more than management of a mailing list. The task of dissemination of tools is as important as their production. For optimal impact to be obtained from these tools, there have to be greater efforts to link up with field offices and to promote the tools actively. For optimal effect, tools need to be appropriately designed in a user-friendly manner, but in many instances there are considerable deficiencies in that aspect.

A large number of tools are produced at the field level by projects. A recent inventory listed nearly 100 tools from 72 projects, largely in the Asian region. Many of the tools are produced in local languages. There appears to be a disconnection between tools produced at the field level and those produced at headquarters. There are deficiencies in the flow of information between headquarters and the field about the tools. In many instances, there is no mechanism to control the quality of tools produced at the field level. A general, overarching problem is that there is no central place where there is information on UNODC tools. There are no central policy guidelines to direct the process of production and dissemination of tools.

To overcome the shortcomings that have been identified, several recommendations have been made. The design of tools needs to be improved, making them more user-friendly and relevant to operational purposes, in particular in addressing clearly identified needs. Provision should be made to facilitate the adaptation of tools at the country level and the experience of the International Trade Centre should be examined.

The preparatory process of tool production should enable capacity-building in relevant institutions in developing countries. At the time of preparation of tools, there should be a considered strategy for their dissemination.

As far as circumstances permit, tools should be based primarily on the experience of developing countries. This would enable the prescriptions that are encouraged to be appropriate to the situations of poor developing countries. This would require a concerted effort on the part of UNODC to collect, organize and analyse the experience and best practices of developing countries.

Mechanisms should be established to improve the channels of communication between headquarters and the field level, in particular with regard to quality control of field-level tools. The field level should also be more involved with the dissemination and application of tools produced at headquarters.

Evaluations of programmes and projects should examine the contribution made by tools to outcomes.

A central web site that registers all information on tools should be established at UNODC, with an obligation on producers of tools to register them.

Policy guidelines should be developed to determine future practice in the preparation, dissemination and application of all tools.

***In brief...***

A fundamental question raised by this evaluation is whether or not tools and toolkits are an appropriate, effective and efficient mechanism of delivering technical cooperation. The evaluation has established that tools and toolkits as an instrument are indeed appropriate and are effective modalities for this purpose. However, UNODC has not taken full advantage of this mechanism such that it is fully and properly utilized. Therefore, the process of developing, disseminating and using tools and toolkits must be improved. The recommendations in the evaluation report address these issues.

# Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Summary matrix of findings, supporting evidence and recommendations. . . . .		iii
Summary . . . . .		vi
Part One. The evaluation . . . . .	1-93	1
I. Introduction. . . . .	1-11	1
A. Background and context . . . . .	1-2	1
B. Purpose and objectives. . . . .	3-6	1
C. Scope and methodology. . . . .	7-11	2
II. Analysis. . . . .	12-35	3
A. Overall performance assessment. . . . .	12-16	3
B. Typology of tools . . . . .	17-21	4
C. Relevance of tools . . . . .	22-25	5
D. Dissemination. . . . .	26-29	7
E. Adaptation of tools. . . . .	30-31	7
F. Feedback and monitoring . . . . .	32-34	8
G. A policy for tools . . . . .	35	9
III. Analysis of individual tools. . . . .	36-83	9
A. Drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation. . . . .	38-44	10
B. GAP Toolkit . . . . .	45-47	11
C. Global Youth Network against Drug Abuse. . . . .	48-50	11
D. Alternative development . . . . .	51-54	12
E. Human trafficking . . . . .	55-57	13
F. Legislative guide to the anti-terrorism conventions . . . . .	58-60	14
G. Anti-Money-Laundering International Database. . . . .	61-64	14
H. Model legislation . . . . .	65-66	15
I. Computer-based training . . . . .	67-69	16
J. United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit (synopsis of the case study). . . . .	70-73	17
K. Field guides produced by India projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41 on community-wide demand reduction (synopsis of the case study) . . . . .	74-75	17
L. Tools produced at the field level. . . . .	76-82	18
M. Major findings . . . . .	83	19
IV. Outcomes, impact and sustainability. . . . .	84-87	21

V.	Lessons learned and best practices .....	88-90	22
A.	Lessons learned .....	88	22
B.	Best practices .....	89	23
C.	Constraints .....	90	23
VI.	Recommendations .....	91	24
VII.	Overall conclusions .....	92-93	26
	Part Two. The United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit: a case study .....	94-162	27
	Part Three. The field guides produced by India projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41 on community-wide demand reduction: a case study .....	163-222	37

Annexes

I.	The evaluation of tools and toolkits as a modality of programme delivery by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime: terms of reference .....	47
II.	List of persons interviewed .....	51

# Part One

## The evaluation

### I. Introduction

#### A. Background and context

1. From being a relatively peripheral player, UNODC has moved to centre stage within the United Nations and the global multilateral system in recent years. Drugs and crime are now recognized as overarching global challenges, threatening global and national governance. Drugs, terrorism, money-laundering, human trafficking and corruption are critical factors in relations between States and in the overall management of the global intergovernmental system. UNODC is a key actor in the multilateral system to manage such issues. It is confronted with challenges as well as opportunities in tailoring and adjusting its organizational systems and procedures to meet new demands. The opportunity to play a lead and constructive role in enabling countries—especially developing ones—to build capacity to address these critical issues within the framework of an international consensus is evident.

2. This is the context in which UNODC normative and operational activities have to be placed. It is also the background against which the present evaluation has to be seen. The magnitude of the resources required for the struggle against drugs and crime is massive and is far beyond the modest resources available to UNODC. Most resources for these tasks have to come from national Governments, of both developing and donor countries. The contribution of UNODC, although not large financially, can make an important difference through the deployment of high-quality technical resources. They can be the catalyst for generating action on a larger scale in the fight against drugs and crime. Most developing countries lack the capacity, the “soft” and “hard” infrastructure, the knowledge, information and technical resources necessary to develop effective responses to the problems they are confronted with. UNODC tools can help build such capacity. Planning, designing, adapting and applying relevant technical tools, jointly and in partnership with the countries concerned, can be an effective means of capacity-building. UNODC has long experience in producing tools of various kinds. What is now required is a re-examination of its strategy and methodology of producing and disseminating tools in order to make them crucial weapons in the war on drugs and crime.

#### B. Purpose and objectives

3. The purpose of the evaluation was to achieve a common understanding of what tools and toolkits are in UNODC and what they have achieved in terms of results, outcomes and impact. A secondary aim was to extract from the diverse activities relating to tool production and dissemination the key common elements that feature in those processes. The identification of such common elements was intended to enable the evaluation team to make recommendations for UNODC that would increase the relevance of tools and toolkits, their effectiveness and impact and thus obtain greater value from the resources utilized.

4. The objective was to examine and analyse the tools and toolkits produced by UNODC in recent years. Tools are an integral and critical part of technical cooperation and individual tools need to be seen in the context of projects and programmes. Some tools are high-profile and global in nature, while others are more specifically project-oriented and local in their application.

5. The evaluation sought to draw lessons and identify best practices that could be used to improve future design and dissemination of tools and toolkits as well as in the management of related processes. For the purpose of the present evaluation, “tool” and “toolkit” were defined as follows:

(a) A “tool” is a printed or online/electronic instrument for the transfer of knowledge and experience on a given topic or issue, organized in a systematic manner and developed by experts in the subject area, by means of which the target audience acquires know-how and the ability to apply it. Guides, manuals and various types of didactic material can be considered tools of this nature;

(b) A “toolkit” is a compilation of tools that brings together in one place practical information for accomplishing a goal or beginning a project. A toolkit can be organized thematically or sequentially. It can consist of, but is not limited to, case studies, action plans, policies, learning modules, resource lists, useful terminology and important contacts. It is a selection of tools that the target group can deploy to achieve a goal.

6. The above definitions are sufficiently broad to include a large number of products. On the basis of these definitions, UNODC has produced a few hundred tools at the global, regional and country levels through programmes and projects.

### **C. Scope and methodology**

7. The scope of the evaluation included all the tools produced by UNODC since 1999. However, to examine and analyse the entire corpus of tools produced was not feasible. A sample of tools considered representative of the various tasks and mandates of UNODC was therefore selected for closer scrutiny. Eleven tools were selected, representing the broad area of crime and the social, health and economic aspects of drugs. A few tools produced in the field, including some produced by regional projects, were included in the selection. The selected tools were examined briefly from several angles: the need for them; the preparatory process, including consultative and design processes; the quality of the final output; strategies for their dissemination; and the outcomes so far.

8. Two tools, the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* and tools produced by the India projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41, were the subject of case studies and were examined using the same criteria as above, while touching, to a degree, on some substantive matters (see parts two and three below).

9. The evaluation team found that the survey on treatment training materials undertaken by the Demand Reduction Section, Policy Development and Analysis Branch, of the former United Nations International Drug Control Programme (now UNODC), in 2003 was a valuable inventory of nearly 100 tools developed through various field projects. The survey was used as the basis for information on local tools.

10. Initially, a desk review was undertaken of relevant documents and tools. To obtain the views and insights of producers and users of these tools, two questionnaires were developed. The questionnaire on tools and toolkits was addressed to those with responsibility for production and dissemination. About 20 persons at headquarters and in the field were contacted by this means. Their response has been excellent—100 per cent. About 50 users of the tools also received the questionnaire and the response here was modest—25 per cent. A circular letter was despatched to field offices and the response was minimal. This was followed up by a series of interviews with those at headquarters responsible for the production and dissemination of tools and also with a few users who were in Vienna. One case study (the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit*) was undertaken during a field visit to Nigeria by one member of the evaluation team.

11. The terms of reference of the evaluation appear in annex I. A list of individuals interviewed during the evaluation is also attached (annex II).

## **II. Analysis**

### **A. Overall performance assessment**

12. There was found to be an expanding range of tools in UNODC: these tools were of various kinds and addressed a large number of subjects. The reasons for producing them were many and varied—decisions of governing bodies, United Nations resolutions, demands from within headquarters and from the field and the perceived need for tools for training, instruction and guidance through technical cooperation. Tools were prepared through differing processes, some utilizing primarily headquarters staff, others based mainly upon outside consultancy services and others with varying combinations of the two. The target groups for the tools extended from policy makers to practitioners, non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations and to concerned members of the general public.

13. Most tools were in printed form, but were increasingly available in electronic versions or exclusively as computer-based tools. A clear distinction should be made between the tools produced at headquarters and the large number of tools being produced at the field level, through field offices and UNODC projects. Broadly, there were three categories of tools: (a) tools in the broad area of crime, prepared at UNODC headquarters; (b) tools in the broad area of drugs, prepared at UNODC headquarters; and (c) tools prepared by UNODC field offices and projects, largely for local application. The latter category dealt mainly with drug abuse issues and is dealt with in paragraphs 76-82 below.

14. It was not possible to come up with precise figures on the number of tools that had been produced in the past decade because records were not available. It was estimated that nearly 100 tools had been prepared at UNODC headquarters during the period under review. More of them were in the broad area of crime, including the criminal aspects of drugs, while a smaller number concerned the social, health and economic aspects of drugs. There was a discernible trend to produce more headquarters tools on issues relating to law and crime, as compared with the social and health aspects of drugs.

15. There were around 250 ongoing regional and field projects, the majority of which were on the social, health and economic aspects of drugs. Field-level projects in the broad area of crime appeared to rely heavily on tools produced by headquarters instead of producing their own tools (there were some exceptions, such as the computer-based training tools in South-East Asia from project AD/RAS/97/C51). Most field-level tools appeared to be related to the social and health aspects of drugs. To make an estimate of the number of tools produced at the field level was not feasible because of poor record-keeping, although the numbers could be said to run into hundreds, depending upon what training material was included. (Some training material appeared to be ephemeral and of limited interest and was not included.)

16. Overall, there was a significant disconnection between headquarters and the field in the development and dissemination of tools. Headquarters tools could profit from the experience of field-level projects when they were being developed and rely less on the experience of developed countries. Conversely, field projects did not appear to take full account of the tools produced at headquarters when producing their own local tools. Field-level tools were produced in a fragmented fashion from one project to another. There was no institutional mechanism in place to facilitate the exchange of experience between headquarters and the field, especially in tool production. There was no institutional memory (library or central web site) within the Office to make possible the collection and transmission of information on tools. Technical staff at headquarters appeared to be consulted only intermittently and not on any regular basis in the preparation of tools in the field. Many field projects were developing tools on identical issues and subjects without taking account of similar tools produced by other projects. Such a practice can be considered a waste of scarce resources.

## **B. Typology of tools**

17. A logical distinction, for analytical purposes, can be made between tools produced by UNODC within its remit and responsibility for crime (including the criminal aspects of drugs) and its work on the social, economic and health aspects of drug abuse and its prevention. The tools produced in the crime portfolio lend themselves to greater specificity and precision, as they address primarily legal issues, legislation and its implementation. Most tools in this area are concerned with United Nations and international conventions and agreements that have a universal application; they are aimed at obtaining legislative compliance at the country level with internationally agreed conventions and at ensuring that they are implemented. Legislative prescriptions offered by such tools require no distinction between developing and developed countries. Distinctions are made according to legal systems—common law, civil law or Islamic law—and those categorizations cut across the developing/developed country divide. Legislation on issues such as terrorism, money-laundering and corruption are largely universal in nature, with appropriate adjustments made for the three types of legal system now prevailing.

18. It was found that most of the tools on crime were prepared at the headquarters level and there was no information on those produced at the field level (with the exception of the tools reported from South-East Asia). There was more information available regarding a clearer link between the legal tools and training activities

undertaken by UNODC. The tools produced at headquarters were clearly associated with training activities undertaken by headquarters staff. Technical cooperation activities on crime—anti-terrorism, corruption, money-laundering and mutual legal assistance—appeared to be largely driven by headquarters, more so than in drugs, where most such activities were field-based. The tools on crime addressed critical issues related to good governance and international order for the most part.

19. Tools concerned with drug abuse treatment and prevention lacked the legalistic specificity that was associated with the tools on crime. They addressed issues that were mostly in the field of health and social policy. (Alternative development tools were more in the field of development policy.) The problem of drugs and how to address it does not lend itself to as much precision as issues in the fields of law and crime. There are more elusive and circumstantially varied situations to be taken into account when producing tools in that area. There are also more extensive outreach communities to be addressed, including non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations. Prescriptions also depend upon the availability of resources. This is probably one reason why most tools addressing those issues were produced locally, through field projects.

20. Another broad distinction that can be made is between tools directly connected with training and others that are relatively free-standing, although they are instructional material. Most of the tools relating to legislation were linked directly to training, while the *Drug Abuse Treatment Toolkit*, the General Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse's *GAP Toolkit* and the Global Youth Network toolkit were relatively free-standing. The computer-based training tool might even belong in its own category, as it constituted the training activity itself. Each type of tool had its value and no one tool was superior to the other, as use depended upon circumstances. Whenever a tool is not directly linked to training, a greater effort to promote its use and application is imperative.

21. Herein lies another important issue. As a key player in the multilateral system and with mandates to take on a lead role, UNODC cannot confine itself to the development of tools that are relevant only to its own technical cooperation programmes and associated training activities. Capacity-building to meet the challenges that developing countries face in the areas of concern to UNODC is so urgent and wide-ranging that a massive effort is required outside UNODC. This has to be undertaken by the developing countries themselves and other bilateral and multilateral donors. Such efforts by UNODC partners can be encouraged and enriched through the technical expertise of UNODC reflected in tools, which can then be utilized to improve capacity, a function of all the tools that UNODC produces and especially of those which are free-standing, provided they can be adapted to varied situations. UNODC tools should not be seen as confined in their utility and value to technical cooperation activities executed and implemented by the Office. Networks of partnerships with institutions and other actors in developing countries should lead to optimal outcomes in this regard.

### **C. Relevance of tools**

22. A critical issue in the production of effective tools is that they should be based on experience that is relevant to the countries where they are to be applied. Relevant

and effective tools in the broad area of drugs can only be produced if they are based largely on the experience of developing countries. Most United Nations development agencies place emphasis on drawing from such experience. It was found that the few tools that had been produced at UNODC headquarters appeared to fall short on this criterion, as they were based largely on the experience of resource-rich developed countries. This was true of tools such as the *Drug Abuse Treatment and Rehabilitation: a Practical Planning and Implementation Guide* tools under the Global Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse and the Global Youth Network. Most of these tools were produced by experts from developed countries, based on the experience of those countries, although relatively modest inputs from developing countries could be observed. The bibliographical references in these tools were related overwhelmingly to the experience of developed countries. The tools therefore lacked direct relevance to prevailing circumstances and lost their effectiveness in resource-poor countries.

23. The argument adduced for this was that only the experience of developed countries was available in any analytically organized form and experience of developing countries was not available in a form that could be utilized. The response to that argument would be that if such organized information was not available, then it was the task of UNODC technical cooperation activities to assist in the building up of a corpus of solid experience. It was also evident that there was a growing body of experience that was being documented through UNODC field activities. The disconnection between headquarters tools and local tools arose in part from not incorporating sufficiently the experience of developing countries into the production of tools at headquarters.

24. UNODC has a major opportunity to play the lead role in developing tools that are primarily of interest to resource-poor developing countries through its technical cooperation activities. Instead of developing tools based on the experience of resource-rich developed countries, the experience of UNODC projects and field offices needs to be drawn upon to collect and collate the experience of developing countries and to identify best practices, especially in drug abuse treatment.

25. Tools need to be prepared to suit situations where overwhelming resource constraints—financial and professional—act as major handicaps. This is part of the problem with the current generation of tools, which predicate themselves on resource-endowed country situations. To develop tools appropriate to fragile and weak capacities, there has to be more information and research into what works and what can work in developing countries. Best practices have to be identified from these difficult circumstances. It is feasible to draw on the expertise of developed countries to explore the contrasting circumstances of resource-poor countries so that they can develop ideas and insights to address problems based on the real-life situations of the poor countries. Governments and organizations in the resource-poor countries may not have the knowledge or the capacity to identify best practices suitable to them. UNODC thus has an opportunity to assist them in addressing their drug and crime problems more effectively by the production of relevant tools.

## **D. Dissemination**

26. The effectiveness and impact of tools that are produced depend upon their dissemination and their relevant application by appropriate users. Production of a tool is only one part of a longer and larger process. Disseminating tools and ensuring their appropriate use requires equal attention.

27. It was found that one important deficiency in the whole process of production and dissemination of tools was that there was little information regarding the uses to which the tools had been applied. There was some information regarding dissemination: they had been sent to field offices and possibly to some other institutions. Whenever training activities were linked to tools (in particular in the field of crime), there was information regarding their use. In the broad area of drugs, there was much less information on the relevant use of tools. There were random pieces of information on use and the questionnaire targeting users had produced a modest level of information in that regard. The problem was that there was no overall strategy to ensure that UNODC tools were made use of effectively. In the case of headquarters tools, it was often left to field offices and projects and other non-UNODC institutions (Governments, other United Nations entities or non-governmental agencies) to find, retrieve and make use of them.

28. UNODC headquarters could not supervise the dissemination of tools more appropriately and more intensively, in part because of resource constraints. For example, in drug abuse treatment, there was only one Professional staff member at headquarters, who had little time to be involved in developing and implementing an effective strategy for utilization of tools. Apart from resource constraints, better planning, linked to an overall dissemination strategy, would improve matters. This is an aspect that requires further consideration. Greater involvement of field offices and projects to disseminate tools and encourage bodies to promote them through workshops and seminars at the local level is required.

29. There is tangible evidence that wherever tools were linked to training activities, there was a strategy for dissemination going beyond the mere management of a mailing list. When tools were associated with training, their immediate impact was visible (see the sections on model legislation and the tools to combat human trafficking below), while for other tools, where training was randomly linked, tangible effects were not obvious. When tools are not related to training, their dissemination could be productively pursued through mechanisms such as workshops and seminars organized by regional and country offices of UNODC. To illustrate, the publication of the *Drug Abuse Treatment Toolkit* was a key event and such tools could be followed up by seminars and workshops, which would encourage their use by relevant policy makers and practitioners and would also contribute to linking up with field-level technical assistance. These are issues that must be considered at the project design stage in order to ensure that adequate resources are set aside.

## **E. Adaptation of tools**

30. Adaptation of tools produced by headquarters to suit country circumstances holds the key to ensuring greater impact of such tools, especially in the area of

drugs. Efficient adaptation practices call for closer working relationships with key relevant institutions, especially in countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The process of adaptation has to be undertaken in cooperation with relevant national institutions, both governmental and non-governmental. Professional associations concerned with crime and drugs are particularly appropriate for association as counterpart institutions in the process of adaptation. Such a process will transform the generic tools produced for global use to suit the circumstances in each country and should also result in building their own capacities.

31. To illustrate from the experience of another United Nations body: ITC, which is based in Geneva, has developed a strategy to adapt its globally produced tools to suit the circumstances of individual countries, through what is described as a “product network approach”, whereby a network of institutions in developing countries cooperate with ITC headquarters in adapting the global tools. It might be worthwhile to consider a similar approach, on a pilot basis initially. To make adaptation possible, global tools have to be produced with such a process in mind beforehand. The current generation of tools might not necessarily be appropriate for adaptation. They appear to be more suitable as background material for use in the development of local tools.

## **F. Feedback and monitoring**

32. An extremely important shortcoming that came to light during the evaluation was that there were no criteria to judge the effectiveness and impact of the tools were being produced and disseminated. There was some feedback on the value of tools from users, although this was relatively sparse. Whenever tools were utilized in training activities, the feedback on them from trainees was largely positive. The response to the users questionnaire sent in the context of the present evaluation has also been largely positive, although the responses have been relatively few in number.

33. It is important that criteria are established, to the extent that it is feasible, to judge the relevance and effectiveness of these tools. In the area of crime, for example, tools were aimed primarily at obtaining national legislative compliance on global conventions. Is it not practicable to establish benchmarks and then assess the progress being made by countries in that direction? UNODC can maintain a “scorecard”, even for internal purposes, and maybe even report to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the other bodies that define the mandate of UNODC. This should give some indication of the contribution that tools and related training are making to the progress of legislative compliance. Similarly, there are other criteria that might be considered for other tools, although that might be more problematic. For tools in the area of drugs, the extent of the references made to them in field-level tools may be an appropriate criterion. Whatever the approach, evaluation of tools from time to time holds the key to maintaining their relevance and effectiveness.

34. From interviews, responses to questionnaires and from other documentary evidence, it can be clearly stated that there is a high level of commitment on the part of UNODC officials to produce high-quality tools and make appropriate use of them. The problem has been that staff are working under severe resource

constraints, both technical and financial, and there is a lack of strategic vision, which leads to less than optimal outcomes. In particular, there is no apparent overall strategy at headquarters to ensure that global tools are made use of to maximum effect.

### **G. A policy for tools**

35. It was evident from the evaluation that there was no coherent overall policy as regards the production, dissemination and application of tools. There were significant discrepancies between headquarters and the field. No consistent approach was evident in the identification of needs, or the assessment of needs, prior to the production of tools. Consultation procedures were left to the discretion of individual tool producers. The dissemination and application aspects, once tools were produced, could best be described as subsidiary activities, without being an integral part of the entire process of obtaining optimal value from the tools. The allocation of resources for tools, in its overall perspective, had also not been clearly thought through. Issues of quality control and exchange of experience in tool production at the field level were only randomly addressed. There was also no policy direction on the important issue of drawing more from evolving developing countries field-level experience in the technical and substantive content of these tools. Comprehensive and coherent guidelines on tool production and dissemination are urgently required. Such guidelines should enable the synergies and complementarities inherent in the large portfolio of UNODC tools to be exploited for maximum benefit.

## **III. Analysis of individual tools**

36. From among the large number of tools available, a sample of nine were selected for cursory analysis and two (the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* and tools from projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41 in India) were the subject of in-depth case studies (see parts two and three below). The analysis of each of the tools highlighted important features in tool production and dissemination. The technical content of the nine tools sampled was not analysed, as that was not within the competence of the evaluators. The two case studies did address substantive issues when relevant.

37. The evaluation showed that, in preparing most of the tools (the *Drug Abuse Treatment Toolkit*, the *GAP Toolkit*, model legislation and *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* and computer-based training), experts and expert groups were engaged to provide advice. Some tools were developed on the basis of needs assessments (for example, the tools to combat human trafficking and computer-based training). Peer groups also played a part in preparing these tools (for example, the youth tools, where a youth network was involved). In-house expertise and outside consultants combined in varying degrees to produce these tools, most of which were justified on the grounds that they were part of the strategy to implement globally agreed conventions and United Nations resolutions.

## A. Drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation

38. The *Drug Abuse Treatment Toolkit* has three parts to it: the main component is *Drug Abuse Treatment and Rehabilitation: a Practical Planning and Implementation Guide*, which provides a comprehensive approach to these issues. The other components are *Investing in Drug Abuse Treatment: a Discussion Paper for Policy Makers* and *Contemporary Drug Abuse Treatment: a Review of the Evidence Base*. Together, these tools provide comprehensive guidance in this field.

39. The *Toolkit* was produced in response to the Declaration on the Guiding Principles of Drug Demand Reduction, adopted by the General Assembly at its twentieth special session (resolution S-20/3, annex), in which the Assembly called for identification and dissemination of best practices, and in response to field office requests. The objective of the *Toolkit* is to provide a broad up-to-date framework to guide planners and implementers through a number of key steps required for the initiation and the further development of treatment and rehabilitation services. It was prepared by a team of high-level consultants with assistance from UNODC headquarters. There has been a modest amount of consultation with field offices and it has been field-tested through various workshops. Users who responded to the questionnaire considered it a high-quality product and a state-of-the-art guide to drug abuse treatment. It is thus appropriate reference material for relevant institutions and their libraries.

40. While it is an impressive instrument, bringing together the varied sources of information and analysis in the area, it is based largely on the experience of resource-endowed developed countries. While there are some references to the experience of developing countries, they are the exception: in the document reviewing the evidence base, of the 136 references, hardly any references to developing-country sources could be found, although experts from four developing countries were consulted during the process of developing the *Toolkit*.

41. For the *Toolkit* to be useful as a practitioners' guide in the context of resource-poor developing countries, it must be supplemented by analysis of best practices in developing countries. An organized effort to find such practices is imperative—an important lesson to be drawn from this *Toolkit*.

42. At the same time the *Toolkit* was being prepared, a corresponding exercise by the same unit of UNODC led to a survey on treatment training materials. This was an imaginative attempt to compile information on tools produced by UNODC projects. Regrettably, the information gained from the survey could not be followed up for incorporation into the *Toolkit*, as these were parallel exercises and not intended as linked activities. Connecting such streams of knowledge and information is a task for the future.

43. The *Toolkit* has been disseminated to field offices and other counterpart institutions. Several workshops and seminars held for other purposes have been occasions to introduce it. While the document has been distributed to relevant institutions, there is no clear dissemination strategy to aggressively promote it, although this is a critical part of ensuring that the *Toolkit* has optimal impact. This is an important issue, which is not confined to this *Toolkit* and indeed applies to most of the others. The *Toolkit* is too valuable a resource for it not to be actively

promoted at the field level and also to make a future update possible, based more on field experience.

44. While a user questionnaire is included in the *Toolkit*, there is no evidence of any feedback. This is not surprising, as response to this type of questionnaire is never very encouraging.

## **B. GAP Toolkit**

45. The *GAP Toolkit* is another comprehensive kit with an expanding number of modules (four modules have already been published and a few more are to come). The *Toolkit* is also a response to General Assembly decisions and its request for assistance to Member States to build up their capacity for data collection. Module 1, *Developing an Integrated Drug Information System*, is comprehensive and technically sophisticated and so are the other modules that are now available.

46. The *Toolkit* is an integral part of the technical assistance activities undertaken by the Global Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse. It is being utilized for training activities and regional advisors of the Programme are encouraged to use it. There is some kind of dissemination strategy, although it is not spelled out in any detail. The strategy hinges on making the *Toolkit* available to relevant national institutions.

47. While the *Toolkit* is a valuable contribution and should stimulate resource-poor developing countries to improve their information systems, the main drawback is that the system prescribed is based largely on the experience of developed countries where advanced statistical systems, backed up by technical and financial resources, are in place. Most developing countries lack that kind of statistical capacity and it will be years before they reach that stage. What is therefore required for practical purposes is a tool that can assist those countries to develop their information systems from the low base they are in and to suit it to their available resources and their urgent priorities. Headquarters staff recognize the need for a more practical guide for those countries. Closer interaction with the Electronic Publishing Unit of the United Nations Office at Vienna might have contributed to greater user-friendliness in the design of the *Toolkit*. To obtain greater impact from this valuable compilation, a strategy for its wider adaptation and application in developing countries should be developed.

## **C. Global Youth Network against Drug Abuse**

48. The toolkit for youth on drug abuse and treatment was developed within the framework of the Global Youth Network against Drug Abuse, which itself was the result of the Drug Abuse Prevention Forum held in Banff, Canada, in 1998. The toolkit currently consists of five publications: *A Participatory Handbook for Youth Drug Abuse Prevention Programmes* and four others dealing with sport, peer-to-peer strategies, performance (drama) and the Internet. More tools are to be added to the series. The publications were prepared in consultation with youth groups, drawing on their experience. A noteworthy feature of the preparation of the toolkit is its participatory nature.

49. The toolkit has been used in the various workshops associated with the Global Youth Network. The value of the tools has been enhanced as a result of the interactions at the workshops. The tools have been disseminated to over 300 members of the Network. There is also a clear effort by the headquarters unit that deals with youth issues to promote the use of the tools in field offices and projects. About 50 field projects (out of a total of about 250 UNODC projects) have a youth component and these tools might have some relevance in them. Whenever projects come up for approval at headquarters, the headquarters unit has used that opportunity to promote the use of these tools through them. This is an important facet in tool promotion. The design of the entire toolkit is user-friendly. Written simply and directly and attractively presented, it is the type of publication that is easily read by practitioners; these are not academic documents.

50. Even in these documents, which are highly user-friendly and can be adapted for use in developing countries, the experience and information base that they have drawn upon is largely from developed countries and best practices too come largely from them. In the publication on the Internet, the seven examples of best practice are all from developed countries. There has to be an effort to obtain experience from developing countries. UNODC officials at headquarters are alert to this aspect. In the *Participatory Handbook*, there is a request for more information on evolving experience. It is essential that this be followed up through field offices and projects and information compiled from poor countries, which can then be incorporated into future material.

#### **D. Alternative development**

51. There are many UNODC publications on alternative development. Eleven publications were listed as available in June 2004, but not all of them fall within the definition of “tools” used in the present evaluation. The main publication that is being examined here relates to the Andean experience. The monitoring and evaluation manual prepared by the UNODC Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific (Bangkok) has also been cursorily examined.

52. With regard to the publication *Alternative Development in the Andean Area*,<sup>1</sup> which was first printed in 1997 and reprinted in 2001, this was a joint effort between UNODC headquarters and the field. The work was issued in English and is presumed to have been prepared in Spanish. There is hardly any information available on the dissemination of the publication and the extent to which it might have been utilized.

53. The publication *A Manual on Monitoring and Evaluation for Alternative Development Projects* was prepared by the International Centre of Chiang Mai University in Thailand and published by the Regional Centre in 2003. There was hardly any contact with headquarters in the production of this tool. The *Manual* has been linked with training activities. Three interesting aspects of the *Manual* can be observed. Firstly, associating a local university in the production of the tool has contributed to capacity-building in local institutions. This offers lessons more

---

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.01.XI.4.

generally in the production of practical tools. Secondly, the employment of a local institution, which apparently has some expertise in alternative development issues, has led to the document being based to a significant extent on regional experience and the bibliographical references have a large component of material and sources derived from the regional experience. Thirdly, there is no evidence of dissemination of the *Manual* beyond South-East Asia.

54. There is an upcoming evaluation of alternative development projects. This is an opportunity to examine in more detail the tools that have been produced in the area, at the headquarters level, the regional level and by projects. This could be an evaluation where the role of tools in technical cooperation can be explored in detail. Alternative development opportunities vary extensively from country to country and it is not clear that there is significant scope for the transfer of experience from one country to another.

## **E. Human trafficking**

55. The training manual *Measures to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings in Benin, Nigeria and Togo* was produced through a regional project (FS/RAF/03/R13) for use in training activities. It was developed on the basis of needs assessment. It has a narrow focus, on training officials of the criminal justice system in the three countries. The target audience is clearly identified. Dissemination of the tool is therefore relatively easy and predictable. The document itself is user-friendly, being a mix of narrative text and graphic and indented presentations, with interspersed sections on key terms, self-assessment questions, learning objectives and so on. It is not a “heavy” text.

56. The manual is intended to facilitate the ratification and implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (General Assembly resolution 55/25, annex I) and its Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (resolution 55/25, annex II), and Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air (resolution 55/25, annex III), as well as the Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters and the Convention on Extradition of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), which are themselves based on UNODC model legislation. (This also illustrates the influence of model legislation at the regional and country levels.) The manual was also based on some previous documents of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Office in Romania and the International Centre for Migration Policy Development. It is planned to produce revised versions of the tool to cover the entire West African region and also Viet Nam.

57. There are several interesting features in relation to this tool. It is a direct response to an acute and recently high-profile and highly specific problem. It is the outcome of a regional project and illustrates the opportunities that are available within such projects to develop tools that have both a local and a more global application. The tool draws exclusively on the experience of the problem on the ground. It is a tool that is also noteworthy for its potential for replication and also for its user-friendliness. It has been adapted in Viet Nam and is expected to be adapted in the wider ECOWAS region. A high degree of cooperation between

headquarters and the field is clearly evident. Although unrealized so far, the tool opens up an opportunity for UNODC, in West Africa in particular, to bring together the United Nations entities working in the field to address the issue of human trafficking through a more integrated approach.

## **F. Legislative guide to the anti-terrorism conventions**

58. The purpose of the *Legislative Guide to the Universal Anti-Terrorism Conventions and Protocols*<sup>2</sup> was to provide a teachers' manual to trainers at headquarters, as well as to provide reading material for trainees. Apart from printed copies, the *Guide* has been posted on the UNODC web site. It is a 36-page document, simply and handily printed. It is a matter-of-fact document, explaining the content and implications of the many conventions on anti-terrorism developed within the United Nations over four decades. It is a useful and relevant guide to policy makers, legislators and those drafting legislation. As States are expected to adjust their laws to conform with international conventions and protocols, the *Guide* has a practical purpose in facilitating such harmonization. It is on record that the document is appreciated within the United Nations system.

59. The *Guide* has been used extensively in the past 12-18 months in Vienna and in the field: 30 courses have been held where it has been used as training material. Personnel in ministries of trade, finance and foreign affairs and in central banks have participated in the training courses. The document has been used by the International Monetary Fund in courses relating to the financing of terrorism and there has been cooperation with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in the Central Asian republics. The *Guide* has been translated into six languages. There is now a request for a further updated practical guide, based on the recommendations of an expert group that met in Africa.

60. There are several noteworthy features. The *Guide* is a relatively low-cost publication, prepared largely within UNODC. It directly addresses an identified need in many States for expert guidance in an important emerging field of international law. As the dissemination of the tool is linked to training, the connection with users is unambiguous. It is focused on a target audience and has directly facilitated the technical assistance programme of UNODC. The *Guide* is considered a relevant tool by the Counter-Terrorism Committee established pursuant to Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) of 28 September 2001. Through its publication, UNODC has taken the lead in this particular area, optimally exploiting the enhanced interest and emerging opportunities in building up capacity to draft and implement anti-terrorism legislation. The important lesson to be drawn from this tool is that UNODC needs to exploit its comparative advantages in addressing the new global challenges and to come up with imaginative responses.

## **G. Anti-Money-Laundering International Database**

61. This is an operational tool, relatively unique in the entire repertoire of UNODC tools. It is a compendium of analyses of national laws and regulations to

---

<sup>2</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.04.V.7.

fight money-laundering and also contains information on procedures for international cooperation. It has been in existence since 1997 and is updated regularly. It is available for use only by public organizations that are registered with the Database. The restriction on access is due not to reasons of confidentiality, but more to control the flow of information and be aware of who the users are.

62. The Database is managed by UNODC within the framework of a more extensive system of international cooperation that has brought together the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Council of Europe, the Financial Assistance Task Force on Money Laundering, the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol), and the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) of the Organization of American States. UNODC has found its niche within this system through the Database, which is highly regarded by international partners. In January 2003, the journal *Foreign Policy* nominated it the best of the web resources for information about money-laundering. The web site has recently been redesigned in order to add new items and make it more user-friendly.

63. As the Database is so highly regarded as a useful tool to facilitate effective legislation to fight money-laundering and also to make possible case-based cooperation across judicial jurisdictions, there is an important obligation for UNODC to ensure that the tool continues to be effective and relevant. As it has existed since 1997, revisiting its concept and contents, on the basis of a user survey, might be appropriate at the present point. It is imperative that the extent of information supplied by States be analysed in detail: there are significant gaps in the information provided by States, with some not having supplied any at all. An extra and more aggressive effort to obtain information and fill the gaps is urgently required to make the Database a more productive operational tool. Resource constraints have been an important factor in retarding such an effort and this needs to be overcome soon.

64. As the Database is a significant component in the broader effort in international cooperation, UNODC needs to take the initiative in improving its relevance. It is also necessary to re-examine the restrictions on access to the web site. Is it not appropriate to encourage access to the web site by associations such as those of lawyers, human rights non-governmental organizations and others who might pressure Governments to adopt anti money-laundering legislation? Despite reservations on the part of programme staff, the evaluators felt that it might be appropriate to maintain a "scorecard" of the quality and quantity of information supplied by States, at least for use among the cooperating international institutions, so that they can encourage those who are remiss in supplying information to be more cooperative.

## **H. Model legislation**

65. The legal assistance programme has been an important mechanism for technical assistance in developing national legislation in accordance with international conventions. It is a specific response to General Assembly resolutions. Producing appropriate pieces of model legislation has been an important component of the programme. Most of the common and civil law models have been developed by in-house experts and are linked directly to training activities undertaken through

the programme. They also inform the relationships with the network of intergovernmental and professional legal partners within the programme (the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Southern African Development Community, ECOWAS and the Association of South-East Asian Nations. These tools have also been used at the country level by the various legal advisors placed in countries. The tools have been used in over 120 countries in six regions. This approach to tool production—developing model legislation—was initiated partly because it was the appropriate methodology to inform clients about legislative improvement and adjustment and also because the alternative of advising individual States is beyond the resources of UNODC. Model legislative tools should therefore be viewed as ensuring a cost-effective approach, given the limitation on resources.

66. While there is evidence that these tools are effective in training activities, there is less evidence of the tangible impact that they have made in changing the legislation at the country level. What is now required is a critical assessment of the model legislation approach to improving legislative compliance. Should these tools be supplemented by other approaches and tools? The obstacles to legislative reform and change do not lie only in deficiencies in technical knowledge. The lack of political will, vested interests, corruption and the absence of civil society pressures collude to prevent legislative improvement. How can these obstacles be overcome? Even a successful tool needs to be reassessed from time to time and a critical look at model legislation is probably now required.

## **I. Computer-based training**

67. Implementation of the project entitled “Enhancement of computer-based drug law enforcement training in East Asia” (AD/RAS/97/C51) began in 1997. Through this project, a computer-based training programme was developed by the UNODC Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific. It has been delivered in nine different languages to thousands of law enforcement officers in 10 countries. The programmes were developed by international experts in each of the subject areas. The training programmes that have been developed are being replicated elsewhere in many other countries. Several UNODC projects are making use of it. This is one instance where a tool produced in the field is being shared widely across many projects and many countries. The reason for this appears to be that the results of computer-based training have been made widely known to a user constituency.

68. Computer-based training is a cost-effective methodology to reach out to a large constituency of middle-level officials. It is implemented through designated training centres. It is designed for adaptation to differing country situations and into the appropriate languages. In computer-based training, the tool is the dominant feature in training and in programme delivery. This is unlike other tools, where the tool plays only a minor role in training activities. In computer-based training, the tool constitutes the training. There is an increasing demand for this type of training in other regions. A comprehensive evaluation of the performance of computer-based training is required, so that it can be expanded to include other subjects and issues within the mandate of UNODC.

69. An important aspect of computer-based training is the incorporation of an impact measurement instrument from the start of the design process. The overall

training programme is managed by a learning management system. Before and after each module the student has to take a test. The learning management system records the name and location of each student, the courses undertaken, courses completed and the results of the pre- and post-test scores. This provides management with useful evaluation data.

#### **J. United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit (synopsis of the case study)**

70. The *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* was produced within the framework of the Global Programme against Corruption. It was prepared as a headquarters-driven exercise, starting in April 2000 and ending in December 2003. In April 2000, 36 anti-corruption experts met in Vienna to initiate the process, with each expert contributing tools or case studies as the basis for the production of the *Toolkit*. The first edition of the *Toolkit* was printed in 2003 and a second edition in March 2004. The current *Toolkit* is organized into 10 chapters, contains 44 tools and 43 case studies and is a massive compendium of 655 pages. Apart from posting on the web page of the Global Programme against Corruption, 1,400 copies have been printed in English. There is little information as to who the users are. The positive features of the *Toolkit* are that it is a comprehensive guide to almost all aspects of corruption. It provides insights into development of the integrated approaches required to fight corruption.

71. There are several problems with the *Toolkit*. It is academic in nature and is not user-friendly. It is not focused on any one target group and its contents are relevant to a large number of potential user groups, with each of these groups probably concerned with only a small part of the compendium. There are problems with presentation of language (for example, tool 23 lacks precision and editorial quality).

72. The work that has gone into the preparation of the *Toolkit* has been immense and that effort should not be wasted. To obtain optimal impact, the *Toolkit* should be revised urgently and even broken into more user-friendly sections and parts, with specific target groups in mind. Field offices should be involved to promote the *Toolkit* in relevant constituencies at the country level.

73. There is another option that could be considered, especially to maintain the advantages of an integrated approach to issues of corruption. A readable, handy version of the compendium (of about 50 pages) could provide an outline of anti-corruption issues, while leaving the detail and component parts in a revised, user-friendly toolkit. The ultimate aim should be to ensure that the resources spent in this major effort have some impact at the country level. (The case study is described in detail in part two below.)

#### **K. Field guides produced by India projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41 on community-wide demand reduction (synopsis of the case study)**

74. Two projects—“Community-wide demand reduction in India” (AD/IND/99/E40) and “Community-wide demand reduction in the northern states of

India” (AD/IND/99/E41)—were implemented by UNODC and the Government of India between 1999 and 2003. The cost of the projects was nearly \$700,000. The survey of treatment training materials (see para. 9 above) lists seven tools produced by these projects, including CD-ROMs. Of these, two tools, the *Field Guide on Counselling for Drug Addiction* and *Documentation for Addiction Management*, both published in 2002, were presented to the evaluator for analysis. The two projects were evaluated recently and during that evaluation these tools were apparently not brought to the notice of the evaluation team by any entity working at the field level. This is an illustration of the general neglect of the role of tools in technical cooperation, especially at the evaluation stage.

75. The impression gained is that these tools were not considered central features in the project and were being treated as ancillary activities. There also appear to be problems with the model of the tools and their content. They prescribe a particular approach to treatment, when there are actually many options and alternatives available. This raises the issue of technical and quality control by UNODC of field-level tools. Does UNODC headquarters agree with the approach prescribed through these tools? (The case study is described in detail in part three below.)

## **L. Tools produced at the field level**

76. Field-level tools are a key aspect of UNODC technical cooperation. With 250 ongoing projects, there is a wide range of tools being produced every year. They are largely training materials, some more ephemeral than others. Some of the training tools are intended for very limited purposes, such as a training workshop. Others are more durable and have value over a longer period of time. Many of the tools are produced by consultants in the field and in local languages. They can be considered as reaching out to a constituency that is beyond the reach of global tools. When producing these tools, there should be opportunities for building capacity in local institutions, although there is little evidence of it.

77. As noted earlier (see paras. 9 and 74), a survey was undertaken by the Demand Reduction Section of treatment training materials developed at the field level and an internal report was completed in March 2003. The survey was an innovative and imaginative effort to develop an inventory of locally produced tools. The report provides interesting insights in its analysis of the tools identified. Seventy-two projects have produced tools, largely for training purposes, and nearly 30 per cent of those tools were produced in India, with Asia accounting for over 60 per cent of the total.

78. These locally produced tools in the field of drug abuse treatment appear to play a significant role in UNODC technical cooperation activities. The report provides extensive information on the uses to which tools have been put and their contribution to various training activities. Some of the tools produced in Pakistan, for example, have contributed directly to the training of 550 treatment professionals in the country. These field-level tools have also been translated into many local languages within each country, as and when appropriate, thus making them accessible to a significantly large and relevant audience.

79. While it is evident that the field tools have played an important part in training and dissemination of knowledge in the countries in which they were produced, there

are only isolated instances where headquarters has been kept informed or where technical support has been obtained from headquarters. Each country and each project appears to have undertaken these activities on its own, leading to an overall sense of fragmentation in the approach adopted to the development of tools at the field level.

80. There is an enormous potential for the transfer of knowledge regarding these tools to other field offices and projects and to other countries. The value of such an exchange of experience is clearly illustrated by the *Drug Counsellor's Handbook: a Practical Guide for Everyday Use*, produced for East Africa by the UNODC Regional Office in East Africa (Nairobi). This user-friendly guide has also proved useful in training activities in Afghanistan.

81. Facilitation of information exchange between projects and field offices and with headquarters on field-level tools can result in a more effective use of resources and in improving the quality of these tools. Another important aspect to note with regard to such tools is that they are more precisely target-focused than any global tool can be. For example, in Brazil one tool (including a video) was intended for drug abuse prevention among street children and adolescents. There is no reason why there cannot be a global tool focused on street children, allowing for its adaptation at the country level.

82. An important conclusion to be drawn from the survey is that there has been little contact with headquarters in the production of tools at the field level. It was noted earlier that, for effective use of global tools in technical cooperation activities, the experience of developing countries and their best practices should be initially researched. Basing global tools largely on the experience of developed countries makes them less relevant and effective. What is also clear from the survey is that there is a growing body of knowledge, experience and expertise and of best practice developed by various UNODC projects. There is a wealth of accumulating knowledge and information from which to draw in the production of global tools. They need not be based to a large extent on the experience of developed countries. For new tools to be developed on that basis, more intensive contacts and connections between UNODC headquarters and field offices at the time of going through the process of tool production, both global and local, have to be encouraged. The potential synergy between global and local tools so far lies dormant and is waiting to be exploited more fully, so that there can be a more relevant and valuable generation of tools in the future.

## **M. Major findings**

83. The major findings of the analysis of individual tools are as follows:

- No overall, comprehensive policy for tool production and dissemination or their application can be observed within UNODC. Fragmentation of tool production and dissemination activities is due primarily to the absence of overall policy guidelines. Current shortcomings can be overcome through a more coherent approach to tool production and dissemination.
- There is a lack of consistency and resulting deficiencies in the production process of these tools. For these tools to be user-friendly and address real

needs, there has to be an assessment of what is required, more consultation with practitioners and peer groups and more thought given to the appropriate design of products.

- The dissemination of tools is as important as their production. Dissemination is a relatively neglected aspect in many tools, due in part to resource constraints and in part to a lack of appreciation of the importance of vigorously promoting them. Field offices have not been fully engaged in the promotion of many tools. Tools are produced, but are not adequately followed through in order to gauge impact.
- From the sample of tools examined, it can be concluded that the tools produced by UNODC are of high quality and are an integral part of the global programmes. They make an important contribution to facilitating the implementation of United Nations global conventions. Member States, in general, expect this kind of tool to be produced by UNODC. That is one of the reasons why donors are inclined to provide financing for tools.
- There are two broad types of tool—those in the area of crime and law and those relating to the socio-economic and health aspects of drugs. The former is in the field of law, order and governance and the other deals more with social issues. The prescriptions embodied in the first set of tools, by their nature, are more specific and precise, while in the latter those prescriptions have to be more nuanced and open to greater adaptation to country circumstances.
- Global tools on drugs rely heavily on the experience of developed countries and consequently their relevance is diminished in resource-poor country situations. Basing tools on the experience and best practices of developing countries should improve their effectiveness and impact.
- To collect and collate the experience and best practices of developing countries, so that they inform the relevant production of global tools, is imperative. A research programme that analyses field experience and builds up a corpus of knowledge is vital to the effectiveness of technical cooperation. Tools should be based on more research in a developing country context, rather than the mere transfer of the experience of developed countries.
- In the production of most tools by headquarters, the feasibility of adapting them to country situations has not been explored. Country-level adaptation can contribute to the greater relevance of tools to local situations and also enable processes of capacity-building to be built into the adaptation process. ITC has successfully experimented with a product network approach by which local institutions are associated in the adaptation of tools.
- Tools linked to training appear to be more purposively disseminated and have a more tangible impact than others. This is particularly true of tools on law and crime. Free-standing tools require greater efforts in promotion, especially through networks and partnerships at the country level.
- Tools produced by regional projects (human trafficking, alternative development and even computer-based training) are based largely on the

experience of developing countries. They are better suited to adaptation, whether as global or as country-level tools. Such regional tools fall between the local and the global.

- New electronic products, such as computer-based training, are being developed and these have enabled projects to reach out to large numbers of practitioners and to train them cost-effectively. Experience in electronic media training needs to be evaluated in detail. Such an evaluation should also examine the prospects and the opportunities for computer-based training in the whole range of UNODC technical cooperation activities.
- While large numbers of local tools are produced by UNODC projects (they can be described as “tools of the poor”), there is no mechanism, in most instances, to control their quality. Each project acts on its own and local tool production appears as a fragmented process. These are important tools to reach out to a large and relevant practitioner constituency. They are in local languages. Improving their quality and ensuring more consistency (especially in technical content) across projects and countries should make them more effective.
- There is a critical gap between headquarters and the field in tool production (global and local). No concerted strategy to exchange information and experience between headquarters and the field is evident. No institutional mechanism exists to transfer experience from one to the other. The lack of a central source of information on UNODC tools is a critical gap, which needs to be filled.
- There is no evidence that evaluations of projects and programmes have adequately addressed the issues relating to tools and tool production. The evaluation process of UNODC can contribute to the production of better and relevant tools and to ensuring that tools are disseminated effectively in order to achieve greater impact.

#### **IV. Outcomes, impact and sustainability**

84. Tools cannot be isolated from the overall technical cooperation programmes of UNODC. They are an integral part of technical cooperation and outcomes, impact and sustainability depend upon the overall technical cooperation effort. With this caveat, in general they are considered to have played a positive role in effective programme delivery.

85. As to outcomes, there are clear results in the form of people who have been trained. Significant numbers have been trained utilizing the model legislation, human trafficking and anti-terrorism tools. Similarly, large numbers have been trained through computer-based training projects. The outcomes in relation to tools on the social and health aspects of drugs are more intangible. There is some evidence that these tools are being utilized to improve systems and procedures. The problem is that there is no evidence on the outcomes. Moreover, these tools have been produced only recently and outcomes can only be judged after a reasonable period of time.

86. The impact of all these tools is difficult to measure and to judge. That also depends largely upon the success of the training programmes themselves. There can be a good tool, but lacklustre training can lessen its impact (not that this has happened). While there are large numbers of trainees who have used the tools, the ultimate impact of the training cannot be judged from the evidence available. Similarly, the impact of field-level tools cannot be judged, as again there is no firm evidence.

87. Sustainability is not so much about sustaining the tools, but their results. Sustainability will be ensured when tools are more attuned to the realities in developing countries and are open to adaptation/customization and updating at the country level. Sustainability can also be ensured when tools are produced and disseminated through partnerships and networks. The current generation of tools has deficiencies in some of these aspects.

## **V. Lessons learned and best practices**

### **A. Lessons learned**

88. The lessons learned from the evaluation may be summarized as follows:

- The relevance and effectiveness of tools will be enhanced when they are based on the experience of resource-poor developing countries, which are the primary users of tools. To develop tools largely on the basis of the experience of resource-rich developed countries makes them less effective in operational terms. A long-term effort to organize the experiences of developing countries to provide a basis for tool development is therefore vital.
- To obtain optimal impact, the dissemination and appropriate use and application of tools are as important as their production. Inadequate attention to the design of appropriate dissemination and user strategies for global tools has limited their impact and effectiveness.
- Deficiencies in the exchange of information between headquarters and the field when planning, designing and preparing tools has resulted in a lack of synergy, complementarities and linkage in tool production. Field offices and projects could be more alert to the appropriate utilization of tools produced at headquarters. Similarly, headquarters needs to be more informed of field-level practices in tool production. Improving communications between headquarters and the field in relation to tool production can enrich the quality and relevance of UNODC tools.
- When designing global tools, their possible adaptation at the country level should be borne in mind. Global tools need to be so designed as to facilitate the process of adaptation at the country level. The current generation of global tools may not be appropriate for such adaptation.
- The evaluation has established that user-friendliness should be a high priority in designing and producing tools. While academic inputs are important to the quality of the tools produced, they should also be informed

by the demands of practitioners. User-friendliness can be obtained by combining academic and practitioner inputs.

## **B. Best practices**

89. There are elements of best practices in most of the tools considered. No single tool can be judged a model tool from the information that is available. It is invidious to draw comparisons between the tools that have been selected for the present evaluation. Overall, the tools are satisfactory and each one of them has its own strengths:

- For state-of-the-art presentation of key issues, the *Drug Abuse Treatment Toolkit*, the Integrated Drug Information System of the Global Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse and the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* can be considered highly satisfactory.
- In facilitating the implementation of global conventions and in linking tools to training, the tools on model legislation, anti-terrorism and human trafficking can be recommended.
- For cost-effective forms of training, the above tools as well as the computer-based training programmes could be considered best practices.
- For absorbing the experience of developing countries, the tools on human trafficking and alternative development can be mentioned.
- For handiness of presentation and readability in a difficult subject, the *Legislative Guide to the Universal Anti-Terrorism Conventions and Protocols* constitutes a model.
- For user-friendliness in tools design, the Global Youth Network toolkit and the tool on human trafficking and the redesigned Anti-Money-Laundering International Database web site are good examples.
- In networking and building partnerships in the production and dissemination of tools, the Global Youth Network toolkit is a model.
- In carving out a niche within the overall framework of international cooperation and coordination in a key task of the international community (in this instance, money-laundering), the Anti-Money-Laundering International Database is a unique tool.
- The inventory of treatment training materials undertaken by means of the Demand Reduction Unit's survey offers the nucleus for a future web site, which will record and document all tools, especially those generated at the field and regional levels. The organization of the material in the survey offers important clues for the design of such a web site and a computerized database.

## **C. Constraints**

90. There are four general constraints on the production and appropriate dissemination of tools:

- There is a lack of general strategy to guide and inform the genesis, development and dissemination of tools and toolkits. In other words, there are no consistent policy guidelines for the development of tools and toolkits. As a result, there is fragmentation, especially between headquarters and the field, and there is no incentive for effective communication within UNODC on tool production and dissemination.
- Resources are an overriding constraint. While resources are provided for the development of tools, relatively few are allocated for their dissemination, except for several country-based projects that appear to provide resources for validation and dissemination. Headquarters technical staff are under strain in producing the tools and staff resources are lacking to oversee an appropriate dissemination and user strategy.
- No institutional mechanisms can be observed to encourage and facilitate the transfer of knowledge from the field to headquarters and also between field offices and projects across countries. Effective mechanisms for the transfer of experience and the exchange of information could lead to more optimal use of resources and greater effectiveness of project delivery.
- The glaring inadequacy of appropriately analysed information and experience from resource-poor developing countries acts as a deterrent to the effective production of tools. As a result, many tools base their prescriptions upon the experience of developed countries. Unlike in other areas of development, such as health or education, where there is a growing emphasis on identifying relevant experience and best practices of developing countries, in the area of drug abuse and its prevention there is little scholarly information to go by. This is a deficiency that has to be addressed by UNODC.

## **VI. Recommendations**

91. The evaluators make the following recommendations:

- Policy guidelines should be established to inform the entire process of tool and toolkit development and dissemination. The preparatory process for tool and toolkits must include the following—needs assessment, consultation procedures, target audiences, a dissemination strategy, feedback mechanisms and measures for impact. In the context of country-based projects, such information should be provided explicitly in project documents.
- A central web site that registers all information on tools, whether produced by headquarters or by regional, field and project offices, should be established at headquarters. An obligation should be placed on all those producing tools to post information on the web site, according to prescribed guidelines. A model format for this can be the survey on treatment training materials.
- Tools developed by headquarters should be based primarily on the experience of developing countries, to suit the conditions and situations in resource-poor developing countries. Excessive dependence on the

experience of developed countries should be avoided. This is a critical factor in making tools more relevant and effective.

- UNODC substantive units should play a more active and initiatory role in collecting, organizing and analysing relevant experience and best practices of developing countries. It is such a corpus of knowledge that can inform the development of practical operational tools of relevance to poor countries. Such an approach would also contribute to bridging the current gap between headquarters tools and field-level tools.
- Tools should be produced in an operationally and user-friendly manner. Design is an important aspect of preparing tools. The exception to this would be when tools of a more academic nature have to be produced for the guidance of policy makers and high-level technical personnel.
- In order to promote their relevant application at the country level, the dissemination of tools is just as important as the production of the tool. Resources should be allocated to the dissemination of tools at the time they are being planned. Optimal outcomes are not obtained as a result of inadequate attention to the dissemination process.
- As many tools as feasible should be prepared with the objective of country-level adaptation in mind. The feasibility of arranging for institutional networks at the country level to facilitate such adaptation should be examined. Such a methodology should contribute to capacity-building. The experience of the product network approach of ITC is relevant in this regard.
- Institutional mechanisms to transfer exchange of experience and information on tool production and dissemination should be put in place to bridge the current gap between headquarters and the field. There should be obligations on the technical units at headquarters and regional field and project offices to interact with each other on tool production. When the appraisal of proposed global programmes and field-level projects is undertaken at headquarters, it should be an obligatory task to ensure that relevant tools are utilized in these projects.
- Evaluations of technical cooperation programmes, whether global programmes or field-level projects, should be obliged to examine the contribution made by tools produced within them for the achievement of programme and project objectives.
- Several recommendations have been made in the text of the present report on individual tools. There is an urgent need to revise the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit*, to make it more user-friendly; the Anti-Money-Laundering International Database should be updated to fill in information gaps and make it a more productive tool; and computer-based training should be evaluated with a view to expanding such training to other relevant areas.

## **VII. Overall conclusions**

92. A fundamental question raised by the evaluation is whether or not tools and toolkits are an appropriate, effective and efficient mechanism for the delivery of technical cooperation. The evaluation has established that tools and toolkits as instruments are indeed appropriate and are effective modalities for that purpose. However, UNODC has not taken full advantage of the mechanism such that it is fully and properly utilized. Further, the process of developing, disseminating and using tools and toolkits has not fully captured the opportunities for capacity-building offered by these processes.

93. Hundreds of tools have been produced, both at headquarters and in the field. Tools produced at headquarters can generally be considered to be of high quality. The quality of field-level tools has not been ascertained. The gap between headquarters and the field in issues such as information, linkages and quality control need to be bridged. Greater interaction between headquarters and the field will lead to greater synergy and impact, as well as more relevant operational tools. Emphasis needs to be placed on obtaining greater efficiency in the substantive dissemination of tools. There is a glaring deficiency in the way that information is organized at UNODC on the tools its technical cooperation activities are generating. These deficiencies need to be overcome.

## Part Two

### The United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit: a case study

#### Introduction

94. UNODC has assembled teams of specialists working on the provision of assistance to States in countering a series of identified global threats that fall within the mandate of the Office.

95. Grouped in what are known as global programmes, these specialists provide technical assistance in their respective areas of expertise. The programmes have a strong normative dimension, drawing lessons from their own experience and that of others, with the aim of disseminating best practices to users worldwide.

96. Technical assistance implemented through the global programmes can take various forms, including legal advisory services, assessment of global and national trends, training and the use of mentors, as well as producing various tools and toolkits aimed at providing users with skills and know-how.

97. The Independent Evaluation Unit has conducted an evaluation of UNODC tools and toolkits in order to better understand, among other things, what impact they are having as a means of delivery of technical assistance. In that context, the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* of the Global Programme against Corruption was selected as one of two case studies in order to illustrate in more detail how the modality of cooperation works.

#### Background

##### Context

98. Corruption affects the poorest members of society the most since they are the least able to absorb its costs. The illegal diversion of state funds undercuts basic services such as health and education that are critical to those with few resources. Corruption also undermines the prospects for economic investment since few foreign firms will invest in societies where there is an additional level of “taxation”. National and international companies that offer bribes to secure business or obtain an advantage over their competitors contribute to weakening legitimate economic competition, distorting economic growth and augmenting socio-economic inequalities.

99. In many societies widespread public suspicion that political and judicial systems are corrupt weakens a Government’s legitimacy and undermines the rule of law; if those systems fail to protect the rights of groups and individuals and only cater to the interests of the few, then the risk of violent conflict increases.

100. The links between corruption and organized crime, terrorism, human rights abuses, environmental degradation and poverty are now universally recognized. Corruption strikes at the core of the priority concerns of the United Nations.

Preventing and combating corruption is therefore part of an overall effort to create the foundation for democracy, development, justice and effective governance.

## Response

101. As one of the means to address the issue, the *United Nations Handbook on Practical Anti-Corruption Measures for Prosecutors and Investigators* was first published in 1992 by the body now known as UNODC, with the assistance of the United States Department of Justice, at the request of the Economic and Social Council. During the 1990s, issues relating to corruption were repeatedly raised in the United Nations and, in 1995, the Council requested that the *Handbook* be reviewed and expanded, with contributions from other relevant international organizations, to take into account new developments. As the expansion of the *Handbook* proceeded, the Secretary-General was requested to keep the issue of actions against corruption under ongoing review and to reflect the new developments in the expanded *Handbook*.

102. As part of the effort to respond to that request, UNODC, through its Global Programme against Corruption, developed four publications for anti-corruption practitioners: (a) the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit*; (b) the *United Nations Handbook on Practical Anti-Corruption Measures for Prosecutors and Investigators*; (c) *The Compendium of International Legal Instruments on Corruption*; and (d) the *United Nations Guide for Anti-Corruption Policies*.

103. The Global Programme against Corruption was established in 1999 in response to global developments and an increasing need on the part of Member States for support in their anti-corruption efforts. Since its creation, the Programme has been active in four main areas: (a) providing technical assistance to Member States in strengthening their legal and institutional anti-corruption framework; (b) strengthening judicial integrity; (c) developing and disseminating anti-corruption policies and tools; and (d) enhancing inter-agency anti-corruption coordination. More specifically, the Programme has provided technical assistance to Colombia, Hungary, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Lebanon, Nigeria, Romania and South Africa.

104. Independent evaluation of these activities (in Hungary, Nigeria and Romania) has confirmed that, despite relatively small budgets and other weaknesses, UNODC, through its technical expertise, can make an important contribution to the fight against corruption.

105. Experts agree that corruption is best tackled by using comprehensive, evidence-based and impact-oriented approaches. An integral part of such a strategy requires that stakeholders be properly prepared so that they can contribute to the effort in an effective manner. In order to help stakeholders achieve this, practical information about how to fight corruption is invaluable. Apart from Transparency International's *Source Book*, there was little relevant practical information easily available for people and organizations dealing with corruption issues.

## Development of toolkits

106. When the Global Programme against Corruption was launched, one of its mandates was to develop and disseminate best practices to Member States. When the current programme manager took on the assignment in 2000, he recommended to management the development of a practical anti-corruption toolkit. This recommendation was accepted and the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* has since been part of the ongoing work programme of the Global Programme.

107. The *Toolkit* provides an inventory of measures for assessing the nature and extent of corruption, for deterring, preventing and combating corruption and for integrating the information and experience gained into successful national anticorruption strategies. It contains a set of tools intended for a diverse group of users.

108. The intended users range from anti-corruption agencies and subject experts, training institutions, academics, students, judges, civil society activists, journalists and politicians to name but a few. The *Toolkit* has become more complex because it tries to meet the needs of such a broad audience.

109. Complementing the tools are case studies that provide practical examples intended to illustrate the use of individual tools and combinations of tools in actual practice. They provide information about the conditions under which a particular tool will or will not work and how they can be adapted or modified to suit the circumstances in which they are likely to be used.

110. Since the completion of the first edition of the *Toolkit*, Member States have successfully negotiated the United Nations Convention against Corruption (General Assembly resolution 58/4). The Convention marks a major step forward in international cooperation against corruption and a brief history and summary of the content of the instrument have been included in the introductory part of the second edition of the *Toolkit*.

111. The design of the *Toolkit* was based on the Global Programme's approach that any anti-corruption initiative had to be evidence-based, inclusive, comprehensive, non-partisan and impact-oriented. The inclusion of case studies is evidence of this approach.

112. The first strategy and work programme plan (2000) of the Global Programme against Corruption identified three major components as the basis for its operations: action learning, technical cooperation and monitoring and evaluation; all three were to make extensive use of the *Toolkit* as well as to contribute to its updating. The *Toolkit* was developed as the axis upon which the Global Programme was to conduct its substantive work.

113. In April 2000 the Global Programme invited 36 anti-corruption experts to participate in a three-day seminar to develop a toolkit. Each of the experts presented two anti-corruption tools or case studies, which were then reviewed and refined. The tools were further refined by staff of the Programme and sent back to the expert group for review and improvements. The case studies were sent to the involved Governments for approval. Other UNODC substantive units participated actively in the drafting process.

114. The draft toolkit was distributed to Member States during the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its eleventh session, in 2002, with a request for comments. The suggestions received were integrated into the revised toolkit. New tools that were a result of the work of the Global Programme in various pilot countries were also incorporated.

115. A revised toolkit containing 44 tools and 40 case studies was developed and a professional editor was engaged to edit and lay out the toolkit. The toolkit was sent to the UNODC Publications Board for review and approval. There were some delays, though eventually some changes were suggested and the *Toolkit* was published. The first edition of the *Toolkit* was posted on the web page of the Global Programme in 2003.

116. The first edition of the *Toolkit* was distributed during the High-level Political Conference for the Purpose of Signing the United Nations Convention against Corruption, held in Merida, Mexico, in December 2003. A second edition of the *Toolkit*, developed to support Member States in their implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, incorporates the 71 articles of the Convention, cross-referencing them with the 44 tools and 43 case studies. The second edition was posted on the web page of the Global Programme in March 2004.

## Findings

117. The need for the *Toolkit* was identified by the programme manager of the Global Programme against Corruption based on his experience in the field and first-hand knowledge of the absence of practical tools required in order to facilitate all key stakeholders' work to curb corruption. No needs assessment was conducted in order to determine the target audience nor what specific issues needed to be highlighted, since the Global Programme wanted a global, all-encompassing document with the widest appeal possible.

118. The version of the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* used for this case study is organized into 10 chapters, consisting of 44 tools with 43 case studies for a total of 655 pages. The chapters are: Introduction; Assessment of corruption levels; Institution-building; Situational prevention; Social prevention; Enforcement; Monitoring and evaluation; International legal cooperation; Recovering illegal funds; and Bibliographical references.

119. No reliable records have been kept as to how many copies of the *Toolkit* have been printed and distributed by the Global Programme, though the best estimate puts the number at approximately 1,400 hard copies, all of them in English.<sup>3</sup>

120. The Global Programme has been responsible for its own fund-raising since its inception, with only one out of five staff members on the regular budget. Funds for the *Toolkit* came from unearmarked funding from the Governments of the Netherlands and Norway. The Programme maintains that, had sufficient resources been available, more effective use of the *Toolkit* would have been possible. Although resources were at times insufficient, some of the deficiencies identified by

---

<sup>3</sup> An unknown number of copies of the *Toolkit* have been translated into Romanian.

the present case study were not caused by a lack of adequate funding alone. In the end, the “management of expectations” is important and the Programme was unable to reconcile the gap in funding and what it wanted the *Toolkit* to achieve.

121. Determining the exact amount that it has cost to produce the *Toolkit* is not possible, since staff of the Global Programme also devoted a considerable amount of their time to the endeavour. Some of the costs of producing the various editions can be broken down as follows:

- (a) Expert group meeting: \$36,937;
- (b) Editing/revision: \$45,000;
- (c) Printing (1,400 hard copies of the *Toolkit* and 1,000 CD-ROMs): \$32,520.<sup>4</sup>

122. The lack of a clearly defined target audience is one of the greatest weaknesses of the *Toolkit*. Although in the preface it is stated that it is intended “for use by officials called upon to elaborate elements of a national anti-corruption strategy”, the document attempts to address a much broader audience. In order to be able to achieve that goal, considerable additional resources would have been required. Irrespective of the general goal of trying to reach a broader target group, a hierarchy of intended users was not clearly defined in order to ensure satisfaction of at least a core constituency.<sup>5</sup>

123. Had a core target group been clearly identified, the style of the case studies could have been adapted accordingly<sup>6</sup> and would have made them more appealing, motivating users to act.

124. The *Toolkit* was to play a leading, if not central role, in the work of the Global Programme against Corruption. Because of financial and personnel limitations, emphasis switched to project execution.<sup>7</sup>

125. The *Toolkit* has been updated, but no clear strategy has been defined for its use. It has become a practice to distribute copies during seminars or meetings, often with only a brief mention as to what the *Toolkit* is. Since no organized method of distribution is in place, it is difficult to follow up on the impact it has generated or to ascertain, with any degree of confidence, users’ views on the document.

126. It is difficult to try to determine the number of persons who have seen the document (either in part or in its totality) via the UNODC web site owing to limitations of the web server’s statistics software.

127. What can be said with certainty is that, during the first five months of 2004, a total of 2,198 individual visits encountered at least part of a chapter and 460 the whole document. These numbers mean that, on average, part of a chapter was seen

---

<sup>4</sup> It costs approximately \$17 to print one copy of the *Toolkit*.

<sup>5</sup> This would have helped in setting a standard for style, format and degree of complexity of the *Toolkit*.

<sup>6</sup> Whether narrative or testimonial, for example.

<sup>7</sup> Aimed at providing technical assistance to Member States in strengthening their legal and institutional anti-corruption framework. Even so, the *Toolkit* can play an important role in this regard.

by 439 visitors per month and parts of the whole document was accessed by visitors 92 times per month in the period under review.<sup>8</sup>

128. There was consensus among the users of the *Toolkit* who were interviewed for the case study about the ambitious and laudable purpose it set out to achieve. Many recognized that they only made infrequent use of the *Toolkit*, mostly limited to using it as a reference source for the preparation of speeches and presentations. There is nothing wrong in the use of the tool for such purposes, yet a better dissemination strategy, focused on mobilizing stakeholders to implement some of the tools, would increase its impact.<sup>9</sup>

129. The *Toolkit* was reportedly used to train various target groups in different pilot countries, though this was not done in a systematic manner in all the projects of the Global Programme against Corruption. As part of the case study, a UNODC staff member attended a strategic planning workshop for the Independent Corrupt Practices and other Related Offences Commission of Nigeria, where the *Toolkit* was to be distributed and some tools discussed in detail.

130. Because of logistical problems (the document was not printed in time), the *Toolkit* was not distributed and a good opportunity to reach key stakeholders was missed. Although the *Toolkit* was mentioned in various presentations and has since been given to some participants, the effect is not the same.

131. Another example of the use of the *Toolkit* is provided by the National Accountability Bureau of Pakistan. While developing a national anti-corruption strategy, the Bureau drew on the *Toolkit* in order to formulate and implement the strategy. The Global Programme was not directly involved in this process, yet the *Toolkit* reached the Bureau and was used.

132. Two tools, tool 5, “Auditors and audit institutions”, and tool 23, “Public education and awareness-raising measures”, were selected randomly for closer examination in order to assess how comprehensive and relevant the advice they contained was, as well as to determine if the material was presented in a clear, logical manner.

133. It was found that tool 5 provided a good overview of the role of auditors and audit institutions in the fight against corruption, in particular when placed in the broader context of institution-building. The information was presented in a straightforward manner, but could be made more reader-friendly if it were more concise.

134. Subject specialists who reviewed tool 23 found it to be wordy and redundant and in need of professional editing. The format of tool 23 did not follow a logical step-by-step process and failed to provide the reader with a clear course of action. The subject specialists expressed their belief that the same material could be covered in half the space with more practical suggestions incorporated.

---

<sup>8</sup> There is no way of distinguishing between new and repeat visitors.

<sup>9</sup> Using complaint boxes, as proposed in tool 26, is a good example of this. The judicial integrity and capacity project in Nigeria executed by the Global Programme against Corruption incorporated this element.

135. The text of tool 23 is often repetitive and can be confusing in places owing to errors in spelling and syntax. Additionally, the first half page of tool 23 can be found in tools 22 and 24.<sup>10</sup>

136. Another example of editorial inconsistencies can be found in tool 12. Whole paragraphs in pages 186-190 are repeated. These facts raise concerns about the quality of the editing.

137. Keeping the *Toolkit* updated is an issue that cannot be overlooked. Although substantive matters do not evolve rapidly, new cases of success stories arise more frequently and provision must be made for their inclusion. Minor details such as web site addresses changing or being invalid occur more often. This is the case, for example, with some of the web site addresses in case study 8 and all of those in case study 14.<sup>11</sup>

138. The *Toolkit* is a voluminous document, which makes it hard to reproduce as well as cumbersome to carry in large quantities. It resembles an academic textbook, which does not make it appealing to read, considering that the majority of the target group are outside academia. The layout does not make the document interesting or user-friendly.

## Issues resolved

139. The editorial inconsistencies identified in tool 12 were promptly corrected by the Global Programme against Corruption team.<sup>12</sup>

## Recommendations

*Recommendation 1.* The role of the *Toolkit* must be clearly defined.

140. The *Toolkit*, unlike many manuals and guides, is not project-specific and has the potential to play a key role in the work of the Global Programme against Corruption, especially in view of the United Nations Convention against Corruption. The role the *Toolkit* will play in the Global Programme must therefore be defined.

141. As part of the process in determining that role, the Global Programme must review its work plan and consider, among other things, if it has an adequate strategic plan and the necessary resources required to implement it. That process will identify what has worked and prevent ad hoc, project-driven actions in order to increase the Programme's impact given the limited resources available.<sup>13</sup>

142. An element that must be taken into consideration in determining the role of the *Toolkit* is the opportunities that arise in connection with the United Nations Convention against Corruption. The Executive Committee of UNODC has discussed various drafts of a document entitled "United Nations Convention against

---

<sup>10</sup> The principles contained in the paragraph in question are dealt with to a great extent in the introduction to chapter 5.

<sup>11</sup> These case studies were chosen at random; it is very likely that more examples exist.

<sup>12</sup> This correction does not imply that recommendation 3 is thereby implemented.

<sup>13</sup> An analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) would be appropriate.

Corruption: priorities for the provision of technical assistance”, according to which the Global Programme will play a crucial role.

143. Despite reservations as to certain issues identified as priorities by upper management, members of the Global Programme team feel that, in order to deliver quality work, the proper resources must be provided and advantage must be taken from the experience acquired to date, in particular with regard to the *Toolkit*.

*Recommendation 2.* The target audience must be limited and clearly identified.

144. The current version of the *Toolkit* sets out to reach anyone and everyone and as a consequence the document has become too bulky, not user-friendly and needlessly complex. Owing to the limited availability of resources, the Global Programme against Corruption is in no position to reach all possible user groups.

145. In order to increase the impact of the *Toolkit*, the Global Programme must limit the target audience it intends to reach directly. The selection of target groups must be made in accordance with its strategic plan.

146. During the course of researching the present case study, the Global Programme was in the process of drafting two audience-specific toolkits (derived from the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit*, one for judges and the other for civil society. This is a good first step but what is required is a comprehensive revision in order to adapt any such toolkits so that they have a maximum impact (see recommendation 3).

*Recommendation 3.* The *Toolkit* should be revised.

147. The ultimate objective is simple: the *Toolkit* must meet the needs of its target audience. In order to achieve this, a thorough revision is required in order to make the *Toolkit* user-friendly, concise and practical, with the goal of generating the largest possible impact. Experts should be hired to redesign and edit the document as well as to develop a dissemination strategy in line with the Global Programme’s overall plans (see recommendation 5).

148. Particular attention should be given to the length of the case studies included and whether they should follow the respective tool they exemplify. More use of bullet points, graphics and similar devices should be considered.

149. The final product should be a new *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* as well as target audience-specific toolkits with their respective dissemination plans. The active participation of other UNODC substantive units is essential.

150. A permanent consultative editorial board consisting of subject specialists and communication experts (internal and external to UNODC) should be set up in order to advise the Global Programme on matters pertaining to the *Toolkit*.

151. The revised toolkit(s) must meet UNODC publication guidelines and standards.

*Recommendation 4.* Adequate resources must be provided.

152. Once the role of the *Toolkit* is defined, sufficient resources must be found to ensure that it is used to its full potential. Upper management must assume a leading role in this respect since it is ultimately responsible for ensuring that adequate resources are available to achieve institutional objectives. If sufficient resources are not forthcoming in relation to the *Toolkit*, then upper management must ensure that the Global Programme's work plan is viable given the resources available.

153. The *Toolkit* is a dynamic instrument requiring constant updating. Among the various forms of funding sources that can be considered is a standard financial allocation in all Global Programme projects for dissemination and updating.

*Recommendation 5.* The dissemination strategy must incorporate alternative channels for distribution.

154. A well defined dissemination strategy is essential and must be developed as an integral part of the overall revision process. The strategy has to incorporate a feedback mechanism in order to obtain reliable information regarding the impact the tool is creating and to capture any comments users may have.

155. A standardized workshop could be incorporated into projects of the Global Programme against Corruption at which the *Toolkit* is introduced and discussed and relevant lessons are drawn by participants. The purpose is not only to highlight what has been done elsewhere, but also to extract, through active participation, lessons that may be adopted locally. This is an example of one of the many alternatives that may be a part of the dissemination strategy (which can also be a source of funding for the *Toolkit*).

156. The *Toolkit* is an instrument that may be adapted to suit different needs, though to do so in an effective manner would be beyond the capacity of the Global Programme. It is therefore important that strategic alliances be forged with various entities that are better placed to further exploit the *Toolkit*.

157. In order to increase the number of users of the *Toolkit*, creative and innovative solutions should be explored. A concerted effort to identify new outlet sources such as university consortiums, non-governmental organizations, international professional associations and even publishing houses should be initiated. These various platforms would be able to disseminate the *Toolkit* (as is or modified to cater to their clients' needs) to a much broader audience.

158. UNODC could establish mutually acceptable collaborative agreements with these actors, allowing them the right to use the materials. The Public Affairs and Inter-Agency Branch may contribute to the effort. Other UNODC substantive units must also be encouraged to incorporate into their work those elements from the *Toolkit* they deem appropriate. Better use must be made of the contacts that field offices have.

## Conclusion

159. The *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* is a valuable instrument that contributes to fulfilling UNODC's mission. That contribution can nonetheless be increased by making some changes that will improve the *Toolkit*.

160. Staff of the Global Programme are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the *Toolkit* and are conscious of the need to make refinements. Unfortunately, at times, the enthusiasm of the Programme's team has made them attempt to achieve more than what resources, both human and monetary, would realistically permit.

161. It is relevant to note that the strengths and weaknesses of the *Toolkit* are similar to those of the other UNODC tools examined in the evaluation.

162. The *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* is a unique instrument that deserves to be widely disseminated. The Global Programme against Corruption and upper management must set realistic goals as to what can be achieved by the *Toolkit*, given the limited resources of UNODC. The recommendations in this case study attempt to address the weaknesses identified while urging creative solutions for going beyond what UNODC alone can achieve.

## Part Three

### **The field guides produced by India projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41 on community-wide demand reduction: a case study**

#### **Introduction**

163. UNODC has assembled teams of specialists working on the provision of assistance to States in countering a series of identified global threats that fall within the mandate of the Office.

164. Technical assistance is implemented through substantive units organized into global programmes or through projects conceived and managed from the various field offices. The technical cooperation can take various forms, including legal advisory services, assessment of global and national trends, training and the use of mentors, as well as producing various tools and toolkits aimed at providing users with skills and know-how.

165. The Independent Evaluation Unit has conducted an evaluation of UNODC tools and toolkits in order to better understand, among other things, what impact they are having as a means of delivery of technical assistance. In that context, the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit* of the Global Programme against Corruption and two field guides produced by India projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41 were selected as case studies in order to illustrate in more detail how the modality of cooperation works.

#### **Background**

##### **Methodology**

166. The methodology used in the present case study, which relied primarily on a previous evaluation exercise led by the author, included field visits, interviews and desk reviews. The sources of data included the original evaluation report of the projects that are the subject of the study and notes from interviews.

167. In addition, the UNODC Regional Office for South Africa (New Delhi) provided a full set of tools and toolkits produced by the projects, which were then reviewed from the perspective of the current evaluation.

##### **Context**

168. The project documents stated that conservative estimates in 1999 placed the number of drug users in India at above 3 million. Initial reports from the national study indicated that drug use was increasing.

169. In view of the increasing problem of drug abuse in the country, the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment of India decided to widen coverage of services

throughout the country and to improve demand reduction services. However, it realized that there was an acute shortage of manpower trained in demand reduction and, as a consequence, the delivery of services was less than satisfactory.

170. To successfully influence the situation, a systematic, cost-effective and well-targeted approach was needed that could introduce up-to-date and innovative demand reduction techniques on a nationwide scale. This included the need to strengthen the capacity of the Government to expand and support demand reduction activities in a systematic fashion, to strengthen the capability of non-governmental organizations, communities, private enterprises, employees' and employers' organizations as well as United Nations entities to carry out such activities. A comprehensive plan needed to be developed in consultation with the Government and non-governmental organizations, with components for drug demand reduction, law enforcement, alternative development and HIV/AIDS prevention.

### **The projects**

171. The two projects "Community-wide demand reduction in India" (AD/IND/99/E40) and "Community-wide demand reduction in the north-eastern states of India" (AD/IND/99/E41) were designed jointly by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and UNODC Regional Office for South Asia in response to a perceived need.

172. The two projects were intended to supplement the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment's programme of supporting non-governmental organizations to carry out demand reduction activities. They were to establish an infrastructure consisting of a government-based National Centre for Drug Abuse Prevention and non-governmental organization-based regional resource and training centres. The aim of the projects was to reduce drug abuse among the general population, high-risk groups and drug addicts and in the workplace and to prevent it on a nationwide scale by relying on non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations and government and United Nations entities.

173. The projects commenced in September 1999. The long-term objectives were to reduce drug abuse and its adverse consequences on social and economic development through the introduction of effective drug rehabilitation and social integration programmes, as well as workplace initiatives, in a coherent national strategy to combat drug and related problems in India.

174. The immediate objectives were to establish the capability at the national level to mobilize community participation in developing drug rehabilitation services and workplace prevention and assistance programmes throughout India and community-based services in north-eastern India.

175. Project AD/IND/99/E40 aimed at establishing an infrastructure consisting of the government-based National Centre for Drug Abuse Prevention and five non-governmental organization-based regional resource and training centres. The intention was to mobilize community-based organizations and enterprises to reduce and prevent drug abuse on a nationwide scale and on a sustainable basis.

176. The expectation was to cover the whole country, with a population of almost one billion people, highly exposed to drug abuse. The key element was to increase

the number of skilled personnel. Reliance was placed on a multiplier effect through training of trainers. The project covered the entire country except the north-eastern states, which were addressed by project AD/IND/99/E41. The two projects were interlinked.

177. Substantive training was also carried out on prevention of drug-related HIV transmission in the country, through the non-governmental organizations supported by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment under their scheme of assistance for drug and alcohol prevention. Convergence of services in health and social justice, addressing gender dimensions of the problem and a decentralized approach, were identified as critical to the response.

178. Project AD/IND/99/E41 aimed at establishing an infrastructure comprising a non-governmental organization-based regional resource and training centre, 25 non-governmental organization-based “de-addiction” plus rehabilitation centres and 40 community extension centres, consisting of suitable community-based organizations. The intention was to mobilize non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations and enterprises to reduce and prevent drug abuse on a large scale in the north-eastern states of India, which are highly vulnerable to drug abuse and related HIV.

179. The projects were implemented from 1999 by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment in collaboration with UNODC. The plan was not simply to deliver a package of technical inputs for people in the programme to use. It went much further and set out to create an infrastructure for continued delivery of such inputs in the foreseeable future, all the way to the smallest non-governmental organization in the remotest corner of the country.

## **Principal tools**

180. The tools produced by the projects and examined by the present case study were two field guides for service providers and trainers, one entitled *Counselling for Drug Addiction* and the other *Documentation for Addiction Management*. The authorship of the guides resided outside of the high-level national body coordinating training. There was no evidence that the guides had been tested in real-life situations.

181. A set of leaflets on management of drug users and a new set of field guides on drug addiction and HIV issues (on a CD-ROM) were also reviewed. The latter documents are also considered in the comments on content. These extra documents were also examined because of the relative paucity of tools and toolkits actually used in practice during the duration of the projects. The two field guides are the only substantial tools strictly relevant to the present study. There may have been other materials that were not presented and the comments that follow are based only on the material that was presented.

182. As regards actual use, during the evaluation conducted prior to the present case study, there was no spontaneous mention at any but one of the regional resource and training centres or field sites of the guides being used to assist practice or training. The only materials spontaneously presented, from the apex of the

training pyramid to the lowest grassroots level, were posters and pamphlets that had been produced by them addressing a wider public.

## **Findings**

183. The project plans and documents did not envisage a large role for materials—printed, audio, video or other—in goal achievement, despite the project being concerned primarily with disseminating knowledge and skills relevant to helping drug users.

184. In the “higher-level” training centres, namely, the National Centre for Drug Abuse Prevention and the satellite regional resource and training centres, the emphasis on materials was low. Neither the parties implementing the projects at its various levels nor the evaluators used the words “tools and toolkits” when referring to the materials, though in this case they are synonymous. This inattention to tools and toolkits/materials persisted at all levels.

185. Two field guides constitute the only real toolkits produced specifically by the projects up to 2002. With one exception, nobody in the regional rehabilitation and training centres or elsewhere referred to them as material that they used in training.

## **Contents**

186. Given that the guides in a way form a kind of curriculum and training manual as well, the relative inattention to them is surprising. How user-friendly, relevant and helpful in the intended task they are will be commented on later, but one reason for their being more or less ignored may be the fact that they were extraneous. The guides were written at a centre in the south of India and did not quite “belong” to the projects, although the funding did come from them. The key trainers at all levels were not really involved in producing the guides or in modifying its content.

187. The guides, with a publication date of 2002, may have physically reached potential users too late for them to play a major role. Material that comes in after the process has begun may not be greatly influential. People would then already be working in ways they thought good and the guides would have to battle existing practice.

188. Timing of the appearance of tools and toolkits is important. If a project expects to use tools and toolkits to enhance the flow of its work, it should have them prepared in time.

189. Quite apart from content, the very idea of using tools in training or dissemination can restrict technical progress. When things are clearly laid out in advance there is little room for innovation and flexibility, nor is there room for the more central structures to learn from what the peripheral experience has to teach.

190. The content of the field guides shows the use of a rather restricted repertoire of options in dealing with drug users and the effectiveness of the chosen model needed to have been field-tested, just as the actual guide needed to be. There was no evidence that the guides had been field-tested in a real-life situation and no

reference was made in them to such testing. If they were indeed field-tested, this should have been stated so as to increase their credibility among potential users.

191. Field-testing is a recognized essential for any tools or toolkits to be recommended for use in a project. In addition to the problem of the guides' appearing late in the process, the need to get toolkits organized well before actual implementation begins is further emphasized. Getting them ready includes having them field-tested.

192. It is more difficult to test the models on which a toolkit is based than to test the actual toolkit. Testing the models is not a task that individual projects can easily take upon themselves, but it is still useful to remember that the models on which interventions are based also need to be subjected to critical scrutiny.

193. The field guides show faith in a particular model of what is called "treatment". Thus they provide a package of steps in training and delivery that conforms more or less to the idea that drug users are victims of a disease and will respond to the recommended intensive package of treatment that is presented. The other formal base on which the suggested interventions rest is the "stages of change" cycle. The disease model has advantages, the principal being that it is relatively easy to sell and it takes away blame from the dependent person.

194. Toolkits used in subjects where there is a wide array of opinions and approaches, sometimes not consistent with each other, should take the range of scientifically tested approaches into account. Content should be inclusive and provide attention to the range of possible interventions and not be idiosyncratically selective. Brief interventions, assisting natural processes of recovery and community-based approaches, need a great deal more attention. Inattention to psychological modes of management such as cue exposure and contingency management is not as bad an omission, as these too demand much time from service providers, as do the approaches covered in the toolkits.

195. Some of the content, of the more recent guides especially, appeared to be taken directly from other sources. This applied especially to technical matters such as diagnostic classification and so on. These may not be greatly relevant to someone who is not making an academic study of the subject.

196. Even within the model that has been chosen for dissemination, from among the wide range of existing approaches, there are further improvements possible in clarity, presentation, user-friendliness and ways of assessing progress. Numerous suggestions are possible in that regard, but this is not relevant to the broad objective of the present study, especially because the field guides, even those with a publication date of 2002, played a relatively minor role in the projects.

197. Toolkits were not sensitive to the need to foster and monitor processes. They should have included more on indicators of progress so that the users would be armed with the means of assessing progress as they continued to use the guides.

## **Dissemination**

198. The project implementation was facilitated by the fact that existing and well-established delivery channels were utilized. The countrywide network of non-

governmental organizations assisted by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment provided the projects with a familiar terrain, both in terms of individuals as well as in institutions involved, in developing the programme, an important factor considering the scope of the projects.

199. Although by utilizing the existing network of non-governmental organizations funded by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment the projects were treading on familiar ground, they were not able to avoid inconsistent delivery channels. The competence of some of the participating non-governmental organizations was probably overestimated.

200. The participating non-governmental organizations provided the service network and the community outreach to the project. Together, as well as individually, they contributed experience and expertise without which the projects could not have been implemented. Considering the limited incursions of the governmental sector in the field, the reliance of the projects on non-governmental organizations brought in not only a reservoir of trained manpower but also a substantial client base. The non-governmental organizations provided leadership to the projects at various levels; they readily shared their material as well as intellectual resources and helped to mobilize support for the programme from different quarters, including perhaps the political sphere.

## **Feedback**

201. A logical contributor to achievement of the overall drug control objective is the outcome or impact achieved at the various training activities. This is an example of an immediate objective that the projects could have conceived of at the inception. Although the results from given training activities were not stated as an immediate objective, they could usefully have been. The results of the training activities undertaken could be examined to verify how much they contributed to the drug control objective.

202. The National Centre for Drug Abuse Prevention organized one- and three-month training for staff from several agencies. The impact of the training is difficult to discern. Most of the information gathered from participants referred to generic elements of training: the quality of the audio-visuals, the clarity of the presentations and so on. An effort to elucidate the subject-specific components taught to participants was made only through a later questionnaire.

203. Feedback from persons in the field, obtained during the evaluation exercise, showed that most of them were able to identify an improvement in capability as trainers through the National Centre for Drug Abuse Prevention and National Institute of Social Defence training. With regard to drug use per se, those who had participated in the National Centre for Drug Abuse Prevention training reported that their counselling skills had improved. The skills they were referring to were, once again, generic. Thus they were able to see an improvement in themselves in not being directive with clients, for example. Little was spontaneously identified as skills or knowledge gained from training specifically relevant to drug issues. When pressed, some former participants said that they had learned about the harm caused by drug use.

204. Trainings received from the regional resource and training centres were similarly rated. Former participants felt that the training of trainers and counselling components were useful. Apart from that, some of the training came in for strong criticism too: “A waste of time” was among the comments made. This was mainly because the content at different training courses was felt to be overlapping. Uniformly high ratings were given for training conducted by the regional resource and training centres in Chennai.

### **Missed opportunities**

205. The terminal evaluation found that the model tested was too heavy on the human resources needed. To provide the required coverage through that model, for the huge population in need, was not feasible.

206. The projects were ideally suited for testing out less human resource-intensive strategies for training or transfer of technology. A top-down system of training from one central resource centre to regional centres and through them to a network of large non-governmental organizations and from there to community-based organizations and the public was established. How could this transfer of abilities have been achieved with less face-to-face training contact at each level?

207. In these different training activities the various resource persons and trainers did use their own materials to make the training more effective, but the projects themselves could have conceived of using other channels and methodologies to achieve the desired enhancement of capacity. There was not enough serious consideration of how the projects could lead to the production of a comprehensive set of materials. The nature and content of tools and toolkits that would be appropriate for the projects were not examined thoroughly enough.

### **Lessons learned**

208. The lessons learned from the case study were as follows:

(a) The role that tools and toolkits can play in meeting the objectives of a project should be examined at the planning stage. The two projects under review were probably not unusual in missing the optimal role that tools could play;

(b) Determining the optimal role for toolkits goes beyond simply producing the best pack. A lesson from these projects is that toolkits are not automatically used simply because they are there. The risk of wasting much effort on redundant materials or tools is real. Anything that fails to be used in a project is redundant;

(c) For tools to be of use, and to be used, the organizers of a project need to envisage, at the planning stage, how they can contribute to progress in implementation;

(d) Getting those actually implementing a project to produce the relevant tools or to modify existing ones according to their needs will increase the likelihood of their being used;

- (e) Toolkits intended for use in a project should be ready and available before training or other dissemination activities commence;
- (f) Badly designed tools are likely to be ignored. Remedies are many:
  - (i) Those assigned to develop toolkits should have expertise in the range of fields to be covered. Remarkable ability in clinical settings may not, for example, translate into ability with communities;
  - (ii) Depending upon the importance attached to the toolkits concerned, time and effort should be spent on refining, by independent specialists, the toolkits produced by an expert or experts. Changes should be agreed among the parties;
  - (iii) Where there is a known range of accepted options and approaches, one should not be picked at random for exclusive attention;
  - (iv) Toolkits need to be adequately field-tested;
- (g) Tools and toolkits do not always have to be limited to the print medium;
- (h) Toolkits should be sensitive to process: there should be indicators that the users can utilize to evaluate progress along the way.

## **Recommendations**

209. Since the projects have been concluded, the following recommendations are intended as general views to be considered by management for future similar ventures.

*Recommendation 1.* The role of the tools must be clearly defined.

210. Projects should have a clear plan as to what to do with the tools produced. Toolkits should be relevant to the overall objectives of the project. Sufficient time and effort should be devoted to identifying who is(are) the target group(s), how best to use the tool and how to ensure adequate feedback.

211. An annual training calendar, for example, could be produced and circulated to all concerned in good time. In the case of the projects examined by the present case study, training programmes should have been well spaced out during the year as they tended to congest the last quarter, thereby straining the infrastructure of the regional resource and training centres and non-governmental organizations.

*Recommendation 2.* There should be adequate representation of views.

212. Toolkits used in subjects where there is a wide array of opinions and approaches, sometimes in opposition to each other, should take the range of scientifically accepted opinions into account. Content should be inclusive and provide attention to the range of approaches and not be idiosyncratically selective.

213. There is a risk that, in some instances, experts preparing toolkits may have recognized experience and expertise in only one aspect of a task but be expected to work in other areas as well.

214. The process of evaluating content has to be rigorous. In some settings, there is a reluctance to suggest changes in something that a particular person has written, for personal reasons. In others the culture is not favourable to open expression of opinion.

215. The solution to errors, lacunae and inappropriateness in content is not simply to subject the toolkit to field-testing. There is a step before this, namely, the critical independent appraisal of the content.

*Recommendation 3.* An adequate delivery medium must be used.

216. Tools and toolkits should fit the intent of a project; this applies not only to content but also to the medium used. For the huge increment in skills that this project envisaged, even the belated written manuals were not the best medium. In these projects a series of vignettes of recorded real-life or role-playing, to demonstrate the required skills, could have been very effective. Although they were not seen by the author, such materials had apparently been prepared.

217. Different kinds of interactions with drug users could have been recorded and the strengths and weaknesses in each demonstrated (audio)visually. This would have allowed both the recognition of common faults as well as recommended types of interaction—in so-called “counselling” sessions, for instance. It is easy to see how these could also have been formulated as a video training package. Likewise, it was stated that such elements were part of the tools of the projects examined, though they were not shown.

*Recommendation 4.* Indicators should be developed.

218. The development of indicators can usefully be made an integral component of interventions. People delivering the service should be guided about the principles for developing indicators to assess progress. This should help to broaden the focus of monitoring to include evaluation elements. Agencies will then learn to broaden the scope of what they look for. Not only will they count the number of counselling sessions conducted, for example, but also think about how many of the session were optimally useful.

*Recommendation 5.* The repertoire should be widened.

219. Within the existing systems of treatment and rehabilitation there is an unfortunate restriction to one particular model. All non-governmental organizations are being trained in “counselling”, for example. What is imparted, other than generic counselling skills, is not examined carefully and the training may be teaching all of India’s non-governmental organizations a particular (and narrow) way of looking at drug dependence.

220. Different models of understanding the behaviour in question and of interventions have to be given consideration. The single monolithic training structure could usefully be decentralized as well as widened in the range of approaches that it proposes.

## **Conclusion**

221. More than what was, the present case study highlights what was not and what might have been. Thus the major lessons are not about the methods of using the tools, although there are some; rather they revolve around the relative inattention to the potential role of tools. Why was the role missed? It was probably for the same reason that the optimal role for toolkits is missed in other projects. The idea of looking at the best channels for transmitting technical expertise is somehow not part of planning, nor is it a standard consideration in proposals.

222. Other likely reasons for the inconsequential part tools played in projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41 are postulated in the section entitled "Lessons learned", but the simplest remedy for the inattention to the use of tools and toolkits is to include a section on it in all future proposals.

## Annex 1

### **The evaluation of tools and toolkits as a modality of programme delivery by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime: Terms of reference**

**Project title:** N/A

**Project number:** N/A

#### **1. Background**

1. The production of various types of tool and toolkit as a means of programme delivery within the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has been standard practice since the genesis of the Office, in particular in the last decade, among various global programmes, utilizing significant amounts of human and financial resources. There is a perception that tools and toolkits are the fundamental delivery mechanism of technical cooperation that the institution possesses and their usefulness has been emphasized in achieving specific objectives.

2. A preliminary review of some tools and toolkits will highlight the diverse nature of the issues they address as well as differences in format and style. These differences are to be expected, given the range of issues UNODC covers, the nature of the target audience and the complexity of the topics. On the other hand, there seems to be no commonly accepted definition of what constitutes a tool or a toolkit.

3. In order to avoid confusion in the course of the evaluation, the following working definition of “tool” and “toolkit” shall be used:

(a) A “tool” is a printed or online/electronic instrument for the transfer of knowledge and experience on a given topic or issue, organized in a systematic manner and developed by experts in the subject area, by means of which the target audience acquires know-how and the ability to apply it. Guides, manuals and various types of didactic material can be considered tools of this nature;

(b) A “toolkit” is a compilation of tools that brings together in one place practical information for accomplishing a goal or beginning a project. A toolkit can be organized thematically or sequentially. It can consist of, but is not limited to, case studies, action plans, policies, learning modules, resource lists, useful terminology and important contacts. It is a selection of tools that the target group can deploy to achieve a goal.

#### **2. Purpose of the evaluation**

4. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to come to a common understanding of what tools and toolkits are and what they have achieved in terms of results and outcomes, what impact is being achieved and if it is sustainable.

5. The evaluation will assess the process leading to the creation of tools/toolkits all the way through to their being put to use. It is to determine whether tools/toolkits

are an efficient means of utilizing resources to produce sustainable outcomes. The evaluation will determine if UNODC tools and toolkits have achieved their objectives and if they are an appropriate and effective delivery mechanism of technical cooperation. Further, the evaluation will determine why tools/toolkits are preferred as a delivery mechanism.

6. The evaluation will highlight lessons learned and best practices that may be used to decide when a tool and/or a toolkit is an appropriate means for delivering assistance as well as improving their design and increasing their impact.

### **3. Scope of the evaluation**

7. The evaluation will address, among others, the following:

- (a) A definition of tools and toolkits at UNODC;
- (b) Tools and toolkits developed since 1999 and/or still in use;
- (c) An analysis of why and how tools and toolkits were created (needs), focusing on the role they play in achieving broader institutional/programme/project objectives (why tools/toolkits are needed, what purposes they serve). This will include how organizational structures, managerial support and coordination mechanisms function in relation to issues dealing with tools/toolkits;
- (d) Measurement of outcomes, impact and sustainability of the benefits provided by tools/toolkits. The evaluation will assess, on a macro scale, tool/toolkit design, implementation results and outputs;
- (e) Whether tool/toolkits are appropriate, relevant and effective in addressing identified needs/problems and producing the desired outcomes;
- (f) Whether tools/toolkits have fully achieved their intended results and, if not, why and what is being done to correct the situation;
- (g) Examination of the role played by field offices, beneficiary countries/target groups and other partners (including various international organizations) in the development and implementation of tools/toolkits.

### **4. Evaluation methods**

8. Evaluating UNODC tools and toolkits will be a challenge, given the lack of a common definition, diversity of approaches to the subject and the complexity of issues. UNODC headquarters, field projects and partners have developed tools and toolkits. Information at headquarters about some of the tools and toolkits initiated in the field is limited and it is therefore difficult to gain an accurate overview. All these issues pose challenges to the evaluation, so evaluators will have to develop approaches that comprehensively capture both the qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluation process will provide a learning opportunity to all the parties.

#### **Case studies**

9. The evaluation will examine two tools/toolkits as a programme/project delivery mechanism in more detail. While tools and toolkits will be examined in

general, two will be chosen as case studies. These case studies are not evaluations in their own right, but rather will complement the evaluation report by providing specific, in-house experiences as to how those tools/toolkits were developed and implemented. The case studies will be on tools/toolkits developed by India projects AD/IND/99/E40 and AD/IND/99/E41 and the *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit*.

10. The evaluation methods will include the following:

(a) Document review and analysis (primary sources and complementary information);

(b) Interviews with key actors (person-to-person or by telephone);

(c) Sample of tools and toolkits as appropriate;

(d) Case study approach applied to two tool/toolkits;

(e) Field visits;

(f) Sharing draft reports and inviting inputs as a form of factual and social verification;

(g) Evaluation team to develop methodology and related instruments for the overall tool/toolkit evaluation.

(Note. Given the volume of UNODC tools and toolkits available, a representative sample might have to be selected for the evaluation. Considering that there is no complete list of the materials in circulation or, of those, which fall under the definition of tools and toolkits, the matter of whether or not to use a sample will be resolved by the consultants with the approval of the Chief of the Independent Evaluation Unit.)

## **5. Composition of the evaluation team**

11. An independent evaluation team that has had no prior involvement with the programme during its design and implementation phases will carry out the evaluation.

12. The evaluation team will be composed of two external evaluators and the Evaluation Officer from the Independent Evaluation Unit of UNODC. The external evaluators will be professionals who have experience in conducting evaluations as well as in the design and use of tools and toolkits.

## **6. Arrangements for planning and implementation**

13. The evaluation should be completed by 2 August 2004. The following time frame is suggested for the evaluation process:

1-14 June Terms of reference to be circulated and approved; shortlist of possible consultants drawn up.

14-18 June The Independent Evaluation Unit recruits consultants and the evaluation team is formed.

18 June	The team reviews the documents and prepares the evaluation instruments.
21-25 June	Team preparation and briefing by UNODC.
28 June-2 July	Field phase of the evaluation (as well as case studies).
5-7 July	Lead consultant debriefing at the Independent Evaluation Unit.
7-9 July	Team members prepare the case studies and submit them to the team leader.
12-16 July	The team leader prepares the draft report and submits it to the Chief of the Independent Evaluation Unit.
19-23 July	Review of the draft by stakeholders.
27 July	Comments submitted to the team leader.
10 August	The team leader submits the (revised) report to the Chief of the Independent Evaluation Unit.
16 August	The final report is circulated.

## **7. Deliverables of the evaluation**

14. The following outcomes are expected:

- (a) A detailed evaluation plan (to be prepared by the team leader);
- (b) A detailed evaluation methodology plus evaluation instruments to be used (developed by the team);
- (c) Clear guidelines for the case studies;
- (d) A draft report with findings, lessons learned and recommendations;
- (e) A presentation of the findings;
- (f) A final report with findings, lessons learned and recommendations and case studies.

## **Annex II**

### **List of persons interviewed**

#### **United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime**

Antonio Maria Costa, Executive Director, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and Director-General, United Nations Office at Vienna

Giovanna Campello, Programme Officer

Michael De Feo, Legal Adviser, Terrorism Prevention Branch, Division for Treaty Affairs

Anja Korenblik, Officer-in-Charge, Sustainable Livelihoods Unit

Petter Langseth, Programme Manager, Global Programme against Corruption

Riku Lehtovuori, Drug Abuse Epidemiologist

Timothy Lemay, Chief, Anti-Money-Laundering Unit

Francis Maertens, Director, Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs

Deniz Mermerci, ProFi Technical and Budget Assistant, Policy Analysis and Research Branch, Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs

Riika Puttonen, Expert, Anti-Human Trafficking Unit

Paul Salay, UNODC Representative, Nigeria

Delphine Schantz, Expert, Anti-Money-Laundering Unit

Abdulahi Shehu, Programme Expert, Global Programme against Corruption

Oliver Stolpe, Programme Expert, Global Programme against Corruption

Juana Tomas-Rossello, Expert, Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit

Eduardo Vetere, Director, Division for Treaty Affairs

Emil Wandzilak, Library Assistant, Legal Advisory Section, Division for Treaty Affairs

Andrew Wells, Senior Legal Adviser, Legal Advisory Section, Division for Treaty Affairs

#### **United Nations Office at Vienna**

Sally Reading, Chief, Publishing, Referencing and English Section

#### **Nigeria**

Victor Adetula, Centre for Development Studies, University of Jos

Uyim Akpabio, Director, Education and Advisory Services, Code of Conduct Bureau

A. Alabi, Justice, Lagos State

Richard Butterworth, Assistant Governance Adviser, Department for International Development (United Kingdom), Nigeria

Charles Cutshall, Senior Civil Society Adviser, Democracy and Governance Office United States Agency for International Development, Nigeria

Chibuzo C. Ekwewuo, Public and Private Rights Watch

Manga Kuoh, Senior Public Sector Management Specialist, World Bank, Country Office, Abuja

Patrick Njoku, President, Initiative for African Peace

Ibrahim Pam, Assistant Chief Legal Officer, Investigation Department, Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC)

Hannatu Raji, Chairman's Office, ICPC

Sam Saba, Secretary, Code of Conduct Bureau

Abdull Saddik, High Court of Justice, Katsina

I. A. Sotiminu, Justice, Ret., Lagos State

#### **Other**

Muhammad Kamran Akhtar, Second Secretary, Embassy of Pakistan (Vienna)

Ishtiak Ahmed Akil, Third Secretary, Embassy of Pakistan (Vienna)

Elaine F. Krivel, Q.C., Counsellor, International Criminal Operations, Mission of Canada to the European Union

Tony M. W. Kwok, Honorary Course Director, Corruption Studies Programme, Hong Kong University

Jeremy Pope, Tiri Network