



PROJECT EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Project, "Promotion of Public Awareness on the
Dangers of Drugs in East Asia"

(AD/RAS/03/G 69)

Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific

Not an official document. For information and documentation only.
Opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect
the views of the United Nations

Project Number : AD/RAS/03/G69

Project Title : Promotion of Public Awareness on the Dangers of Drugs in East Asia

Agency : United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific

Country : Thailand (with travels to Malaysia, Viet Nam and the Philippines and phone calls and e-mails sent to participants from Brunei, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Laos PDR, Myan mar, Singapore, and Vienna)

Project Evaluator : Maria Corazon M. Cortez,
Managing Director,
Faradale Media-M Sdn Bhd,
Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia

CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------|----------|
| LIST OF ACRONYMS | 3 |
|-------------------------|----------|

| | |
|--------------------------|----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 4 |
|--------------------------|----------|

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 8 |
| .. Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation | 8 |
| .. Executing Modality/Management Arrangements | 8 |
| ↑ .3. Scope of the Evaluation | 9 |
| ↑ .4. Evaluation Methodology | 9 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2. ANALYSIS AND MAJOR FINDINGS | 9 |
| 2.1. Overall performance assessment | 9 |
| 2.2. Attainment of Objectives | 11 |
| 2.3. Achievement of Project Results and Outputs | 12 |
| 2.4. Implementation (Operational Plan, Monitoring and Backstopping) | 13 |
| 2.5. Institutional and Management Arrangements | 14 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3. OUTCOMES, IMPACTS and SUSTAINABILITY | 14 |
| 3.. Outcomes | 14 |
| 3.. Impact | 14 |
| 3.3. Sustainability | 15 |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| 4. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES | 16 16 |
| 4.. Lessons Learned | 17 |
| 4.. Best Practices | 18 |
| 4.3. Constraints | |

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| 5. RECOMMENDATIONS | 19 |
|---------------------------|-----------|

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| 6. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS | 20 |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ANNEXES | 22 |
| a. TERMS OF REFERENCES of the EVALUATOR | 22 |
| b. ORGANIZATIONS VISITED AND PERSONS INTERVIEWED | 26 |
| c. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE | 33 |
| d. RELEVANT MATERIALS | |
| n Project Document | |

LIST OF ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------------|---|
| ACCORD | : ASEAN and China Cooperative Operations in Response to Dangerous Drugs : |
| ASEAN | Association of Southeast Asian Nations |
| U NODC-RCEAP | : United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific |
| G69 Projec | : The subject of this evaluation, this refers to the UNODC executed project, “Promotion of Public Awareness on the Dangers of Drugs in East Asia” with funding from the United States, Sweden and Turkey. |
| N FPs | : National Focal Points (or executing agencies at national levels) |
| n NCB | Narcotics Control Bureau, Brunei Darussalam |
| n NACD | National Authority for Combating Drugs, Cambodia |
| n NNCC | National Narcotics Control Commission, China PRC |
| n NNB | National Narcotics Coordinating Board, Indonesia |
| n LCDC : | National Commission for Drug Control and Supervision, Laos |
| n NDA | National Drugs Agency, Malaysia Central Committee for Drug |
| n CCDAC | Abuse Control, Myanmar Dangerous Drugs Board, Philippines |
| n DDB | Central Narcotics Bureau, Singapore Office of the Narcotics |
| n CNB | Control Board, Thailand |
| n ONCB : | Standing Office on Drug Control, Vietnam |
| n SODC : | |
| PAC | : G69 Project Advisory Committee |
| WHO | : World Health Organization |
| YCAB | : Yayasan Cinta Anak Bangsa, Indonesia |

Disclaimer

Independent Project Evaluations are scheduled and managed by the project managers and conducted by external independent evaluators. The role of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process, but IEU does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IEU to respond to the commitment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in professionalizing the evaluation function and promoting a culture of evaluation within UNODC for the purposes of accountability and continuous learning and improvement.

Due to the disbandment of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) and the shortage of resources following its reinstatement, the IEU has been limited in its capacity to perform these functions for independent project evaluations to the degree anticipated. As a result, some independent evaluation reports posted may not be in full compliance with all IEU or UNEG guidelines. However, in order to support a transparent and learning environment, all evaluations received during this period have been posted and as an on-going process, IEU has begun re-implementing quality assurance processes and instituting guidelines for independent project evaluations as of January 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project, “Promotion of Public Awareness on the Dangers of Drugs in East Asia” (AD/RAS/G69) hereinafter referred to in this report as the “G69 project”, was designed to improve civic advocacy and effective responses to the dangers of drugs through public awareness building initiatives. It supports the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and China Cooperative Operations in Response to Dangerous Drugs (ACCORD) Plan of Action endorsed by the governments of ASEAN and China. The G69 project aimed at addressing the challenges and possibilities in developing and implementing public advocacy and awareness building initiatives on the dangers of drug abuse on the family, individual and the community in the East Asia and the Pacific region. Specifically, the project aimed at improving and expanding civic advocacy, awareness building and networking for the prevention of drug abuse among the countries in the region. The G69 project was executed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific (UNODC-RCEAP) based in Bangkok, Thailand.

I. FINDINGS

| Findings | <u>Supporting evidence</u> | Recommendations |
|---|--|--|
| Lack of knowledge and skills in identifying and producing appropriate information materials among those involved in public awareness and civic advocacy programmes in the region. | Most respondents realized the need for upgrading their communication skills and acquiring competence in developing a communication plan for their public awareness and civic advocacy programmes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provision of ongoing training on skills and knowledge needed to develop and implement effective public awareness and civic advocacy programmes. ○ Implement a “Train the Trainers” programme on public awareness and civic advocacy in the region |
| Lack of a direct mechanism for information sharing or collaboration/cooperation among countries in the region in the area of civic advocacy and public awareness | All of the respondents agreed that the ideas and experiences shared at the regional training and workshops on best practices conducted under the G69 project were very useful in helping them generate ideas for improvement of their own projects. Thailand, for instance, noted that they were able to adopt and modify some of the approaches employed by their Singapore counterparts in implementing a public awareness project targeted for the youth. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facilitate the establishment of bilateral or multilateral cooperation in the field of public awareness and civic advocacy. ○ Secure funding commitment from member countries to strengthen regional cooperation and sustain G69 initiatives. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Lack of knowledge and skills in engaging other sectors especially the media, private sectors and policy makers in advocacy and public awareness campaigns</p> | <p>The G69 project itself provided an example of how a multi-sectoral approach can enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of any public awareness and civic advocacy efforts. Thus, broadening the exposure of the participating National Focal Points on the possibilities of working with other sectors in the fight against drugs abuse.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop and implement regional joint campaigns to promote a community culture of healthy lifestyles and positive life skills among the region's population, anchored on the UN-theme of "Your Life. Your community. No Place for Drugs". ○ Employ technical expertise from member countries which are more experienced in organizing civic advocacy and public awareness programmes to assist other countries. |
| <p>Lack of capacity to conduct internal and external evaluations of public awareness and civic advocacy campaigns.</p> | <p>Those who were involved in the G69 project recognized their need to acquire competence in effectively monitoring and evaluating their respective campaigns.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide training on Monitoring and Evaluation. ○ Set up a Regional Monitoring and Evaluation center. |

II. LESSONS LEARNED

- a. Critical need for capacity building - Addressing the gaps in the knowledge and skills, particularly in the areas of communication strategies, advocacy and social marketing, among those involved in the planning and implementation of drug abuse prevention campaigns, is crucial to ensuring the successful implementation of public awareness and civic advocacy programmes in the region.
- b. Sharing of information and resources - Learning from the experiences of their counterparts in the region has enhanced the effectiveness and efficiency of their respective civic advocacy and public awareness campaigns.
- c. The "needs-based" and multi-sectoral approach (i.e., engaging the media, policy makers, other groups such as NGOs and schools, private sector) is fundamental to ensuring the success of any communication or public awareness campaign.
- d. Repositioning of messages pertaining to drug abuse and prevention - There is a need to reposition the messages in their public awareness and civic advocacy campaigns from current emphasis on dangers of drugs to that of promoting or shaping a community culture and/or a youth sub-culture that encourages healthy lifestyles and positive life skills and coping mechanisms.

- e. Resource mobilization - The opportunities exist in tapping and mobilizing needed resources in implementing public awareness and civic advocacy by actively engaging the support of various groups, particularly the media and the private sector.

III. BEST PRACTICES

National level initiatives show some potentials as best practices in public awareness and civic advocacy when a combination of the following elements are incorporated in the campaigns:

- f. The credibility of the source or the endorser of the campaign must be widely perceived and accepted as a model or inspiration of positive lifestyles and behavior.
- g. The appropriateness and creativity of the communication materials or activities relative to the target audience.
- h. Community engagement rather than top-down approach.
- i. Institutional support and commitment.
- j. Multi-sectoral involvement.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

- k. Provision of ongoing training is a must in order to meet the challenge of implementing effective public awareness and civic advocacy programmes that will complement and support other initiatives to achieve a drug-free ASEAN and China by the year 2015. The most viable option would be to train a corps of trainers within the respective countries who will be mobilized to train others in their own countries.
- l. Categorize countries based on their levels of technical capacities and experience in the area of public awareness and civic advocacy. Regional projects can then be developed and implemented that are appropriate to the level of technical capacities of these countries.
- m. Set up a Regional Monitoring and Evaluation unit. Monitoring and evaluation must be made an integral component of any project by providing the necessary funds and resources for the conduct of a properly executed evaluation process. In order to address the weakness in this area in the countries in the region, the UNODC-RCEAP can consider setting-up a unit that can provide an independent monitoring and evaluation of public awareness and civic advocacy projects in the region. Results of these evaluations can then be used as important criteria for consideration in the process of deciding the allocation of technical assistance or grants by the UNODC-RCEAP.
- n. Develop and implement regional joint campaigns to promote a community culture of healthy lifestyles and positive life skills among the region's population, anchored on the UN-theme of "Your Life. Your community. No Place for Drugs". This is seen as crucial to the achievement of the ACCORD goal of a "drug-free ASEAN and China by 2015". The technical expertise from member countries which are more experienced in

organizing civic advocacy and public awareness programmes may be tapped in these regional campaigns. Implementing programmes at regional level could address the issue of lack of support for such initiatives at the national levels.

- o. Secure funding commitment from member countries to strengthen and sustain regional cooperation, in addition to any funding that the UNODC-RCEAP will be able to secure.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR UNODC

The G69 project was successfully implemented in accordance with its project design and intent and was able to model the approaches and strategies that make for a successful public awareness and civic advocacy endeavors. The gains achieved by the G69 project in bringing together the national focal points, the media, the private sector, the policy makers in the conduct of the G69 project activities and making them see and recognize the importance of a well-executed, multi-sectoral and needs-based communication campaigns and public awareness initiatives can now serve as an important platform from which further initiatives towards strengthening the public awareness and civic advocacy capacity of the ACCORD countries can be launched. Future initiatives can include the following:

- p. A mechanism to strengthen and sustain the cooperation and collaboration among the executing agencies to share experiences, expertise and resources in the conduct of civic advocacy and public awareness programmes.
- q. Matchmaking of countries based on needs/experiences. All the countries in the region share the same concerns and face the same issues in the area of civic advocacy and public awareness. It was also acknowledged that each of the countries in the region has its own areas of strengths and weaknesses.
- r. Setting up a dedicated mechanism that could effectively pool and channel technical and financial resources into collective efforts to build up civic advocacy and communications and social marketing capacities of all the countries in the region. A dedicated mechanism should be set up, under the auspices of the UNODC-RCEAP but with committed funding from each of the member countries in the region to complement the funds that can be secured by the UNODC for such initiatives. This mechanism can also be tapped to provide independent evaluation services to address the weakness in this area among the countries in the region.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background and Context:

The project, “Promotion of Public Awareness on the Dangers of Drugs in East Asia”(AD/RAS/03G69) hereinafter referred to in this report as the “G69 project”, was designed to improve civic advocacy and effective responses to the dangers of drugs through public awareness building initiatives. It supports the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and China Cooperative Operations in Response to Dangerous Drugs (ACCORD) Plan of Action endorsed by the governments of ASEAN and China. The G69 project aimed at addressing the challenges and possibilities in developing and implementing public advocacy and awareness building on the dangers of drug abuse on the family, individual and the community in the East Asia and the Pacific region. Specifically, the project aimed at improving and expanding civic advocacy, awareness building and networking for the prevention of drug abuse among the countries in the region.

1.1. Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation:

This evaluation was designed to assess whether the areas of need of the executing agencies in developing and implementing civic advocacy and public awareness programs on drug prevention in their respective countries were addressed by their involvement in the G69 project. Subsequent improvements, if any, in their approaches and strategies in developing and implementing civic advocacy and public awareness campaigns as a result of their participation in the G69 project activities were noted in this report.

1.2. Executing Modality/Management Arrangements:

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific (UNODC-RCEAP) based in Bangkok, Thailand implemented the G69 project in 003. Originally intended to be a 3-year project, it was extended for two years. A Project Coordinator was engaged to oversee and coordinate the implementation of project activities. The Project Coordinator, assisted by a Project Assistant, reported directly to the UNODC Representative and to the Project Advisory Committee (PAC).

The setting up of the PAC was an integral part of the G69 project design to review its progress, deal with important operational issues and make recommendations as needed. The PAC is chaired by the UNODC-RCEAP Representative with members comprising a representative from UNODC Headquarters and the World Health Organization (WHO) as associated agency as well as the Chair of the ACCORD Pillar on Civic Awareness and the G69 Project Coordinator.

The G69 Project team worked directly with the designated National Focal Points's from the executing agencies in each of the countries in the ASEAN and in China. These executing agencies were:

- a. Narcotics Control Bureau (NCB), Brunei Darussalam
- b. National Authority for Combating Drugs (NACD), Cambodia
- c. National Narcotics Control Commission (NNCC), China PRC
- d. National Narcotics Coordinating Board (NNB), Indonesia
- e. National Commission for Drug Control and Supervision (LCDC), Laos
- f. National Drugs Agency (NADA), Malaysia
- g. Central Committee for Drug Abuse Control (CCDAC), Myanmar
- h. Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB), Philippines

- i. Central Narcotics Bureau (CNB), Singapore
- j. Office of the Narcotics Control Board (ONCB), Thailand
- k. Standing Office on Drug Control (SODC), Vietnam

1.3. Scope of the Evaluation:

This evaluation assessed the following:

- a. The appropriateness of the project's approaches in addressing the needs of the executing agencies which were identified at the time of project formulation
- b. The efficiency of allocation of project activities and resources
- c. The sustainability of the project results
- d. Lessons learned from the project and best practices

Recommendations on how the project could be expanded into another phase in the next five years is also included in this report.

1.4. Evaluation Methodology:

The evaluation process was conducted over a period of six (6) weeks from March ,00 to April ,00. Evaluation data was obtained through a series of open-ended interviews with the G69 project's national focal points. Participants of the training and workshops conducted under the G69 project were also interviewed. The respondents included in the evaluation were selected based on the length and extent of their involvement with the project as well as the nature of the positions or tasks that they were assigned in their respective organizations at the time of the G69 project implementation. The main criteria were their involvement in public awareness and civic advocacy activities in their respective organizations in their countries. UNODC staff involved in the project were also interviewed and reports pertaining to the project were also reviewed by the evaluator. There were 35 respondents who provided inputs in this evaluation.

2. ANALYSIS AND MAJOR FINDINGS

2.1. Overall performance assessment (Appropriateness, Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency)

The approaches adopted by the project proved to be appropriate and relevant to the needs of the executing agencies. These approaches were:

- a. Working closely and directly with the respective national drug control agencies in the implementation of the project component and activity :- The Project G69 stressed the importance of drawing the active participation and contributions of the focal points in determining the project activities that must be implemented to meet the expressed needs of the countries involved.

The UNODC-RCEAP requested nominations for focal points from each of the executing agencies. A Project Inception meeting of the designated NFP's for the project was held from July -9, 005 in Bangkok, Thailand to discuss and review the expected project outputs and activities as well as to clarify expectations of the parties involved in the project. The said meeting resulted in the identification of the needs to be addressed and decisions were made as to which project activities must be prioritized.

- b. Extensive participation of each of these agencies in the planning and delivery of project activities implemented at national levels :- At the national level, each of the G69 project activities were implemented by the executing agencies themselves, with technical assistance provided by the G69 Project Coordinator. This approach of engaging the NFP's in the planning and implementation of project activities helped instill a sense of ownership, and ensured that the project activities that were implemented met actual needs. For example, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines each hosted and helped organize regional training, workshops and/or meetings while Thailand worked closely with the UNODC-RCEAP in the implementation of special events associated with the International Day Against Drug Abuse.
- c. The adoption of a needs-based approach in the implementation of the project's activities :-The inception meeting and a workshop participated in by the NFP's served as an example of the needs-based approach in the planning and implementation of a communication program. Over the course of the project implementation, the Project Coordinator exerted efforts in ensuring that all the focal points were consulted on matters pertaining to the project and their suggestions and recommendations taken into consideration in all decisions made. This needs-based approach was, in and by itself, served as an effective model of how to conduct communication and public awareness programs. For instance, as a result of their exposure to this approach through the G69 project model, the executing agencies from the Philippines and Brunei requested for a training on needs assessment to equip them with knowledge and skills in identifying the needs of their respective target groups for their public awareness programs.

The G69 project is the first UNODC initiative that focused exclusively on civic advocacy and public awareness in the region. This was the key point in its relevance to the needs of the participating agencies. The needs addressed by the G69 project, which proved its relevance, were:

- a. Lack of knowledge and skills in identifying and producing appropriate information materials :- All of the respondents to this evaluation have been involved in implementing civic advocacy and public awareness programs on drug prevention in their respective agencies or organizations. However, they cited that the training and workshops that they took part in under the G69 project equipped them with necessary communication skills that they previously lacked. All of the respondents mentioned being able to gain useful knowledge and approaches that they were able to apply in their respective public awareness programs. After participating in these training and workshops, most realized the need for upgrading their communication skills and acquire competence in developing a communication plan for their public awareness and civic advocacy programs.
- b. Lack of a direct mechanism for information sharing or collaboration/cooperation among countries in the region in the area of civic advocacy and public awareness:- For most of the respondents in this evaluation, the G69 project afforded them their first ever opportunity to be involved in an activity that allowed them to gain knowledge and exposure on drug prevention civic advocacy and public awareness programs of other countries. All of the respondents agreed that this opportunity was invaluable in expanding their understanding of the methods and approaches that other countries have adopted in their civic advocacy and public awareness programs. They cited the fact that the ideas and experiences shared at the regional training and workshop on best practices conducted under the G69 project were

very useful in helping them generate ideas for improvement of their own projects. Thailand, for instance, noted that they were able to adopt and modify some of the approaches employed by their Singapore counterparts in implementing a public awareness project targeted for the youth.

- c. Lack of knowledge and skills in engaging other sectors especially the media, private sectors and policy makers in advocacy and public awareness campaigns :- The G69 project itself provided an excellent example of how a multi-sectoral approach can significantly enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of any public awareness and civic advocacy efforts. Thus, the participation of the NFP's broadened their exposure on the possibilities of engaging other sectors in the fight against drugs abuse. The experiences of the executing agencies in Thailand, Singapore and Indonesia in engaging other sectors provided ideas for others to adopt in their own campaigns.

The overall effectiveness and efficiency of the G69 Project was hampered at the early stage of its implementation by the following factors:

- a. Delay in the recruitment of the Project Coordinator, which resulted in a significant time gap between the project inception and actual implementation of the project activities
- b. Insufficient funding and the inherent challenge of raising funds

However, once the Project Coordinator was recruited, she was able to speed up the execution of the project activities. It should be noted that all the NFP's interviewed by the evaluator regarded the Project Coordinator highly in terms of her competence in the field of communication and advocacy as well as her resourcefulness and ability to effectively engage their active participation and support for the G69 initiatives. They also noted that the Project Assistant was efficient in keeping them up-to-date with the developments pertaining to the project.

The Project Coordinator, with assistance from the members of the Project Advisory Committee, was also able to secure much needed funding to address budget shortfalls and the piecemeal allocation of committed funding (ref. Item .4 under this section)

2.2. Attainment of Objectives

The G69 project's immediate objective was to "improve and expand civic advocacy, awareness building and networking for the prevention of drug abuse in the region". In all respects, the G69 project was able to achieve this objective despite the initial delay in project implementation. The approaches adopted by the G69 project, in and by itself, provided a model of how an effective public awareness and civic advocacy programs should be conducted (ref. Item .above). The linkages established among the NFP's as a result of their involvement in the G69 project can now serve as a workable and functional platform from which further initiatives for regional collaboration in the area of public awareness and civic advocacy on drug abuse prevention can be launched.

2.3. Achievement of Project Results and Outputs

The G69 project set out to achieve several key outputs, as was agreed on by the NFP's and endorsed by the PAC. The following summarizes the outputs, activities and results achieved by the G69 project within the 5-year time frame of its implementation.

| Outputs | Activities Implemented | Results Achieved |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Basic campaign strategies developed and profiled</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Conducted a regional workshop on “Basic Campaign Strategies” ■ Conducted a regional workshop on “Best Practices in Drug Prevention Campaign and Strategies” ■ Development and production of a Manual on Drug Prevention Campaign and Strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Development of an outline for a communication plan for the participants' respective campaigns ■ Spin-of workshops and training were conducted at national level upon requests made by countries eg Philippines and Brunei on “Needs Assessment” and Vietnam on “engaging the media” ■ Recognition and acceptance of the need for monitoring and evaluation of public awareness and civic advocacy campaigns among the participants ■ Provided a platform for enhanced collaboration and sharing of ideas |
| <p>Printed public information and awareness building materials developed and delivered</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Production and distribution of the following information materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eastern Horizons Magazine - UNODC-RCEAP Annual Report - Think pieces, guidelines, factsheets, flash reports, posters - Campaign materials for specific events - Audio-visual and web-based materials production - Comprehensive plan for the website, targeting important groups through subsections of the website - Press reports - Production of exhibit materials ■ Provision of technical assistance to countries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Expanded the contents, readership and distribution of the “Eastern Horizons” ■ Enhanced the involvement of the media in the fight against drugs by making information accessible and user-friendly, resulting in wider coverage of drugs issue in both traditional and alternative media. (eg 5 stories produced online were carried by 3 international wire services; provision of requested information to media organizations such as the BBC, Time Magazine, Xinhua News Agency, Radio Free Asia, The Economist, and the United Nations Radio of the Department of Public Information. Exhibit materials were also provided to other UN agencies to support their respective activities such as the UN Day celebration in Bangkok.) ■ The G69 project helped seven (7) countries in the development and production of their information materials by providing technical assistance. |

| Outputs | Activities Implemented | Results Achieved |
|--|--|--|
| Innovative community special events supported | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Establish relevant communication channels to countries and counterparts ■ Orient and train possible partners ■ Special events support programie grants | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Engaged other sectors such as the civil society, media, socio-civic organizations, private sector. ■ Established partnership with the Lions Club International (Thailand) to promote awareness on drug abuse issues through their club networks' activities. ■ Launched the UNODC-YCAB Journalism Life Award in Indonesia in partnership |
| Material products systematically reviewed and updated as necessary | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Developed registration system ■ Developed internal and external networks for focus testing ■ Implement monitoring, revision and | All materials developed in connection with the implementation of the project have been tracked and filed accordingly. |

2.4. Implementation (Operational Plan, Monitoring and Backstopping):

The operational plan adopted for the project implementation was appropriate for the purposes and intent of the G69 project. This included the direct involvement of the NFC's from each of the executing agencies in the ASEAN countries and in China and the setting up of the PAC. The advice, assistance and recommendations from the PAC proved to be crucial in ensuring that the project was able to adjust and modify its activities, as and when necessary, without deviating from the original intent and design of the project.

The implementation of the G69 project was hampered at the initial stage due to the following reasons:

- . Delay in the recruitment of the Project Coordinator :- This delay was however compensated by the fact that the Project Coordinator who was eventually hired for the project was able to garner the support of all the focal points and other parties involved to implement the project activities without any more delays. The Project Coordinator was also able to actively engage the NFP's in providing inputs and feedback on the project activities and ensured consistent communication with and among them through missions as well as through phones and e-mail links. This consistent communication linkages among the parties involved in the project served as an effective means of monitoring the progress of the G69 Project activities.
- . Piecemeal allocation of funding from committed donors resulting in budget shortfalls:- With the G69 project encountering budget shortfalls during the implementation period, the Project Coordinator, upon the advice of the PAC, explored funding opportunities through the Advocacy Section of UNODC Headquarters and Prevention Section of UNODC Headquarters. Through the Advocacy Section, funds were secured for the national media training on drug abuser reporting for Malaysian

journalists while the Prevention Section provided funds for the conduct of training for policy makers to pre-test a training manual in the development of ATSpolicies directed for youths.

The Project Coordinator also initiated negotiations with the national executing agencies resulting in their active involvement in the organization of the regional training-workshops on a cost-sharing basis. For example, the national drug control agencies of Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines and Thailand contributed to the local costs associated in the conduct of such workshops and training.

2.5. Institutional and Management Arrangements

The G69 project deliberately placed heavy emphasis on the involvement of the executing agencies in project activity planning and delivery. Thus, the management arrangements for some of the project activities were entrusted to the specific counterpart agency in the country where the project activity was implemented. The G69 project management staff provided the necessary technical assistance and guidance in the planning and implementation of the said activities. This approach helped enhance the sense of ownership among the executing agencies involved and thus, ensured their active engagement in the project. As inputs to the activities implemented were drawn from the participating entities and not dictated by the lead agency (i.e. UNODC-RCEAP), the conduct and management of the G69 Project served as an excellent model of the multi-sectoral, community-based approach in implementing civic advocacy and public awareness programs.

3. OUTCOMES, IMPACTS and SUSTAINABILITY

3.1. Outcomes :

The G69 project achieved the desired outcomes of:

- a. Increasing awareness among the participants on the need to upgrade knowledge and skills in communication, advocacy and social marketing.
- b. Engaging other sectors in public awareness and civic advocacy.
- c. Improving knowledge and skills on the design and development of a communication plan.
- d. Enhancing networking among executing agencies on drug control and prevention by establishing linkages among the people involved in civic advocacy and public awareness programs on drug prevention in the ASEAN countries and in China.

3.2. Impacts :

The intended impacts of any public awareness and advocacy programs are a) the dissemination of the appropriate messages to the widest audience possible; b) the achievement of concurrence among differing parties of the need to work together to achieve common goals; and, c) the active engagement of various sectors. All these have been achieved by the G69 project over its 5-year implementation period.

a. Impacts to the participating countries:

The G69 project resulted in the enhanced recognition and greater acceptance among the executing agencies that civic advocacy and the promotion of public awareness on the dangers of drug abuse is not an "internal" issue for the respective countries to address on

their own. The need to work together in promoting public awareness on drug abuse and prevention is crucial in achieving the goal of a “drug-free ASEAN by 05” as endorsed by the governments of the ASEAN countries and China under the ACCORD agreement. Thus, a major impact of the G69 project was the opportunity for sharing and exchange of knowledge and experiences that it afforded the participating executing agencies. Those agencies which have less experience in implementing advocacy and public awareness programs were most appreciative of the knowledge and exposure they have gained on the approaches and methods that have worked for other countries. On the other hand, those agencies which had the technical expertise and are more experienced in developing and implementing civic advocacy and public awareness programs welcomed the opportunity to share and impart the lessons they have learned from their successful campaigns. These agencies also expressed willingness to provide technical and/or financial resources, within the bounds of their respective countries’ foreign and fiscal policies, to those countries with less experience and which currently lack technical and financial resources in organizing civic advocacy and public awareness programs on drug prevention.

b. Impact to the UNODC-RCEAP:

The G69 project has enhanced and strengthened the public awareness initiatives of the UNODC-RCEAP. For example, the G69 project was responsible in expanding the contents as well as the readership of the Centre’s magazine, the Eastern Horizons. The public visibility and profile of the Centre was also enhanced through the G69 initiatives such as the organization of special events like the International Day against drug abuse and illicit trafficking in collaboration with NGO’s and socio-civic organizations, the media and the private sector. These included:

- n Signing of an MOU between the UNODC-RCEAP and the Lions Club International (Thailand) for the latter to include drug awareness in their club’s activities such as the Smart Camps, sports events and in their information materials.
- n Active involvement of the private sector in the organization of the International Day against drug abuse. For example, an SMS blast campaign conducted with a Thai telecommunications company that sent out anti-drug abuse messages to their phone subscribers; the awarding of guitar scholarships by Yamaha; and the provision of a space for exhibits and special events by the management of a shopping mall
- n The implementation of the UNODC-YCAB LIFE AWARD in Indonesia. This is a joint initiative of the UNODC-RCEAP, the Yayasan Cinta Anak Bangsa (YCAB), a non-profit organization dealing with youths and Media Group, a major publishing company in the country. This initiative seeks to promote the active engagement of the media in primary prevention aspects of drug abuse and to recognize their contributions towards achieving a drug-free nation. It is hoped that this initiative will serve as a launching pad for a regional journalism awards or recognition scheme in the future.

3.3. Sustainability:

At the regional level, the G69 project achieved the desired intent of bringing together relevant parties crucial to implementing effective public awareness and civic advocacy programs. These parties included the national drug control agencies, the NGO’s, media, and policy makers. At the national level, the upgrading of the knowledge and skills of those involved in the development, planning and implementation of public awareness and civic advocacy programs was also achieved by the G69 project.

The respondents to this evaluation were agreed that without a formal mechanism such as the G69 project, the collaboration and cooperation among the executing agencies as far as the exchange of information and sharing of technical and other resources, will be difficult to sustain. Given the reality that funding for such a project as the G69 is limited and/or may no longer be available, the challenge then for the next phase of the project is to dispel this perception and to open up the minds of the NFP's on the possibilities for greater collaboration among them, with or without a formal mechanism such as the G69 project.

The G69 project was able to instill a desire among the NFP's to work together in developing and implementing their respective public awareness and civic advocacy campaigns. Strengthening this desire and the capacity to work together among these parties is the key to the sustainability of the project's results. The expressed willingness of some countries, such as Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam, to continue to pursue bilateral or multilateral collaborations in public awareness and civic advocacy endeavors provide a workable platform from which the results achieved by the G69 project can effectively be sustained and generate an even greater impact in the region.

The UNODC-RCEAP can play a vital role in facilitating these bilateral or multilateral collaborations by providing technical advice and guidelines on how such collaborations can be effected. The UNODC-RCEAP, given its scope of influence among the governments of the ACCORD countries, can mediate the process of establishing such bilateral or multilateral cooperation among these countries and provide official endorsements for any joint public awareness or civic advocacy campaigns that these countries may wish to implement. An official endorsement from the UNODC-RCEAP will carry significant weight in these countries' efforts to gain support and backing from their respective governments as well as other parties such as the media, NGO's and the private sector. Moreover, UNODC-RCEAP's official mediation and/or endorsement can also help break down political barriers or bureaucratic encumbrances that can impede the process of establishing such bilateral or multilateral cooperation among countries.

4. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

4.1. Lessons Learned:

- a. **Critical need for capacity building:-** It must be noted that while the countries in the region have been implementing information and public awareness campaigns on drug control and prevention, there were significant gaps in the knowledge and skills, particularly in the areas of communication strategies, advocacy and social marketing, among those involved in the planning and implementation of such campaigns. This knowledge-and-skills gap has clearly contributed to the weaknesses in some of the campaigns that have been, or are being implemented, in their respective countries, as most of the participants in the workshop on Best Practices held under the G69 project, have acknowledged. This has also led to the dearth of well-documented cases of successes in public awareness and civic advocacy programs across the region that can serve as models which can be replicated or adopted region-wide.
- b. **Sharing of information and resources:-** All the respondents in this evaluation process noted their appreciation of the opportunity afforded by their involvement in the G69 project to gain knowledge and exposure on each other's respective campaigns. Learning

from the experiences of their counterparts in the region has enhanced the effectiveness and efficiency of their respective civic advocacy and public awareness campaigns.

- c. The “needs-based” and multi-sectoral approach (ie engaging the media, policy makers, other groups such as NGO’s and schools, private sector) is fundamental to ensuring the success of any communication or public awareness campaigns.
- d. Repositioning of messages pertaining to drug abuse and prevention:- Most of the respondents to this evaluation were agreed that there is a need to reposition the messages in their public awareness and civic advocacy campaigns from emphasis on dangers of drugs to that of promoting or shaping a community culture and/or a youth sub-culture that encourages healthy lifestyles and positive life skills and coping mechanisms. They also noted the need to learn and acquire skills in the use of current communication media or channels, such as the use of electronic games, animation and “sms blast” technologies, that will appeal to today’s youth, who are the major target audience in all the countries in the region. It was also noted that the rapid changes in trends of drug use as well as in the peoples’ lifestyles, in particular the youth of today, necessitates continuous upgrading of knowledge and skills among those involved in the planning and implementation of public awareness and civic advocacy campaigns.
- e. Resource mobilization: From both the regional and national perspectives, the G69 project showed the possibilities in tapping and mobilizing needed resources in implementing public awareness and civic advocacy by actively engaging the support of various sectors, particularly the media and the private sector. For example, organizing a region-wide campaign, such as the Journalism Award, is highly feasible given the extent of involvement and contributions by the relevant parties. A template for such a regionwide initiative can be developed based on the experience of Indonesia’s efforts to recognize the media’s contributions in the fight against drugs abuse through its “UNODC-YCAB Life Award” initiative.

4.2. Best or Promising Practices:

In assessing best practices in public awareness and civic advocacy campaigns, the basic criteria applied is the efficiency of the project delivery relative to the numbers reached, the outputs achieved relative to the activities implemented and the outcomes achieved in relation to the goal of reducing demand for drugs.

At the “Regional Workshop on Best Practices in Drug Abuse Prevention Campaigns” which was jointly organized by the NADA, Malaysia and the UNODC-RCEAP as part of the G69 project, the national-level communication campaigns presented by the respective countries show relative promise as potential best practices. In view of the lack of proper monitoring and evaluation mechanism in most of these campaigns, and thus the insufficiency of documented data or information on the impact generated by the campaign on their respective target groups, these above-mentioned practices cannot be classified as best practices as yet. Nonetheless, the campaigns presented and discussed at the workshop included some elements of what makes for “best practices” in any given public awareness or civic advocacy campaign. These elements are:-

- a. The credibility of the source or the anchor person in the campaign must be widely perceived and accepted as a model or inspiration of positive lifestyles and behavior involved in the campaign. For example, in Thailand’s “One Baht” campaign, the inspiration behind the campaign- the King of Thailand- was a key factor in its success.

In Malaysia's "Gempadah" campaign, the involvement of a popular singer noted for his clean and healthy lifestyle is instrumental in getting the message across to its target audience of young people.

- b. The appropriateness and creativity of the communication materials or activities relative to the target audience. Singapore's "Ambassador's Scheme" strength was in the use of information materials and incentives that appeal to its target audience

~~Final Draft of the Paper Submitted to the National Institute on Drug Abuse on the Effectiveness of Public Awareness Campaigns~~
~~regarding~~

- c. Community engagement rather than top-down approach. Malaysia and Lao PDR are gaining valuable experience on how to mobilize the grassroots communities in the fight against drugs.
- d. Institutional support and commitment. Philippines, China, Brunei, Cambodia and Indonesia draw upon the institutional support –from the government, the education institution –in carrying out their respective campaigns.
- e. Multi-sectoral involvement. All of the campaigns presented at the workshop show some elements of multi-sectoral engagement with the media, other civic society groups and organizations and the private sector being tapped for support in the conduct of their campaigns.

4.3. Constraints

The G69 project was an endeavor to address the challenges and possibilities of public awareness and civic advocacy on the prevention of drugs abuse in East Asia. The G69 project activities and the corresponding outputs and results open up possibilities for adoption and use in the respective public awareness campaigns of the ACCORD countries. However, the following constraints can influence the degree or extent of adoption of the approaches or practices that proved to be effective in the context of the G69 project.

- a. Differences in the technical capacities of the countries:- While some of the countries in the region have ready capacity to adopt and use materials that were produced under the G69 project, other countries in the region found it difficult to make full use of these due to the lack of capacity to translate and/or modify such materials or information to suit local conditions and languages.
- b. Lack of support from top decision-makers : As a result of their participation and exposure to the G69 project, some of the NFP's came up with proposals to strengthen their capacities in implementing public awareness campaigns in their respective countries. However, these proposals received unenthusiastic response from their superiors.
- c. Lack of capacity to conduct both internal and external evaluation of campaigns:- The need for proper monitoring and evaluation to measure the impact of their campaigns on their target audiences is an essential component of any public awareness and civic advocacy efforts. The executing agencies, with the exception of Singapore, suffer from the lack of knowledge and skills in conducting both internal and external evaluations of their respective campaigns.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The G69 Project was able to fulfill its avowed intent of supporting and strengthening Pillar of the ACCORD Plan of Action. There is general agreement and desire among those involved in the G69 project that the initiatives started by the project should be continued and sustained. Recommendations that will specifically address the constraints earlier noted (ref Item 4.3) are:

- a. **Training of Trainers on Communication Strategies:** The needs of the region is enormous in terms of addressing the challenges of implementing public awareness and civic advocacy campaigns. The possibility of any one institution to meet the needs of the countries in the region for ongoing training in the field of communication and advocacy is an unrealistic and unworkable expectation. Ongoing training is a must in order to meet the challenge of implementing effective public awareness and civic advocacy programs that will complement and support other initiatives to achieve a drug-free ASEAN and China by the year 05. Hence, the most viable option to address the issue of varying degrees of technical competence among countries would be to train a corps of trainers within the respective countries who will be mobilized to train others in their own language. Their familiarity with local conditions and situations will also enable them to effectively guide project implementers in their countries. These corps of trainers must be equipped with the knowledge, skills and competence on:
 - n drug use trends
 - n development of communication plans
 - n advocacy to effectively engage other sectors/groups
 - n media engagement
 - n profiling and needs assessment of target audience
 - n use and development of both traditional and alternative media
 - n crisis communication and public relations
 - n resource mobilization
 - n monitoring and evaluation of programs
- b. **Categorize countries based on their levels of technical capacities and experience** in the area of public awareness and civic advocacy. Regional projects can then be developed and implemented that are appropriate to the level of technical capacities of these countries. Countries with more experience and better technical capacities in organizing civic advocacy and public awareness campaigns may also be tapped to provide assistance to the less experienced countries. The UNODC-RCEAP can develop a mechanism or a system to match countries based on their complementary needs and areas of strengths and encourage the establishment of bilateral relations and partnerships between countries.
- c. **Set up a Regional Monitoring and Evaluation unit:** Those who were involved in the G69 project recognized their need to acquire competence in effectively monitoring and evaluating their respective campaigns (ref Item 4.3c). Monitoring and Evaluation must be made an integral component of any project by providing the necessary funds and resources for the conduct of a properly executed evaluation process. In order to address the weakness in this area in the countries in the region, the UNODC-RCEAP can consider setting-up a unit that can provide an independent monitoring and evaluation of public awareness and civic advocacy projects in the region. Results of these evaluations can then be used as important criteria for consideration in the process of deciding the allocation of technical assistance or grants by the UNODC-RCEAP.

- d. **Develop and implement regional joint campaigns to promote a community culture of healthy lifestyles and positive life skills among the region's population**, anchored on the UN-theme of "Your Life.Your community. No Place for Drugs".This is seen as crucial to the achievement of the ACCORD goal of a "drug-free ASEAN and China by 05".The technical expertise from member countries that are more experienced in organizing civic advocacy and public awareness programs may be tapped in these regional campaigns. Implementing programs at regional level will be able to address the issue of lack of support for such initiatives at the national levels (ref Item 4.3b).
- e. Secure funding commitment from member countries to strengthen and sustain regional cooperation, in addition to any funding that the UNODC-RCEAP will be able to secure.

6. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The G69 project was successfully implemented in accordance with its project design and intent and was able to model the approaches and strategies that make for a successful public awareness and civic advocacy endeavors. The gains achieved by the G69 project in bringing together the national drug control agencies, the media, the private sector, the policy makers, the nongovernmental organizations and other civic society groups, in the conduct of the G69 project activities and making them see the importance of a well-executed, multi-sectoral and needs-based communication campaigns and public awareness initiatives serve as an important platform from which further initiatives towards strengthening the public awareness and civic advocacy capacity of the ACCORD countries can be launched. Future initiatives can include the following:

- a. A mechanism to strengthen and sustain the cooperation and collaboration among the executing agencies to share experiences, expertise and resources in the conduct of civic advocacy and public awareness programs, such as what the Project G69 has initiated and provided, is needed in the region.The Project G69 has successfully raised awareness among the executing agencies that they would be more effective in conducting civic advocacy and public awareness on drug prevention in their respective countries if they are able to learn from each other and share expertise and resources with each other. It has also provided a window of opportunity for executing agencies to consider the possibilities in working together to achieve the common goal of a "drug-free ASEAN and China by 05"through jointly and collectively organized civic advocacy and public awareness programs throughout the region.

However, as the Project G69 has shown, it is very difficult to sustain such an initiative without the necessary funding and manpower resources. In view of this fact, it may well be a more pragmatic approach to consider and adopt a suggestion made by some of the focal points who were involved in Project G69 to tap the resources, such as technical expertise and funding, from the countries in the region to complement and/or supplement the resources of the UNODC-RCEAP.

- b. Matchmaking of countries based on needs/experiences : All the countries in the region share the same concerns and face the same issues in the area of civic advocacy and public awareness. It was also acknowledged that each of the countries in the region has its own areas of strengths and weaknesses. For instance, Singapore's strength in developing and promoting messages that advocates for healthy, positive lifestyles among youths to steer them away from drugs, could be tapped to meet the needs of countries like

Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos in this particular area. Singapore could play an active role as a technical adviser as well as consider providing some funds for these countries to implement their youth advocacy programs on drug prevention. The UNDOC-RCEAP can play an important role in facilitating these partnerships and collaborations.

- c. Setting up a dedicated mechanism that could effectively pool and channel technical and financial resources into collective efforts to build up civic advocacy and communications and social marketing capacities of all the countries in the region. Several of the focal points, as well as those who participated in the training and workshop sessions conducted under the G69 Project, expressed the desire to work together with their counterparts in developing and implementing a communication campaign that all the countries in the region can implement in their respective countries, with some modifications to suit local conditions. A dedicated mechanism should be set up, under the auspices of the UNODC-RCEAP but with committed funding from each of the member countries in the region to complement the funds that can be secured by the UNODC for such initiatives. This mechanism can also be tapped to provide an independent evaluation services to address the weakness in this area among the countries in the region.

ANNEXES

a. TERMS OF REFERENCES for the Evaluator

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR SPECIAL SERVICE AGREEMENT

POSTTITLE : Project Evaluator

AGENCY/PROJECT NAME : United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific/
Regional Project, "Promotion of Public Awareness on
the Dangers of Drugs in East Asia"

COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT : Bangkok, Thailand with travels to Malaysia,
Viet Nam, and within Thailand

1. GENERAL BACKGROUND

The project has been designed to improve civic advocacy and effective responses to the dangers of drugs. It supports the ASEAN and China Cooperative Operations in Response to Dangerous Drugs (ACCORD) Plan of Action endorsed by the governments of ASEAN and China. The project aims to improve and expand civic advocacy, awareness building and networking for the prevention of drug abuse in the region.

The project will produce and distribute awareness building materials suitable for a number of different media, develop model campaigns, support innovative community-based special events and review and adjust public advocacy initiatives as necessary. The initiatives will be reviewed and refined through the exchange of information and experience at the national and regional levels.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSIGNMENT

To assess the progress made towards achievement of the immediate objective. More specifically, the evaluation will review and evaluate a) project concept and design b) project implementation and c) project outputs and any immediate impact. The evaluation should also provide recommendations and lessons learned from project-initiated activities to serve as bases for future initiatives.

3. SCOPE OF WORK

Under the supervision of G69 Project Coordinator, the evaluator shall review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy and evaluate the relevance and the appropriateness of the project objective, outputs, activities and resources. More specifically the evaluator will assess:

- n whether the needs of executing agencies at the time of project formulation were properly addressed as reflected in the project document
- n whether project activities and resources were allocated adequately
- n whether the project's approach has been appropriate

The evaluator shall assess the outputs, outcomes and any immediate impact achieved or expected to be achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results, when applicable. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objective (increased knowledge, skills and capabilities of public awareness practitioners of national drug control agencies and selected partners, and the contribution to attaining the drug control objective and any unexpected results.

The evaluation will include recommendations for any future action. Recommendations may also be made in respect of issues related to the implementation or management of the project, as well as concerning replication of the project approach and strategy in other regions or in specific countries covered by the project.

Lessons learned from the project which are valid beyond the project itself should be highlighted in the evaluation report. Conscious effort by the evaluator should be taken into consideration in finding out how the project could be expanded substantively into another phase in the next five years.

The evaluator will conduct the evaluation based on the attached programme. In addition, he/she would:

- . Discuss with concerned UNODC staff at the Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok
- . Be based in Bangkok, Thailand with travels to selected countries covered by the project, namely, Malaysia, Viet Nam, and the Philippines. Initial evaluation methodology, questionnaires/ evaluation tools should be conducted before visiting these countries.
3. Review and study of existing documents and reports, interviews with selected stakeholders. Information from countries not included in the travel will be obtained through phone interviews, emails, or other means of communication, as deemed necessary.
4. Interview selected Project Focal Points and Project Advisory Committee members, staff at headquarters involved in the project, participants to project-initiated trainings-workshops, Regional Centre staff, and other persons who have participated in the annual review of progress and future work plan of the project; and
5. Arrange with UNODC Regional Centre to schedule telephone interviews for interviewees who are not based in Thailand. Project documents, work plans, progress reports, and other publications resulting from the project implementation will be reviewed.

Lump sum consultancy fee includes travel and lodging expenses which the consultant will be responsible for arranging.

4. DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

9 days from March –April 00.

It is understood that the evaluator would not hold the UNODC Regional Centre responsible for any unforeseen or untoward incident during the duration of the evaluation. It is recommended that the evaluator secure his/her own insurance coverage during the conduct of the evaluation. Proven insurance documents should be submitted to UNODC for reference.

5. FINAL PRODUCTS

The evaluator shall submit a report in English to the UNODC Regional Centre by 4 March 00. This draft evaluation report will be discussed with the executing agencies and other parties to the project, as appropriate.

Any observations and comments received from UNODC Regional Centre and executing agencies may be taken into account by the evaluator for the final report to be submitted by 5th April 00.

While the evaluator takes views expressed by the concerned parties into account, his/her independent judgement in preparing the final report should be considered.

The evaluator should follow the UNODC standard format and guidelines for the preparation of project evaluation reports. He/she shall provide the final report not exceeding 50 pages excluding annexes to the Regional Centre who will distribute the report to concerned parties including the Evaluation Section of UNODC Headquarters.

6. PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

The evaluator would be under the supervision of the Project Coordinator. A briefing would be made prior to the conduct of the evaluation, specifically on the overall policies and management of the Regional Centre and () details and status of the project. Discussions will also be made with the Project Coordinator on how the evaluator proposes to conduct the evaluation and the overall strategic approach to the evaluation. Documents in relation to the project will be provided to the evaluator as part of the inputs for the evaluation. The project will be responsible for providing substantive and administrative support to the evaluator, should the needs arise.

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------|
| n | Actual project evaluation | 0 March –5 April 00 |
| n | Submission of draft report | 0 April 00 |
| n | Submission of Final report | 4 April 00 |

7. DEGREE OF EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS

- n The evaluator should have solid experience in project evaluation and is well-versed with technical cooperation, project planning and management in the field of drug demand reduction and public awareness and advocacy/communication campaigns.
- n He/she should have a post-graduate or graduate degree in communication, communication campaigns and research, health sciences, social sciences, evaluation or other related fields with a minimum of years experience in the field of drug demand reduction, and communication strategies in the ASEAN countries and China
- n Has excellent analytical skills; excellent in written English
- n Has good interpersonal and research skills.
- n The evaluator should not have been directly involved in the design, appraisal or implementation of the project and should be able to use his/her independent judgment in the evaluation.

b. ORGANIZATIONS VISITED AND PERSONS INTERVIEWED

(either via face-to-face, phone or e-mails)

Brunei Darussalam

Mr. Osmawi Bin Haji Osman
Chief Narcotics Officer I
Preventive Drug Education
Narcotics Control Bureau

Tel: (+6-3) 44-, 4-49, 4-40

Fax: (+6-3) 4-4 E-mail:

ncb@brunet.bn

Mr. Haji Aminuradin Bin Haji Saman

Senior Narcotics Officer

Narcotics Control Bureau (NCB)

JalanTungku, Gadong, BE 0, Brunei Darussalam Tel:

(+6-3) 44-

Fax: (+6-3) 45-

E-mail: ncb@brunet.bn

Mrs. Wasulhana Binti Haji Sudin

Assistant Narcotics Officer II

Narcotics Control Bureau (NCB)

JalanTungku, Gadong, BE 0, Brunei Darussalam Tel:

(+6-3) 44-

Fax: (+6-3) 45-

E-mail: ncb@brunet.bn

China

Mr. Gao Wei

Deputy Director, Preventive Education Division National Narcotics Control Commission (NNCC)

4, Dong Chang An Street, Beijing 004, PR China Tel: (+6-0) 666-35,666-4

Fax: (+6-0) 5-65

E-mail: onncc@public.bta.net.cn

Ms. Shen Yue

Oficial, International Cooperation Division

China National Narcotics Control Commission (NNCC)

4 Dong Chang An Street, Beijing, China

Tel: (+6-0) 666-4 Fax: (+6-0) 5-65

E-mail: verashenyue@vip.sina.com

Indonesia

Ms. Sri Haryati
Head, Office of Intervention and Information
National Narcotics Board
StafBag. Kerma Set Lakhar BNN
[JL. MT. Haryono No.Cawang](#)
Jakarta Timur, Indonesia
Tel: (+6-) 0566,056
Fax: (+6-) 055,059

Ms. Paulina G. Padmo Hoedojo
Demand Reduction Specialist
BNN, Indonesia
Tel: +6--35-903
[E-mail: padmo-h@dify.com](mailto:padmo-h@dify.com)

Ms. Ni NengahYustinaTutuanita
Campaigner (Non-school Campaign Supervisor)
Yayasan Cinta Anak Bangsa (YCAB)
JL. Surya Mandala I, No D,
SunriseGarden, Kedoya Utara, Jakarta Barat, 50 Indonesia Tel:
(+6-) 535-5000, Fax: (+6-) 535-500
[E-mail: yustina@ycab.org](mailto:yustina@ycab.org)

Malaysia

Mr. Sasidharan Narayanan, Principal Assistant Director
5th Fl., National Anti-Drugs Agency (ADK)
Ministry of Internal Security
Level 6, Block D
Federal Gov. Administrative Centre
650, Putrajaya, Malaysia
Tel: +603-949-4, [E-mail: sasi@adk.gov.my](mailto:sasi@adk.gov.my)

Ms. Rohaidah bte Sharif
Assistant of Principal Assistant Director
Library, National Anti-Drugs Agency (ADK)
Ministry of Internal Security
Level 6, Block D
Federal Gov. Administrative Centre
650, Putrajaya, Malaysia
Tel: +603-949-45, E-mail: [<rohaida@adk.gov.my>](mailto:rohaida@adk.gov.my)

Mr. G. Sukumaran
Director, National Anti-Drugs Agency, Stateof Johore
Mobile: 0-0-05, [E-mail: sukumaran@adknj.gov.my](mailto:sukumaran@adknj.gov.my)

Mr. Oei Shuen Yi (John-Hans)
Pioneer Member
Growing Emerging Leaders (G.E.L)
Mobile: (+60-) 69-94, [E-mail: hans_o_e_i@hotmail.com](mailto:hans_o_e_i@hotmail.com)

Ms. Elmariah Chung
Assistant Director
National Anti-Drugs Agency
Federal Territory, Kuala Lumpur
Tel: +60-3-693-504

Philippines

Ms. Luningning H. Gotera
Officer-in-Charge
Administrative and Financial Division
Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB)
3rd Floor, PDEA Bldg., NIA Northsite Road
National Government Center, Brgy. Pinyahan
Quezon City, Philippines
Tel: (+63-) 99-6405
Fax: (+63-) 99-6405
E-mail: ning05@yahoo.com

Asec. Ma. Belen V. Matibag
Deputy Executive Director for Operations
Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB)
3rd Floor, DDB-PDEA Bldg., NIA Northsite Road
National Government Center, East Triangle
Quezon City, Philippines
Tel: (+63-) 99-53
Fax: (+63-) 99-663
[E-mail: lhengmatibag@yahoo.com](mailto:lhengmatibag@yahoo.com)

Ms. Teresita Pineda
Health Education and Promotion Officer 3
Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB)
Quezon City, Philippines
Tel: 63--99-6639
[E-mail: tesspineda06@yahoo.com.ph](mailto:tesspineda06@yahoo.com.ph)

Mr. Mark Ybanez Gabumpa
VP-Luzon
Centennial Force Foundation, Inc.
56-B Pao St., Sta Mesa Heights
Quezon City, Metro Manila, Philippines
Tel: (+63-)4-650
Fax: (+63-) 4-550
Mobile: (+63-) 09-44-
[E-mail: centennialforce_luzon@yahoo.com](mailto:centennialforce_luzon@yahoo.com)

Ms. Lalaine F.Divina
Administrative Aide III
Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB)
3rd Floor, PDEA Bldg., NIA Northsite Road
National Government Center, Brgy. Pinyahan
Quezon City, Philippines
Tel: (+63-) 99-663
Fax: (+63-) 99-66-3
[E-mail: tingtingdivina@yahoo.com](mailto:tingtingdivina@yahoo.com)

Ms. Kristine Ballad
Public Relations Officer
Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB)
3rd Floor, DDB-PDEA Bldg., NIA Northsite Road
National Government Center, East Triangle
Quezon City, Philippines
Tel: (+63-) 99-53
Fax: (+63-) 99-663
[E-mail: kristineinskort@yahoo.com](mailto:kristineinskort@yahoo.com)

Singapore

Ms. SeiYueTheng
Head, Preventive Education Unit (PEU)
Central Narcotics Bureau
393 New Bridge Rd.,
063 Singapore
Tel : (+65) 635-6643
Fax: (+65) 6-4
[E-mail: SEI Yue Theng@cnb.gov.sg](mailto:SEI_Yue_Theng@cnb.gov.sg)

Ms. Hannah Wong
Deputy Head, Preventive Education Unit (PEU)
Central Narcotics Bureau
393 New Bridge Rd.,
063 Singapore Tel :
(+65) 635-669 Fax: (+65)
6-4
[E-mail: Hannah_WONG@cnb.gov.sg](mailto:Hannah_WONG@cnb.gov.sg)

Mr. Ben Low Choon Kiat
Project Executive, Preventive Education Unit
Central Narcotics Bureau
393 New Bridge Rd., 063
Singapore Tel: (+65) 635
663 Fax: (+65) 64
[E-mail: Ben_LOW@cnb.gov.sg](mailto:Ben_LOW@cnb.gov.sg)

Mr. David Chew Tai Wai
Team Member, Enforcement Division
Central Narcotics Bureau
393 New Bridge Rd., 063
Singapore Tel: (+65) 635
6666 Fax: (+65) 64

[E-mail: CHEW_Tai_Wai@cnb.gov.sg](mailto:CHEW_Tai_Wai@cnb.gov.sg)

Thailand

Ms. Tanita Nakin
Director, Demand Reduction Bureau
Office of the Narcotics Control Board
5 Din Daeng Road, Phyathai
Bangkok 0400, Thailand
Tel: (+66-) 46-03, 45-9 Fax: (+66-) 45-9

Ms. Chuanpit Choomwattana
Director, Special Affairs Division
Demand Reduction Bureau
Office of the Narcotics Control Board 5
Din Daeng Road, Phyathai Bangkok
0400, Thailand

Tel: (+66-) 45-9 Fax: (+66-) 45-9

[E-mail: nchoomwa@yahoo.com](mailto:nchoomwa@yahoo.com)

Ms. Chotiros Utsahakit
Policy and Planning Analyst
Office of the Narcotics Control Board
5 Din Daeng Road, Phyathai
Bangkok 0400, Thailand
Tel: (+66-) 45-9354 Fax: (+66-) 45-9354

Mrs. Bang-orn Lamduanhom
Policy and Planning Analyst
Office of the Narcotics Control Board (ONCB) 5
din Daeng Rd., Phyathai
Bangkok 0400 Thailand
Tel: (+66-) 45-9354 Fax: (+66-) 45-9354 [E-mail:
bangorn@oncb.go.th](mailto:bangorn@oncb.go.th)

Mr. Phorphan Kridakorn Na Ayutaya
Public Relations Officer
Office of the Narcotics Control Board (ONCB) 5
din Daeng Rd., Phyathai
Bangkok 0400 Thailand
Tel: (+66-) 45-9354 Fax: (+66-) 45-9354 [E-mail:
phorphank@oncb.go.th](mailto:phorphank@oncb.go.th)

Viet Nam

Mr. Nguyen Duc Long
Int'l Cooperation & Project Management Division Official
Standing Office on Drug Control of Viet Nam
No.44,Tran Phu Street, Ba Dinh District
Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel: (+4-4) 34-0956
Mobile: (+4-9) 405599
Fax No: (+4-4) 34-0964
[E-mail: long_ngduc@yahoo.com](mailto:long_ngduc@yahoo.com), long.ngduc@gmail.com

Mr. Nguyen Cong Son
Director
Standing Office on Drug Control of Viet Nam (SODC)
No.44,Tran Phu Street, Ba Dinh District
Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel: (+4-4) 34-0965
Fax No: (+4-4) 34-0964

Mr.Ta Duc Ninh
Int'l Cooperation & Project Management Division
Deputy Chief of Division
Standing Office on Drug Control of Viet Nam
No.44,Tran Phu Street, Ba Dinh District
Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel: (+4-4) 34-0956
Mobile: (+4-9) 335539
Fax No: (+4-4) 34-0964
[E-mail: quocdatninh@yahoo.com.au](mailto:quocdatninh@yahoo.com.au)

Mr. Cao Hoang Long
Officer
Standing Office on Drug Control of Viet Nam
No.44,Tran Phu Street, Ba Dinh District Hanoi,
Viet Nam
Tel: (+4-4) 34-0965
Fax No: (+4-4) 34-0964
[E-mail: caohoang_long@yahoo.com](mailto:caohoang_long@yahoo.com)

Ms. Tran HuongThao
Expert
Educational Centre for Population,
Health and Environment
Viet Nam Youth Union
Ba Trieu Street, Ha Noi, Viet Nam
Tel: (+4-4) 943-493 Fax: (+4-4)
-330 E-mail:
tka00@gmail.com

UNODC HEADQUARTERS

Ms. Giovanna Campello
Programme Officer
Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit
UNODC Headquarters
UNODC Vienna International Centre
Vienna 400, Austria
Tel: (+43-) 6060-555
Fax: (+43-) 6060-566
[E-mail: giovanna.campello@unodc.org](mailto:giovanna.campello@unodc.org)

NOTE: E-mails were sent to National Focal Points and participants of the workshops and training conducted under G69 project from Cambodia, Myanmar and Thailand. However, no replies were received from these countries.

c. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

TALKING POINTS for the INTERVIEW PROCESS in the G69 PROJECT EVALUATION:

- . Prior to your participation in the G69 project, what is it in your country's, in general, or in your agency's situation, that needed to be improved? Was that area of need addressed or met by your agency's participation in this project?
- . How different or unique was the G69 project from the other projects that your agency was involved with in the past?
3. What were some of the communication strategies or approaches that were used or recommended in the G69 project that you found most useful in your own agency's public awareness campaigns? How did you apply these approaches to suit your target groups?
4. Were the information materials produced by the G69 project useful to your agency? Which ones did you find the most useful and why? Which ones will you continue to use?
5. How often were you able to make use of these information materials? Were you able to make use of these materials in their original form, or did you have to make some modifications? In what ways?
6. How would you assess the level or extent of collaboration and cooperation among the participating agencies in the G69 project? What were your agency's specific contributions in the implementation of the project? How did the contributions of the other participating agencies prove useful to your agency?
- . What cooperation mechanisms established by the G69 project should be sustained? In what ways do you think these mechanisms can be strengthened?
- . What were your expectations from the trainers/facilitators and from other participants during the workshop/training sessions conducted under the G69 project?
9. What interests, concerns and problems relevant to your agency were addressed at those workshops or trainings? Which ones of these workshops and trainings you found most relevant for your situation?
0. Given your position in your organization, what learning outcome/s from these workshop/training sessions was (were) most beneficial to your organization? Were you able to apply what you have learned? In what ways?
- . What was one obvious area of agreement among the participants of the workshop/training sessions (that has led to or could possibly lead to a greater collaboration or cooperation among them)?
- . What activity/ies or topic/s that was done or discussed at the workshop/training that made the workshop successful, from your perspective?
3. What other areas, in terms of knowledge and skills, that you realized you needed as a result of your participation in this workshop/training?