

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME  
Vienna

Independent project evaluation of the  
**Development of effective law enforcement responses to  
violence against women in the Southern Africa region**

XAST17

Southern Africa

Independent Evaluation Unit  
June 2012



UNITED NATIONS  
New York, 2012

This evaluation report was prepared by an independent evaluator, Mr. Pieter C Du Plessis, in cooperation with the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

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

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime  
Vienna International Centre  
P.O. Box 500  
1400 Vienna, Austria  
Telephone: (+43-1) 26060-0  
Email: [ieu@unodc.org](mailto:ieu@unodc.org)  
Website: [www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

#### 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.

© United Nations, Month Year. All rights reserved.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication has not been formally edited.

# CONTENTS

Acronyms.....	iv
Executive summary .....	v
Summary matrix of findings, evidence and recommendations.....	ix
I. Introduction.....	01
1. Background and context .....	01
2. Evaluation methodology.....	03
3. Limitations to the evaluation.....	05
II. Evaluation findings.....	07
1. Design.....	07
2. Relevance .....	08
3. Efficiency .....	11
4. Partnerships and cooperation.....	12
5. Effectiveness.....	13
6. Impact.....	16
7. Sustainability .....	16
III. Conclusions.....	19
IV. Recommendations.....	21
V. Lessons learned.....	23
<i>Annexes</i>	
I. Terms of reference of the evaluation .....	25
II. Desk review list .....	27
III. Evaluation tools: questionnaires and interview guides.....	29
IV. List of persons contacted during the evaluation.....	33
V. Results Achieved.....	35

# ACRONYMS

CLP'S	Core Learning Partners
NGO's	Non Governmental Organisations
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SARPPCO	Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Coordination
UN	United Nations
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNODC ROSAF	UNODC REGIONAL OFFICE FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA
US	United States
USD	United States Dollar

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Violence against women is rife in the Southern African region. The lack of services for survivors of gender-based violence and the lack of effective response by law enforcement officials in this regard, provide for a specific human security concern. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has developed a Handbook for Effective Police Responses to Violence against Women, which aims to furnish law enforcement officials with information that will enable them to recognize and identify key elements in defining violence against women, essential both in the prevention of violence and in their role in cases of violence reported by women. This project intervention was based on the content of the handbook.
2. UNODC Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSAF), in partnership with the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Secretariat and the Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organization (SARPCCO), implemented this regional project aimed at enhancing capacity of law enforcement officials in Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, as well as the Southern African region, to respond effectively to violence against women.
3. The XAS T17 – “Development of effective law enforcement responses to violence against women in the Southern Africa region” – project document was signed by SADC and SARPCCO during 2008 and Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe were identified during a selection process to benefit from the project.
4. The project objective was: “To enhance the capacity of law enforcement officials in six target countries of the Southern African region to respond effectively to violence against women is enhanced by 2010”.
5. The overall purpose of this evaluation is to assess whether the planned objective has been attained and if the project has been relevant, efficient, cost effective and sustainable. The evaluation also highlights best practices and lessons learned that could then serve as a basis for instituting improvements to further project planning, design, implementation and management.
6. The evaluation followed a systematic approach according to the following key steps:
  - a. Inception meeting with project team
  - b. Desk Review relevant project documents (see Annexure II)

- c. Questionnaire developed to guide the information gathering process. (See Annexure III)
  - d. Questionnaire distributed to Project Focal Points
  - e. Interviews undertaken with relevant stakeholders;
  - f. Information analyzed and draft report prepared;
  - g. Draft report shared for inputs from UNODC project team, SADC, SARPCCO and Core Learning Partners (CLPs) (see Annexure I);
  - h. Comments consolidated in Final Report and submitted.
7. The main findings can be summarized as follows:

In regards to design, targets and performance indicators are well defined in the project documents. The baseline study revealed that different countries are at different levels regarding addressing violence against women and children and therefore that a “one-size-fits-all” approach will not be effective and tailor-made solutions for each country should be developed. Infrastructural needs were highlighted in the base-line study that falls outside the scope of this project

Consultation during planning and design phase was done with SADC representatives and not with individual beneficiary countries and communication between SADC and member-states seems to be not effective. Therefore, specific needs of recipient countries were not planned for but a rather generic approach was followed. Project implementation was done in a participatory manner and effective partnerships were established on operational level.

Overall, the project objective, outcomes and inputs were relevant but did not fit into a comprehensive strategy per beneficiary country that will ensure other key components of such a strategy will be addressed through other means. Impact and effectiveness will therefore be limited. Additionally, although the managerial and institutional framework for implementation is well defined, ownership by executive and decision-making level of beneficiary countries was relative low and contributed towards delays in project implementation. The main reason for low level of ownership is related to lack of knowledge of the project.

Communication and coordination constraints experienced during implementation phase were slightly addressed with the establishment of focal points per recipient country

Overall, high level of value for money was experienced. Sufficient funds were available and on time to cover planned activities and the budget allocated have been spent accordingly. Moreover, the quality of inputs was of high standard. Despite delays in the project, overall project management, reporting and financial management practices were of high standard.

It is too soon after implementation to establish real impact, although a sound foundation was laid through the training interventions and key government departments understand the need for an integrated approach. Due to joint training events, different departments appreciate each other's roles, responsibilities, mandates and constraints. The potential for sustainability is rated as satisfactory mainly due to the train-the-trainer element of the project.

8. Lessons Learnt include:

- a. Project planning and design was done without participation of beneficiary countries. Although the project objectives were relevant, specific needs of recipient countries were not considered.
- b. Identification and appointment of focal points per recipient country enhanced coordination and flow of communication, but could be more effective if it was part of original design of project and if mandates, roles and responsibilities of focal point representatives were clearly defined.
- c. A clearly defined implementation strategy with implementation management structures per beneficiary country could be conducive for identifying support activities needed to ensure impact and effectiveness of inputs. It could also assist in coordinating activities to ensure comprehensive solutions were provided.

9. Best practices identified include:

- a. Joint training provided by UNODC ROSAF to representatives from different countries and different government departments provides better understanding of the roles responsibilities and interdependencies between different government institutions. It provides a platform for networking and improved coordination and cooperation between government officials from different departments. It highlighted the need for an integrated approach when dealing with violence against women and children
- b. Although effective communication remains a problem, the establishment of focal points per recipient country provides a central point for coordination purposes. If these focal points can be fully mandated and capacity can be developed at these focal points, they can be a very useful structure for coordination and implementation purposes even after the lifespan of this project.

## **10. Recommendations**

Specific recommendations are made for different target groups, namely the UNODC, recipient countries and the Development Partners.

### **10.1 Recommendations for UNODC**

- a. Future planning and design activities should follow a participatory process that include consultation with executive level representatives from the recipient countries to ensure buy-in and ownerships, but also to ensure needs of recipient countries are well addressed during programme design.
- b. Design of future projects should address project implementation to ensure project management and coordination at all levels are clearly defined and clarified with recipient countries before start of project implementation.
- c. A follow-up project is recommended to ensure comprehensive strategies are developed per recipient country to deal with violence against women. .

#### **10.2.1 Recommendations for Recipient Countries**

- a. Recipient countries take ownership to develop comprehensive implementation strategies based on the foundation that was laid and lessons learnt through this project.
- b. The functioning of the focal points should be reviewed with an aim to build capacity for coordinating activities, as well as managing implementation within relevant line departments. It will require high-level representation with decision-making authority within these project management structures.

#### **10.3 Recommendations for Development Partners:**

- a. Future financial support is critical to ensure other critical components of a comprehensive strategy to address violence against women and children is addressed. Training on its own will not be sufficient to make real impact.

# SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<b>Findings: problems and issues identified</b>	<b>Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Project planning and design was done with participation from regional bodies such as SADC and SARPCCO but not with representatives from individual countries. Therefore specific needs of recipient countries were not planned for but a generic approach was followed	Interviews	It is recommended that planning and design of new projects should make provision for inputs from all recipient countries to ensure buy-in and to accommodate individual needs
Infrastructural needs are critical but not being addressed and falls outside the scope of this project	Baseline study	Critical elements needed to address all components of a strategy to address violence against women and children, such as infrastructural needs should be covered through other initiatives. The recipient country should be responsible to manage these needs and coordinate this project with other complimentary projects. A follow-up project is recommended to ensure comprehensive strategies are developed per recipient country and systems and structures are established to ensure effective implementation
Different countries are at different levels regarding addressing violence against women and children.	Baseline study	A “one-size-fits-all” approach will not be effective and tailor-made solutions for each country should be

developed.

Project objective, outcomes and inputs were relevant but were developed in the absence of a comprehensive strategy per beneficiary country

Baseline study and interviews

Recipient country should develop comprehensive strategy to address violence against women and be responsible to coordinate inputs and contributions received through different projects. It is the recipient country's responsibility to ensure all critical components of the strategy is addressed (legislation, capacity, infrastructure, budget allocations, management structures, etc)

Although the managerial and institutional framework for implementation is well defined, ownership of beneficiaries was relatively low

Project documents, reports and interviews

Buy-in from executive level during planning and design and alignment with beneficiary countries needs and priorities are critical for ownership. Country representatives and coordinating structures should be fully mandated by the recipient country and communication channels and decision-making authorities should be defined before project implementation

Various delays were experienced during project implementation. Delays were caused mainly by cumbersome communication procedures to be followed through SADC structures; between SADC and recipient countries; decision-making process within recipient countries and development of the UNODC Handbook

Project reports and interviews

Some delays can be prevented with improved communication and when country representatives responsible for coordination are on senior level and are fully mandated

# I. INTRODUCTION

## 1. Background and context

Violence against women is rife in the Southern African region. The lack of services for survivors of gender-based violence and the lack of effective response by law enforcement officials in this regard, provide for a specific human security concern. UNODC has developed a Handbook for Effective Police Responses to Violence against Women, which aims to furnish law enforcement officials with information that will enable them to recognize and identify key elements in defining violence against women, essential both in the prevention of violence and in their role in cases of violence reported by women.

UNODC ROSAF, in partnership with SADC Secretariat and the SARPCCO, implemented this regional project aimed at enhancing capacity of law enforcement officials in Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, as well as the Southern African region, to respond effectively to violence against women. The project is primarily based on the UNODC Handbook for Effective Police Responses to Violence against Women (the UNODC Handbook) and its Training Curriculum on Effective Police Responses to Violence against Women (the Training Curriculum). The total budget for the project was US\$886,265 including support costs.

The project document was signed by SADC in May 2008 and by SARPCCO, which was the remaining counterpart, in August 2008. A meeting with all the counterparts (SADC, SARPCCO and UNODC) was held in September 2008, to plan the activities to be implemented in 2008 and select countries that are to benefit from the project. Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe were identified during a selection process to benefit from the project. The project logical framework defines the objective of the project as follows: “To enhance the capacity of law enforcement officials in six target countries of the Southern African region to respond effectively to violence against women is enhanced by 2010”.

This project directly supports Outcome 8 of the Thematic Programme: Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform by enhancing the capacity of law enforcement officials in Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, as well as in the Southern African region as a whole, to respond effectively to violence against women through specialized training based on the

UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum as well as through the development of effective police responses to violence against women.

The overall purpose of this evaluation is to assess whether the planned objectives have been attained and if the projects have been relevant, efficient, cost effective and sustainable. In addition, best practices and lessons learned were drawn from this evaluation that can then serve as a basis for instituting improvements to further project planning, design and management. Moreover, a Core Learning Partnership (CLP) is proposed to encourage a participatory evaluation process from the beginning to the end of the evaluation. The core learning partners and beneficiaries (beneficiaries represents a broader audience as it also includes justice officials) to the programme provided information and assistance to the evaluator. They also commented on key steps and key documents of the evaluation such as the draft evaluation report. The final evaluation is designed to be a project life span evaluation that should cover the project period of 3 years and 6 months (July 2008 to December 2011). The geographical coverage will be at the regional level and covers the SADC region with Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe identified as specific countries to focus implementation

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Key questions</i>
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Are objectives of the supported project in line with the policy priorities of the Government and UNODC mandate?</li><li>• Are the activities implemented under the project appropriate for achieving the stated objectives?</li><li>• How well do the activities implemented by the project reflect the specific problems and needs of the prisoners?</li><li>• Was the targeted prison population relevant to the project?</li></ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is there any behavioural change among the participants of the project's activities following the project implementation?</li><li>• Are there any policy changes with regard to human trafficking and smuggling of migrants</li><li>• Have any countries taken any steps forward in their implementation of UNCTOC and its supporting protocols?</li><li>• Has there been an effective roll out of material regarding Violence against Women and Children</li><li>• Have the trainers improved in their ability to train other law enforcement in the aspect of violence against women</li></ul>

---

---

Efficiency

- Has the allocated budget been spent accordingly?
- Is the project delivering on time as planned?
- Were funds available in project sufficient for project implementation?
- Has the appointed service provider (namely, Pieter Cronje) satisfied the expectations?

---

Sustainability

- Are UNODC supported interventions sustainable?
- Do the interventions have a potential for scaling up or replication?
- Have the beneficiaries taken ownership of the project objectives to implement them as a programme after UNODC funding?
- Is the Government supportive to continue with the programme?
- Can this particular programme become financially self-sustaining?

---

Partnership

- Is there effective coordination between UNODC and other implementing partners?

---

Lessons Learnt &  
Best Practices

- Are there any lessons learned from UNODC provided assistance?
  - Are there any key lessons that can provide a useful basis for strengthening UNODC support?
  - Are there any features to be considered as good practices at country level for learning and replication?
- 

## 2. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation followed a systematic approach according to the following key steps:

- a. Inception meeting with project team
- b. Desk Review relevant project documents (see Annexure II)

- c. Questionnaire developed to guide the information gathering process. (See Annexure III)
- d. Questionnaire distributed to Project Focal Points
- e. Interviews undertaken with relevant stakeholders;
- f. Information analyzed and draft report prepared;
- g. Draft report shared for inputs from UNODC project team, SADC, SARPCCO and Core Learning Partners (CLPs) (see Annexure I);
- h. Comments consolidated in Final Report and submitted.

The Inception Meeting was used to clarify (i), understanding of the Terms of Reference, (ii), expectations of the Project Team and (iii), agree on the methodology, timeframes, reporting during the evaluation and clarify logistical arrangements. It was agreed between the consultant and the Project Coordinator that no visits to beneficiary countries would be undertaken as all information needed could be obtained through electronic communication and telephonic interviews. The Inception Report was compiled and submitted at the end of week 1 of the evaluation.

The literature review phase was used to get a clear understanding of the programme intent, actual performance, and changes to original design during implementation and content of the programme. The literature study also provided sufficient information needed to finalize the questionnaire that was used to gather information from the beneficiaries.

The questionnaire was distributed electronically to beneficiary member states project focal points to gather individual responses. It was followed by a group discussion with contact persons during a Project Steering Committee.

The Terms of Reference identified relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability as the evaluation criteria. In addition to these evaluation criteria, the effectiveness of partnerships was assessed and lessons learnt and best practices were identified that can be considered for learning and replication. The table below outline the evaluator's understanding of the criteria used for this evaluation.

### **3. Limitations to the evaluation**

The slow start of the project did not allow enough time for impact to materialize. It was therefore not possible to measure impact of this programme and only potential impact could be commented on.

A limited number of persons were interviewed due to distance to various countries and limited timeframe. Questionnaires were sent via email but no response was received. Interviews were therefore limited to 9 representatives from the different beneficiary countries while attending a workshop in South Africa. Information obtained from project reports and interviews with members of the project team were used for cross-reference and correlation.



## II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

### 1. Design

The project was revised in December 2011 in order to extend the project until 31 March 2012 and compensate for the initial delays in project implementation which was mainly caused by the need for an extensive consultation process in the region, prior to implementation of certain project activities, as well as the delay in finalization of the UNODC Handbook and the Training Curriculum from UNODC-HQ.

There is a clear and logical consistency between the objectives, inputs, activities, outputs in terms of quality, quantity, time frame and cost-efficiency. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs are specified in the project documents and flexibility to address needs as they arise during implementation was addressed within the parameters of the project objectives. Some of the needs highlighted during the baseline study, such as infrastructure needs were not addressed as they fall outside the scope of this project. There are therefore still various needs that are critical and necessary to be addressed to ensure a comprehensive solution and it therefore stresses the need for an overall strategy.

Targets and concise performance indicators are clear and well specified in the Project Document. A project monitoring system has been set up, including a baseline survey, to allow a proper monitoring throughout the project.

Prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks) were not well specified and met. It therefore caused delays during implementation. These delays, to some extent, had implications on the project design, as a single approach as defined in the original project documents, was not feasible and the two phases could not be implemented in sequence, but phase II was implemented in parallel with phase I.

The managerial and institutional framework for implementation is well defined. Ownership of beneficiaries however has a negative impact on project implementation and lead to slow responses. In any case, all external institutional relationships were correctly identified and efforts were made to manage partnerships. The partners and beneficiaries are well identified in the project document. UNODC ROSAF, in partnership with the SADC Secretariat and the SARPCCO, is implementing this regional project. Further, project design was done in consultation with SARPCCO and SADC on behalf of the beneficiaries. Beneficiaries were only informed about the project content after it was designed and approved through UNODC internal processes. The planning and design phase therefore missed out on the opportunity to ensure buy-in and ownership from recipient countries. It therefore did not take in consideration all needs of the beneficiaries and the design was not meant to provide a comprehensive solution. The components included in the project design were relevant, but need to be supported by additional components (such as infrastructure; integrated management approach to ensure active participation of supporting environments such as social development, healthcare, NGO's and Justice departments; referral services for treatment and places of safety, etc.) to provide an effective and comprehensive solution. An overall strategy per recipient country to address violence against women and children could ensure coordination between different components that may even be implemented through different projects and with different development partners. One of the components of such a comprehensive strategy can be to develop a one-stop service model to cater for the health, welfare, safety and justice needs of victims.

The work plan is practical, logical and cohesive. Project implementation in term of the Revised Costed Work and Monitoring Plan (following the Project Revision in October 2010), is on schedule and it is anticipated that activities planned for 2012 will be completed as planned and indicated. The planned project duration was realistic but due to delays during implementation phase, a time extension was requested to ensure all activities would be implemented.

## **2. Relevance**

The project XAST17 is aligned with the national plans and strategies of governments concerning Violence against women. It supports the mandate and functions of the governments to coordinate and strengthen the integration of services related to violence against woman activities and are in support of the legislation on Violence against women in the relevant governments. The project is the appropriate solution to the problems it aims to address, as the main objective of the project is relevant

to the current situation regarding Violence against women. It is a fairly new concept for these governments where legislation is still under consideration. The objectives of this project firmly contributing towards capacity development and creating better understanding of the concepts of Violence against women.

It also highlighted the need for coordination and cooperation between different government agencies in addressing issues related to Violence against women and through activities of this project already builds relationships, initiate innovative thinking amongst participants to address challenges and strengthen cooperation beyond key stakeholders. The project was designed by UNODC, in consultation with SARPCCO and SADC, but without participation of the beneficiary countries and institutions, SARPCCO and SADC could provide inputs from regional perspective, but could not provide detail information, needs and priorities per recipient country and consultation with these regional structures does not contribute towards ownership of recipient countries. Direct consultation with senior level representatives from the recipient countries could ensure closer alignment with plans, strategies and priorities and could also influence future planning and strategies.

Implementation was done in a participative manner, although level of representation from the recipient countries was not on senior level. Representatives were not fully mandated and did not have decision-making authority. This caused some delays during implementation. The project mainly focused on training and it was based on international experience and knowledge of the Southern African region rather than addressing well-defined existing needs of the beneficiaries and counterparts

Other actors providing similar type of assistance include the Institute for Security Studies (ISS) that assists SARPCCO in updating the existing SARPCCO Handbook on Policing Violence against Women and Children and hosted a regional workshop based on the handbook during 2011. UNODC ROSAF engaged with SARPCCO and ISS as well as the country focal points to ensure alignment with this project. UNODC ROSAF also consulted with SARPCCO and the SADC Secretariat in order to align the different processes and prevent duplication

It was resolved that the revised SARPCCO Manual on Policing Violence Against Women and

Children would be used as supplementary reference material during the training workshops. Further, project activities and regional interaction have also highlighted the need for expansion of the training curriculum, training material and training modules to include prosecutors so as to strengthen the criminal justice response from both a prosecutorial and law enforcement perspective. Bilateral interaction with beneficiary countries, the SADC Secretariat and SARPCCO, have highlighted the need to continue with training and distribution of the UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum to the entire SADC region (including countries not yet covered under the project). There is also a need to address specific country requirements, as well as to harmonize policy and criminal justice (including law enforcement) responses to violence against women and children in the region. A specific need that was raised during the interviews with beneficiary countries was the urgent need to include training of commanders to ensure they share the same vision and understanding as the subordinates to be able to provide support and guidance. Printing and distribution of the UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum within the region together with completion of the regional train-the-trainer training workshop and the development and production of project awareness material, have contributed greatly towards the achievement of the overall objective and address the needs of violence against women.

The activities implemented under the project were appropriate for achieving the stated objectives. The regional needs assessment that was conducted during 2009 and completed in January 2010, served as a baseline study, and continues to guide the formulation and implementation of various activities. For example, the needs assessment was used to develop the regional training module and workshops and guide the six national training workshops presented in 2011. As can be expected, the scope of this project was very specific and could therefore not cover all needs expressed in the baseline study.

### **3. Efficiency**

Sufficient project costs were available and therefore did not cause any delays. The 2011 Revised Costed Work and Monitoring Plan reflected a total project budget of USD 886,200.00. Total disbursement according to UNODC Management Expenditure Reporting by 31 December 2011 was USD 580,000.00 including project support costs. Certified financial reporting is provided by the UNODC Financial Resource Management Service and is available in ProFi. Project implementation in terms of the Revised Costed Work and Monitoring Plan (following the Project Revision in December 2011), is on schedule and it is anticipated that activities planned for 2012 will be completed as planned and indicated. A revision of the original project plan was needed to provide for an extension up until December 2011 and to adapt the regional training module into contextualized national training modules and subsequently organize one regional as well as six national workshops. The extension was necessary due to a delay in project implementation that was mainly caused by the delay in finalization of the UNODC Handbook for Effective Police Responses to Violence against Women (the UNODC Handbook) and its Training Curriculum. The revision furthermore provides for an increase in the Overall Budget in order to cover currency exchange gains. The new available budget is USD 886,200, an increase of USD 35,649. The project is fully funded.

The budget has been spent according to project document. Further, overall good value for money was achieved and project's progress has been made at an acceptable cost. The UNODC could provide more value for money than other possible approaches and more progress could be made with the same input due to the fact that resources of the UNODC system was available for the project.

Appointed service providers satisfied the expectations and overall recipients are satisfied with the quality of services provided; e.g recipient countries experienced high quality of services during implementation of activities. The project management arrangements put in place performed well and also make up for some of the constraints experienced by the SADC internal processes and procedures. UNODC followed their internal financial and procurement procedures during project implementation and it proved to be highly efficient and effective. Delays experienced during project implementation were not due to these procedures but rather SADC internal procedures and communication protocol with member states. Overall, the quality and timeliness of the monitoring, administrative and

financial support provided by ROSAF and UNODC Headquarters were very satisfactory and did not contribute towards any unreasonable delays.

#### **4. Partnerships and cooperation**

The project was implemented in a consultative/participatory manner between UNODC, SADC and SARPCCO. The focal points that were successfully established per beneficiary country strengthened the consultative approach and provide a more effective mechanism to consult with beneficiaries than through the SADC mechanism. Further, the UNODC maintained an effective relationship with International Development Partners, in particular with Austria and United States of America who were the funders of this project.

Two coordinating mechanisms were established to support implementation of this project, namely the coordination mechanisms between UNODC, SADC and SARPCCO; and the Project Steering Committee. Both these structures were highly effective in their purpose. Proactive discussions and exchanges of experience have been created through the coordinating mechanisms to improve effectiveness and efficiency of this project. The establishment of focal points in beneficiary countries proof as example of such proactive discussions and experience.

The partnership between the UNODC and the beneficiary countries was not an equal partnership, but more of a provider of support – receiver of support relationship. Beneficiaries have no decision-making authority about project content. Recipient countries were not represented on high level at the steering committee. Representatives from beneficiary countries were at a relative junior level with limited mandates. The UNODC has the comparative advantage that it brings a wealth of experience, international best practices and resources to the project through its network and international offices. It includes high quality training material, booklets and information literature that were distributed and international experience in the project subject. It has the capacity to act as project management unit but also bring highly skilled technical support. Because of its nature as an international body with international resource base, the UNODC provide much more than just a project management unit and therefore provide more value for money than any other project management unit can offer.

## **5. Effectiveness**

A regional needs assessment report was finalized in January 2010, reflecting the regional and national training needs in the six beneficiary Member States. This formed the basis for planning and scheduling the training interventions. Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe were identified to benefit from the project. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) was established in November 2008. In an effort to improve coordination and communication, national focal points were established for each of the Member States.

Successful establishment of focal points from the six identified countries in the region has ensured commitment on behalf of the national law enforcement authorities from the respective countries and contributes towards sustainability of the capacity building to be undertaken. The focal points provide a single entry point of project activities in respective recipient countries and were responsible for coordinating activities related to the project per beneficiary country.

Regional and national training modules were developed and presented during regional and national workshops. Awareness-raising material was developed for regional and national training workshops and contextualized national resource materials were developed for each of the beneficiary Member States. National training workshops (5 days) were conducted in each of the beneficiary countries. A 5-day national inter-departmental training workshop was conducted in 2011 with representatives from law enforcement, social services and prosecutors. A 6-day regional train-the-trainer training workshop was conducted during November and December 2010. 18 law enforcement officers from Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe as well as 3 officials from SADC and SARPCCO were trained. This activity forms part of the sustainability planning of the project. 1000 copies of the English version of the UNODC Handbook and the Training Curriculum were printed in October 2010 and 110 copies of each were distributed to Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. The UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum were also translated into Portuguese. Copies of the Handbook were also distributed to SARPCCO.

To ensure linkages with other initiatives, representatives from this project participated in a Workshop on Police Training on Violence against Women on 20 November 2010 in Cape Town as part of the South African "One Stop Centres", initiative. (UNODC Mitchell's Plain Care Centre (ZAF/S56)) . 50 copies each of the English version of the UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum was

distributed to the South African Police Service in the Western Cape. Moreover, through this project, support and copies of the UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum were provided to UNODC Vryburg One Stop Centre (ZAF/S15) Workshop on Police Training on Violence against Women.

Project implementation had a slow start mainly due to the following reasons:

- The project document was signed by SADC in May 2008 and by SARPCCO, which was the remaining counterpart, in August 2008 (three months later).
- The PSC was established in November 2008 and the first meeting was held on 25 November 2008.
- A consultant was recruited to undertake the needs assessment in the six selected countries that should guide implementation of future project activities. The report was only available by the end of February 2009. There were some delays in obtaining the necessary signatures of counterparts, which again affected the commencement of the project.
- As the project was initially conceived based on the envisaged UNODC Handbook for Effective Police Responses to Violence against Women. The final version of the Handbook and curriculum was received from UNODC Vienna in January 2010, when it was amended and adapted in order to meet the specific needs of the SADC region. The delay in finalization of this training material by UNODC Vienna impacted negatively on the implementation and achievement of Output 2 and Output 3 causing a delay in overall project implementation.
- Other factors that delay implementation have to do with communication between the different implementing structures and beneficiary countries.
- Initially, constraints in establishing communication with beneficiary countries were experienced, as most of the countries did not have a dedicated focal point or lead department.
- The SADC working mechanism also caused delays with project implementation as project activities often require a lengthy consultation process in line with the working arrangements between the SADC Secretariat and its Member States, but also in relation to aligning unilateral and bilateral actions within each of the respective beneficiary countries regarding counter-trafficking in persons activities within the scope of the project and beyond

The managerial and institutional framework for implementation is well defined. The PSC was established in November 2008 and comprised of representatives from the UNODC, SADC,

SARPCCO and focal points. The PSC adopted terms of reference concerning its work; agreed on the responsibilities of the focal points in subsequent project activities; and put in place a review mechanism for project implementation. The PSC discussed the work plans, details of the project activities and provide strategic direction and meetings have been held in March 2009, October 2010, and March 2011. The PSC monitors project implementation by means of comprehensive status and progress reports that were discussed during PSC meetings.

UNODC ROSAF, the SADC Secretariat and the SARPCCO Secretariat together with the Project Steering Committee (PSC) met formally at least once a year and maintained regular formal email and telephonic contact in order to ensure effective strategic planning and project activity implementation. Stakeholders also occasionally meet informally in the margins of other joint activities and training workshops in order to maintain effective communication and joint planning. UNODC ROSAF has established a sound and strategic working relationship with both the SADC Secretariat and the SARPCCO Secretariat jointly and individually.

UNODC ROSAF has been submitting narrative and financial reports to the donors and has also submitted monthly management expenditure reports, quarterly reports as well as semi-annual and annual project progress reports to UNODC HQ. A need was expressed by some focal point representatives to have reporting per country that will make it easier for the recipient countries to have clear targets and objectives within which to manage implementation. This was echoed by a need expressed by the recipient countries that reporting to the respective recipient countries on their individual performance and progress would have been appreciated. Such reporting could assist respective countries to manage implementation in each of the countries more effectively. Such reporting could also provide some guidance to respective countries regarding steps to improve implementation

Overall, the project achieved reasonable results under the specific circumstances. For detailed overview of results achieved, please see Annexure III. Detailed results achieved against Outputs are covered in Annexure V.

## **6. Impact**

Due to delays, there has not been sufficient time that has elapsed to allow for real evidence of impact to surface. Further, the project design did not make provision for activities or funding to measure impact of the project. There is also no obligation on recipient countries to conduct impact assessments a few months after the final date of implementation. It could be useful during project design phase to plan for impact assessment tools that could allow recipients to measure impact at a later stage.

The training activities however, have improved understanding about violence against women and children and highlighted the need for an integrated approach between different government departments to address issues related to the topic. Joint training interventions allowed for discussion between representatives from different departments and create a better understanding of each other's roles, responsibilities, mandates and constraints. The training of trainers provides the capacity for rollout of training material. Training will contribute towards changes in attitudes and behaviour and will have longer-term impact. Capacity of trainers to train other law enforcement personnel has improved. A limited number of law enforcement officers have been reached with this project per recipient country, but through continuous training a larger number of law enforcement officers in the region will benefit from this project.

Many other supporting elements for a comprehensive approach to address violence against women are still missing, such as lack of overall strategy per country, integrated approach and management mechanisms, infrastructure, capacity of supervisors and senior officials, but this project at least provide some momentum.

## **7. Sustainability**

The issue of sustainability was considered during project design and during implementation phase as was proved by the capacity building components, training of trainers, together with placement of ownership of interventions with respective governments. Establishment of focal points in respective beneficiary countries and building their capacity enhance to potential for sustainability.

The training interventions have the potential for scaling up or replication in other countries in the region and can be financially sustainable. Additional funding however will be needed to put training into practice. It will require a comprehensive approach and support on a much broader scale to cover all elements require for implementation of a full-scale strategy to address violence against women and children. The training component however provides a solid platform to raise awareness and understanding.

The recipient countries have taken ownership to continue with training interventions, but additional elements (such as infrastructural, equipment and resources) are still outstanding. The training can therefore be sustained, but in the absence of the supporting activities, real impact and effectiveness will be low. The general impression that was created during the interviews was that beneficiary Governments are supportive to continue, but a huge concern was raised about funding needed to implement a comprehensive strategy and approach.



### III. CONCLUSIONS

In general, the project was successful in achieving its objectives and planned activities were implemented. It is a bit early for the project to proof real impact, but activities implemented through this project go a long way in building a foundation from where strategies can be developed to address violence against women in a more effective manner.

The overall impression is that the project design was relevant, although specific needs of recipient countries were not included in the original planning and design of the project. A participatory process during project planning and design phase could have a positive impact on project scope, outcomes and outputs. All countries involved in the project were not on the same level regarding implementation of strategies to address violence against women and children, but through the project valuable lessons were shared amongst SADC member states.

Communication and coordination caused massive delays that could be addressed in some way during project planning and design phase. Although there was considerable delays during phase I of this project, overall project delivery was very acceptable. A time extension was requested that allows implementation of activities to take effect. Beneficiaries rated the quality of the inputs very high and the UNODC as implementing structure provided good value for money and were able to provide additional support and expertise based on their international experience and capacity.

Training and training-of-trainer interventions developed capacity that provide clear indications that activities will be sustainable after the lifespan of this project and training material can be rolled out to a broader audience.

The project was implemented in such a way that partnerships with development institutions were established and the focus was very strong on improvement of coordination and cooperation amongst different government departments in the respective beneficiary countries.

A solid foundation was laid for development of capacity in the SADC region to deal with crimes against women and other vulnerable groups such as children. It is up to the respective recipient countries to develop comprehensive strategies to deal with these crimes in a consistent manner and provide the necessary support to the vulnerable groups. Some member-states such as South Africa has well developed models to deal with violence against women that brings together government institutions from the Justice and Social sectors, NGO's and civil society groups, Regional bodies

such as SARPCCO and SADC are well positioned to provide the platform for exchange of best practices, joint training on regional level, development of integrated approach and models to deal with violence against women.

## IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. Recommendations for UNODC

It is recommended that:

- a. Future planning and design activities should make provision for sufficient consultation with executive level of key government institutions and departments of the recipient countries to ensure ownership, buy-in and to accommodate of specific needs of recipient countries.
- b. Design of future projects should address project implementation to ensure project management and coordination at all levels are clearly defined and clarified with recipient countries before start of project implementation.
- c. A follow-up project is recommended to ensure a comprehensive strategy, systems and structures are in place and established to effectively address violence against women and children. It is recommended that implementation strategies, procedures and management structures per country receive special attention. Infrastructural needs will be a critical component of such a strategy to make provision for places of safety and supporting services.

### 2. Recommendations for recipient countries

It is recommended that:

- a. Recipient countries take ownership to develop comprehensive implementation strategies based on the foundation that was laid through this project. Such a strategy should provide the vehicle for coordination to ensure the supporting environment is in place to implement a comprehensive solution. It will require interdepartmental management mechanisms to strengthen an integrated approach and clustering of government departments responsible to provide services related to violence against women and children.
- b. The functioning of the focal points should be reviewed with an aim to build capacity for coordinating activities, as well as managing implementation within relevant line departments. It will require high-level representation with decision-making authority.

### 3. Recommendations for Development Partners:

- a. Future financial support is critical to ensure other critical components of a comprehensive strategy to address violence against women and children is addressed. Training on its own will not be sufficient to make real impact.

## V. LESSONS LEARNED

### 1. Planning and Design

- a. Project planning and design was done without participation of beneficiary countries. The project was designed in the absence of a well-defined, comprehensive strategy on regional and also within the respective recipient countries. Although the project objectives were relevant, specific needs of recipient countries were not considered and when evaluate on the basis of impact, effectiveness and efficiency per country there are be gaps that will not be addressed by other supporting environments. It might be constructive in future if recipient countries are involved during planning and design phase to factor in other critical components of a comprehensive solution and how it will be coordinated and managed as part of a broader strategy per country and also to address regional needs.

### 2. Implementation

- a. Identification and appointment of focal points per recipient country can be regarded as a best practice to enhance coordination and flow of communication. The lesson learnt from this experience was that it would however be even more effective if focal point representatives receive a clear mandate and authority from the respective recipient countries with a clearly defined job description, to ensure roles and responsibilities are clear and conducive for coordination as well as implementation of activities.
- b. The focus of this project was on training and did not address other key elements such as infrastructure needs, strategy development and development of integrated management capacity. A clearly defined implementation strategy with implementation management structures per beneficiary country could be conducive for identifying support activities needed to ensure impact and effectiveness of inputs. It could also assist in coordinating activities to ensure comprehensive solutions were provided. In absence of such a strategy per country, activities may seem to be ad hoc and create some doubt about real impact, sustainability and effectiveness.

### 3. Best practices

- a. Joint training was provided to representatives from different countries and different government departments. This joint training provides better understanding of the roles responsibilities and interdependencies between different government institutions. It provides a platform for

networking and improved coordination and cooperation between government officials from different departments. Participation by representatives from different countries provides a better understanding of regional needs and priorities and provide a platform for regional networking between officials and sharing of ideas, best practices and lessons learnt.

- b. Establishment of focal points per recipient country improves communication and provides a central point for coordination purposes. Capacity developed at these focal points can be useful for coordination and implementation purposes even after the lifespan of this project. It might be even more effective if it can be incorporated as part of a comprehensive strategy implementation management structures to address organized crime per country.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE



## ANNEX II. DESK REVIEW LIST

- Annual Report 2008
- Annual Report 2009
- Annual Report 2010
- Annual Report 2011
- Project Revision 2010 and 2011
- Baseline assessment – Determining Training Needs in six countries
- Terms Of Reference
- Training Workshop Reports
- Steering Committee meeting minutes



## ANNEX III. EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

**Evaluation questions from the Terms of Reference were used as basis for developing this questionnaire. Additional questions were added based on the document review and initial interview with Project Team**

### **Evaluability of project:**

- Has a project monitoring system been set up, including a baseline survey, to allow a proper monitoring throughout the project?
- Are targets well specified in the Project Document, including clear and concise performance indicators?
- Is there a clear and logical consistency between the objectives, inputs, activities, outputs in terms of quality, quantity, time-frame and cost-efficiency?
- Are the partners and beneficiaries well identified in the project document?
- Are prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks) well-specified and met?
- Is the managerial and institutional framework for implementation well defined?
- Is the work plan practical, logical and cohesive?
- Is the planned project duration realistic?
- Are all external institutional relationships correctly identified?

### **Relevance**

- To what extent is XAST17 and XASS69 aligned with the relevant national plans and strategies of governments
- Which are the differences? Why?
- Is the project the appropriate solution to the problems it aims to address?
- Was the project designed in a participatory manner?
- Is the project aligned with the priority needs of the beneficiaries/counterparts ?
- Taking evolution of the context over time, to what extend did the project adapt to these changes?
- Are there any other actors providing a similar type of technical assistance in the country, targeting the same stakeholders?
- Are objectives of the supported project in line with the policy priorities of the Government and UNODC mandate?
- Are the activities implemented under the project appropriate for achieving the stated objectives?
- What is the particular added value of the project in comparison to ongoing projects being implemented in the country and/or the region by other actors?
- Would it be valuable to replicate best practices and lessons learned from the project, to future or ongoing projects with the UNODC or other actors, with or without modifications, and if so how?

### **Sustainability**

- Are UNODC supported interventions sustainable? Do the interventions have a potential for scaling up or replication?

- Have the beneficiaries taken ownership of the project objectives to implement them as a programme after UNODC funding?
- Is the Government supportive to continue with the programme?
- Can this particular programme become financially self-sustaining?
- To which extent have issues of sustainability been considered and incorporated into the project outline and activities?
- Extent of handover of project deliverables, and more importantly actual transfer of knowledge and ownership (specific institutions to be mentioned)
- What measures were put in place to ensure sustainability?

### **Efficiency**

- Were sufficient funds available compared with planned activities?
- Has the budget that has been allocated spent accordingly?
- Is the project delivering on time as planned?
- Is the cost sufficient for project implementation?
- Has the appointed service provider satisfied the expectations?
- To what extent have project counterparts fulfilled the obligations/responsibilities agreed upon in providing support towards the implementation of the project?
- Which challenges have project counterparts experienced, that has prevented them from fulfilling their obligations/responsibilities to provide support to the project?
- Which measures have been taken during the planning and implementation of the project to ensure that resources are used efficiently?
- Is there a well-functioning and accountable project management and monitoring system in place?
- What is the quality and timeliness of the monitoring, administrative and financial support provided by ROSAF and UNODC Headquarters?
- What organizational and managerial arrangements were put in place and how well did they perform?
- Which procedures for procurement were followed? To what extent did the procedure allow for efficiency?
- Compared with alternative approaches that would accomplish the same development objectives, has the project's progress been made at an acceptable cost? Could more progress have been achieved with the same input? Could the same have been achieved with less input? Would alternative approaches accomplish the same results at a lower cost without sacrificing on quality?
- What measures have been taken during project planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used?

### **Effectiveness**

- What was the institutional set up and contractual agreements?
- Which were the coordination bodies involved and what were their roles?
- To what extent has the project achieved the stated objectives?
- What are the success factors for achievement and non-achievement of the project's objectives?
- What are the major challenges and obstacles that the project encountered? Was the project able to cope with them or may they prevent the project from producing the intended results?
- Has the project achieved its foreseen objective and results (i.e. outputs, outcomes and impact)? If not, which progress had been made towards these achievements?
- What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of the project objective?

- To what extent could the management and implementing agencies overcome the challenges of the project? How?
- Has the project been implemented with sufficient cooperation and dialogue with other UNODC projects, so as to effectively complement these efforts?
- What are the major challenges, opportunities and obstacles encountered by the project as a whole?
- Has the project achieved its foreseen objectives and results (outputs, outcomes, and impact)? If not, has some progress been made towards their achievement?
- What are the success factors for the achievement or reasons for non-achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent is the progress made so far the result of the project's intervention rather than of external factors or other actors?

### **Impact**

- Is there any behavioural change among the participants of the project's activities following the project implementation?
- Are there any policy changes with regard to human trafficking and smuggling of migrants
- Have any countries taken any steps forward in their implementation of UNCTOC and its supporting protocols?
- Has there been an effective roll out of material regarding Violence against Women and Children
- Have the trainers improved in their ability to train other law enforcement in the aspect of violence against women
- The extent to which the benefits received by the target beneficiaries had a wider overall effect on larger numbers of people in the region.
- What is the general quality of the project outputs to date?
- What difference has the project's intervention made to the operations of the relevant Government agencies and departments?
- Based on the views of stakeholders and actors involved, to what extent has the project had intended and/or unintended impact, whether negatively or positively?
- To what extent have external factors beyond the control of the project affected its implementation, whether negatively or positively?
- Has the project pursued the possibility of assessing impact? Which provisions were made, or could have been made, at the planning and implementation stage to assess impact?

### **Partnership and Cooperation**

- How consultative / participatory was the project implementation conducted?
- Have coordination mechanisms between UNODC and other relevant development entities to the project been successfully established?
- Which lessons can be drawn from the coordination efforts and working arrangements between the project team, the relevant substantive offices at UNODC Headquarters as well as the project counterparts/beneficiaries?
- What are the comparative advantages of UNODC as a partnering organisation?
- To what extent was proactive discussions / exchanges of experience / communication streams been created?
- How was content of this project harmonized with related initiatives by other development partners?
- Where partnerships were established, was it relationships of equal partners?



## ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED DURING THE EVALUATION

• SADC	• Ms. Kakukuru Elizabeth Naukongo Programme Officer: Gender GENDER UNIT SADC SECRETARIAT
• SARPCCO	• Ms. Susan Chemurema Regional Specialised Officer
• Botswana	• Ms. Maloti Gabositwe • mgabositwe@gov.bw
• Namibia	• Ms. Lavinia Zimmer
• Lesotho	• Ms. Florence Morai
• Mozambique	• Mr. Joaquim Nhampoca
• South Africa	• Mr. Braam Korff
• Zimbabwe	• Ms. Isabella Sergio
• UNODC Pretoria	• Adv Johan Kruger



## ANNEX V. RESULTS ACHIEVED

Outcome	Achievements
<p><b>Outcome:</b></p> <p>Law enforcement officials use the acquired skills and knowledge in effectively responding to survivors of violence against women.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National training workshops in each of the beneficiary countries were conducted during which 20 - 25 participants per country were nominated to attend the training.</li> <li>• "Master trainers" were trained per recipient country during the regional train-the-trainer workshop. The national training workshops also provided for the opportunity to utilise these three individuals per country as co-facilitators so as to reinforce training and knowledge and to develop sustainable national capacity to replicate national training activities in the respective countries in future.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 1:</b></p> <p>Cooperative working relationship and a shared vision established between SADC, SARPCCO and UNODC in effectively responding to gender-based violence in the region by end 2008.</p>	<p>UNODC ROSAF, the SADC Secretariat and the SARPCCO Secretariat together with other members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) meet formally at least once a year and maintain regular formal email and telephonic contact in order to ensure effective strategic planning and project activity implementation.</p> <p>Stakeholders occasionally meet informally during other joint activities and training workshops in order to maintain effective communication and joint planning.</p> <p>UNODC ROSAF has established a sound and strategic working relationship with both the SADC Secretariat and the SARPCCO Secretariat jointly and individually.</p>
<p><b>Output 2:</b></p> <p>By the end of 2011 an intensive training and capacity building initiative to promote effective police responses to violence against</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5-day national training workshop hosted in Zimbabwe from 7 - 11 March 2011. 20 law enforcement officials were trained.</li> <li>• 5-day national training workshop hosted in Mozambique from 11- 15 April 2011. 19 law enforcement officials were trained.</li> <li>• 5-day national training workshop hosted in Namibia from 9 - 13 May 2011. 20 law enforcement officials were trained.</li> </ul>

<p>women has been developed and implemented in 6 countries in the SADC region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5-day national training workshop hosted in South Africa from 22 - 27 May 2011. 15 law enforcement officials were trained.</li> <li>• 5-day national training workshop hosted in Lesotho from 6 - 10 June 2011. 19 law enforcement officials were trained.</li> <li>• 5-day national training workshop hosted in Botswana from 20 - 25 June 2011. 20 law enforcement officials were trained.</li> <li>• 5-day national inter-departmental training workshop hosted in Mauritius from 5 – 9 December 2011. 25 law enforcement, social services and prosecutors were trained.</li> <li>• A further 30 UNODC Handbooks and Training Curriculums per country were distributed to co-facilitators, participants and training colleges during each of the national training workshops.</li> <li>• 50 copies each of the English version of the UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum was distributed to the UNODC One Stop Centre (ZAF/S15) Workshop on Police Training on Violence against Women</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 3:</b></p> <p>Training material, Handbook and related training experience have been disseminated and shared with experts at regional and international level and taken up in their work by end of 2011</p>	<p>The UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum were distributed to 5 of the 6 beneficiary countries (except Mozambique, due to translation requirements). The UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum were utilised as training material during 7 national training workshops. 30 copies of each document were disseminated to participants, co-facilitators and training facility libraries during the national training workshops.</p> <p>UNODC also presented and disseminated 22 copies each of the UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum to Member States during the SARPCCO Policing Violence against Women and Children Review Task Team</p> <p>Distribution of final material and training modules to beneficiary countries happened during March 2012 following the Experts Group Meeting to be held after completion of the 6 national awareness-raising events and activities.</p> <p>UNODC presented the UNODC Handbook and Training Curriculum and status of implementation, initiatives and experiences regarding this</p>

	<p>project to the following regional and international fora:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SADC Regional Policy Seminar on Gender, Peace and Security held in Johannesburg, South Africa March 2011.</li><li>• SARPCCO Policing Violence against Women and Children Review Task Team Meeting from held in Otse, Botswana</li><li>• SARPCCO Annual General Meeting of Chiefs of Police / SADC Chiefs of Police Sub-Committee of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Inter-state Defence and Security Committee held in Lusaka, Zambia</li><li>• ICPC Symposium on Policing and Violence Prevention hosted by the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC) held in Cape Town, South Africa</li></ul>
--	---