

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Regional Office for Southern Africa

Independent Mid-term project evaluation of the

Capacity building for Member States of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) in the ratification and the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its two first additional Protocols

XASS69

Southern African Region

Independent Evaluation Unit

August 2012



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2012

This evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of Pieter 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
Website: 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

	<i>Page</i>
Executive summary	iv
Summary matrix of findings, evidence and recommendations.....	ix
I. Introduction.....	1
1. Background and context	1
2. Evaluation methodology.....	5
3. Limitations to the evaluation.....	6
II. Evaluation findings.....	7
1. Design.....	7
2. Relevance	9
3. Efficiency	10
4. Partnerships and cooperation.....	12
5. Effectiveness.....	12
6. Impact.....	14
7. Sustainability	16
III. Conclusions.....	17
IV. Recommendations.....	19
V. Lessons learned.....	21
VI. Best Practices.....	23
<i>Annexes</i>	
I. Terms of reference of the evaluation	25
II. List of persons interviewed during the evaluation.....	37
III. Evaluation tools: questionnaire and interview guides	39
IV. Desk review list	43
V. Results Achieved	45

ACRONYMS

CLP'S	Core Learning Partners
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SARPCCO	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. There is growing awareness of the need for well-coordinated joint initiatives on human trafficking at the Southern African regional and sub-regional levels. In this context, comprehensive and harmonized legislation and policy is particularly crucial. At present, only few countries in the Southern African region have enacted a comprehensive anti-trafficking legislation. The lack of specific legislation covering criminalizing trafficking in persons undermines all the ongoing efforts by governments, and international organizations to counter trafficking in persons in the region. The main objective of this project (XAS/S69 - Capacity building for Member States of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) in the ratification and the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the additional Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children) is to strengthen the technical and legal capacity of the competent drafting national authorities of Member States in the ratification and domestication of the UN Trafficking Protocol. The project document was signed by SADC as counterpart in mid-May 2008, and project activities commenced in June 2008. The original approved duration was for 2 years (from May 2008 to May 2010). The duration was extended, bringing the implementation period to December 2013 with additional funding.
2. The XAS S69 project document was signed by SADC and SARPCCO during 2008. Four SADC Member States, namely Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Swaziland, were identified in October 2008, in consultation with SADC, as countries to benefit from outcomes of the project during Phase I; and Angola, Lesotho, Seychelles and Zimbabwe to benefit from Phase II.
3. The project objective was: To strengthen the technical and legal capacity of the competent drafting national authorities of SADC Member States in the ratification and domestication of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children.

3. The original plan was to implement the project in two linear phases, but delays during implementation of the original Phase I meant that it was no longer feasible or possible and necessitated implementation of the original Phase I whilst initiating and implementing Phase II simultaneously.
4. The UNODC Regional Office for Southern Africa (UNODC ROSAF), in partnership with the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Secretariat were responsible for implementation of this project.
5. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether the planned objectives have been attained and if the project has been relevant, efficient, cost effective and sustainable. In addition, best practices and lessons learned are drawn from this evaluation that can serve as a basis for instituting improvements to existing and further project planning, design and management. 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.

6. The main findings can be summarised as follows:

In regards to design, targets and performance indicators are well defined in the project document. The baseline study revealed that different countries are at different levels regarding legislation and implementation models and therefore a “one-size-fits-all” approach will not be effective and tailor-made solutions for each country should be developed.

Project planning and design was done between UNODC and SADC. SADC represents the SADC member-states and individual member states were not involved in planning and design phase. Overall, the project objectives, outcomes and inputs were relevant but practical implementation of the envisaged activities proved to be much more difficult and

strategic in nature than originally foreseen. 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. 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. Project implementation was done in a participatory manner and effective partnerships were established on operational level.

Overall, high level of value for money was experienced. Sufficient funds were available and on time to cover planned activities, and the budget allocated has been spent accordingly. Cumbersome communication procedures and inadequate ownership by recipient countries delayed project implementation. Despite delays in the project, overall project management, reporting and financial management practices, and quality of inputs were of high standard.

It is too soon after implementation to establish real impact, although impact is foreseen if beneficiary countries sustain activities. The potential for sustainability is rated as satisfactory as beneficiary countries have incorporated inputs into day-to-day activities.

7. Lessons Learnt include

- a. Project planning and design was done in participation with representatives from SADC but not with representatives from the respective member states. It therefore limits the level of ownership by recipient countries and such an approach does not convince that needs and conditions of recipient countries were fully considered.
- b. Different countries were at different level of readiness and in some cases had already started with own initiatives related to ratification and the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its two first additional Protocols. It therefore calls for different approach and support to address specific needs per recipient country.
- b. Capacity, structures, mandates and responsibilities of recipient countries to coordinate implementation activities per country were not assessed and planned for during project design phase. Project implementation was delayed due because of lack of access to key institutions in recipient countries. Although identification and

appointment of focal points per recipient country enhanced coordination and flow of communication, the process of appointment of these focal point representatives did not come with a full mandate and clear roles and responsibilities from executive level of the recipient countries. Therefore, focal point representatives had limited powers and decision-making authority that were required to ensure effective implementation of activities.

8. Best practices identified include:

- a. Joint inter-departmental workshops provided by UNODC ROSAF on the international legal framework pertaining to trafficking in persons to representatives from 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 and enhances cooperation between departments in responding to TIP.
- b. Establishment of focal points per recipient country improves communication and provides a central point for coordination purposes. These focal points can provide a platform for coordination and implementation purposes even after the lifespan of this project.

10. Recommendations

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

10.1 Recommendations for UNODC

- a. Future planning and design should allow for formal participation from recipient countries to ensure buy-in and to ensure specific needs per country are covered by project activities.
- b. Future programmes should consider institutional capacity per recipient country and ensure management structures are established to ensure effective implementation of the Convention and its trafficking protocols.

10.2 Recommendations for recipient countries

- a. Recipient countries should take ownership to develop and execute comprehensive implementation plans to ensure institutionalization of the Convention and Protocols, based on the foundation created through this project.

- b. The functioning of the focal points should be assessed with a view to establish fully mandated structures to coordinate activities within recipient countries. It will require high-level representation with decision-making authority.

10.3 Recommendations for Development Partners

- a. Future financial support is critical to ensure that project activities are entrenched and capacities are developed (human, institutional as well as infrastructural capacity) to ensure effective implementation of the UN Convention and subsequent legislation, policies and strategies.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings: problems and issues identified	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations
Ownership by recipient countries was below satisfaction.	Interviews and project documentation	It is recommended that planning and design of new projects should make provision for inputs from all recipient countries to ensure buy-in and ownership. Local conditions and capacities should be considered to ensure programme activities are flexible enough to cater for variances amongst beneficiary countries.
Roles and mandates of country representatives responsible for programme implementation were not well defined at the start of implementation. Decision-making processes were also not agreed upon with each individual recipient country	Interviews and project documentation	Future programme design should consider institutional capacity per recipient country, programme implementation structures, roles, responsibilities and mandates to ensure effective implementation. Decision-making authorities should be well defined and buy-in insured before implementation start date.
This project focuses on developing the legislative and policy frameworks. In addition, other needs related to implementing the legislation and policy frameworks, such as capacity development, were identified as critical to provide an effective and comprehensive solution per recipient country.	Interviews and project documentation	It is the responsibility of the recipient country to develop a comprehensive strategy to institutionalize the Convention and protocols. It is also the responsibility of recipient countries to coordinate and align related interventions with their own strategies.
Cumbersome communication	Project reports and	Country representatives and

<p>procedures to be followed through SADC structures; between SADC and recipient countries; and decision-making processes within recipient countries caused considerable delays.</p>	<p>interviews</p>	<p>coordinating structures should be fully mandated by the recipient country and communication channels and decision-making authorities should be defined and clarified with all key stakeholders before project implementation. Current focal points should be assessed and capacity developed through this project, should be enhanced to become formal coordination structures per recipient country even after lifespan of this project.</p>
<p>Follow-up programmes are needed to develop capacity, systems, procedures and organizational structures to implement legislation and policies developed as a result of this intervention.</p>	<p>Interviews and project reports</p>	<p>International development partners should prioritize support towards capacity development and institutional strengthening of institutions responsible for implementing the legislation and policies developed as a result of this intervention.</p>
<p>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 and decision-making process within recipient countries</p>	<p>Project reports and interviews</p>	<p>Country readiness, existing coordination structures and capacities should be assessed during project planning and design phase and provision made for capacity development of these structures in future programmes.</p>

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background and context

1. According to the “*UNODC Global Report on Trafficking in Persons*” (2009), Southern Africa is both a destination, origin and a transit region for victims of human trafficking and smuggling of migrants originating from or destined for other countries in Africa, Asia, as well as Central and South East Europe.
2. There is growing awareness of the need for well-coordinated joint initiatives at the regional and sub-regional levels. In this context, comprehensive and harmonized legislation and policy are particularly crucial. At present, only few countries in the Southern African region have enacted a comprehensive anti-trafficking legislation. The lack of specific legislation covering criminalizing trafficking in persons undermines all the ongoing efforts by governments, NGOs and international organizations to counter trafficking in persons in the region. The main objective of this project is to strengthen the technical and legal capacity of the competent drafting national authorities of SADC Member States in the ratification and domestication of the UN Trafficking Protocol.
3. The project document was signed by SADC as counterpart in mid-May 2008, and project activities commenced in June 2008. The original approved duration was for 2 years (from May 2008 to May 2010). The duration was extended twice, with the final end date until December 2011, bringing the implementation period to 3 years and 8 months.
4. The project was revised in December 2011 and extended until December 2013 in order to accommodate a new grant received from the United States Department of State. As part of this revision, all project activities, work plan implementation as well as duration of the project were reviewed and revised. As part of this project revision, the work plan was amended in order to reflect the extension of the project up until December 2013.

-
5. No substantive changes were introduced at the outcome-level. At the output and activity-level, provision was made for the hosting of a regional SADC workshop primarily to facilitate and support implementation of the SADC Strategic Plan of Action, sharing of regional progress and experience regarding drafting of national legislation and support the operationalization of the TIP activities in the programme. This regional workshop was also planned to serve as a SADC Experts Group Meeting aimed at supporting the operationalization of the SADC/UNODC Regional Programme.
 6. However this mid-term evaluation evaluates only the time period between May 2008 and December 2011. The total budget for the time period evaluated is US\$454,800.00.
 7. The project was originally designed for implementation in two phases during which four countries would benefit from Phase I, another four countries would benefit from Phase II and continuous legal advice would be provided to all SADC Member States across both phases. Four SADC Member States, namely Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Swaziland, were identified in October 2008, in consultation with SADC, as countries to benefit from outcomes of the project during Phase I; and Angola, Lesotho, Seychelles and Zimbabwe to benefit from Phase II.
 8. The SADC Secretariat presented invitations to the selected countries in the second phase in December 2009. Lesotho, Seychelles and Zimbabwe have accepted the invitation to receive support and assistance.
 9. The original project logical framework defines the following objective and Outcomes:
 10. **Project Objective:** *SADC Member States align laws and policies with the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children*
 11. **Expected Outcomes:**
 - a. **Outcome 1:** *Selected SADC Member States will draft and consider national anti-trafficking legislation, in accordance with the UN Trafficking Protocol.*

-
- b. **Outcome 2:** *A Declaration and Plan of Action against Trafficking in Persons is developed and presented to SADC*
- c. **Output 1.1:** *Four SADC Member States identified to benefit from the project's activities in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be identified in phase two.*
- d. **Output 1.2:** *National, in-depth legal assessments on anti-human trafficking measures and provisions carried out in four of the SADC Member States in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be assessed in phase two.*
- e. **Output 1.3:** *Legal advice provided to all SADC Member States and draft legislation (in line with the UN instruments) developed in selected four countries in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be assisted in drafting legislation and continuous legal advice will be provided to all SADC Member States in phase two.*
- f. **Output 1.4:** *The drafting of national policy, including a plan of action against trafficking in persons, supported in four SADC Member States in phase one; and additional four SADC Member States will be assisted in drafting a plan of action against trafficking in phase two.*
- g. **Output 2.1:** *In phase one, a SADC Declaration and Plan of Action on Trafficking in Persons is drafted*
12. The Terms of Reference (see Annexure I) state as the main purpose of the Mid-term Evaluation to “assess whether the planned objectives have been attained and if the project has been relevant, efficient, cost effective and sustainable”. In addition, best practices and lessons learned should be drawn from this evaluation which can then serve as a basis for instituting improvements to further project planning, design and management. The evaluation further seeks to draw good practices, which will be used to improve project management in the office.
13. This mid-term evaluation aims to evaluate the project from May 2008 until December 2011. The geographical cover will be at the Southern African region.

14. Table 1 below outlines the assessment criteria and key questions per criteria that were covered by the report:

Table 1. Evaluation Questions

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Key questions</i>
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are objectives of the supported project in line with the policy priorities of the Government and UNODC mandate? b. Are the activities implemented under the project appropriate for achieving the stated objectives? c. How well do the activities implemented by the project reflect the specific problems and needs
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Is there any behavioral change among the participants of the project's activities following the project implementation? e. Are there any policy changes with regard to human trafficking? f. Have any countries taken any steps forward in their implementation of UNODC and its supporting protocols?
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. Has the allocated budget been spent accordingly? h. Is the project delivering on time as planned? i. Were funds available in project sufficient for project implementation?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> j. Are UNODC supported interventions sustainable? k. Do the interventions have a potential for scaling up or replication? l. Have the beneficiaries taken ownership of the project objectives to implement them after UNODC funding? m. Are there clear indications from Government that they will continue with implementing the Convention and Protocol after this project's lifespan?
Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> n. Is there effective coordination between UNODC and other implementing partners?
Lessons Learnt & Best Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. Are there any lessons learned from UNODC provided assistance? p. Are there any key lessons that can provide a useful basis for strengthening UNODC support?

-
- q. Are there any features to be considered as good practices at country level for learning and replication?
-

B. Evaluation Methodology

15. The evaluation followed a systematic approach according to the following key steps:
- a. Inception meeting with project team to discuss the Terms of Reference and proposed methodology
 - b. Desk Review of relevant project documents (see Annexure II for list of documents reviewed) to provide background information about the project. Project reports were used to finalize interview questionnaires and to address information gaps needed for this assessment.
 - c. Develop questionnaire to guide the information gathering process. (See Annexure III)
 - d. Distributing questionnaire to contact persons
 - e. Interviews with focal point representatives to get individual reflections, opinions, perceptions and specific information per country;
 - f. Analyze information gathered through interviews and document review.
 - g. Prepare draft report
 - h. Submit draft report for inputs from UNODC project team, SADC and Core Learning Partners
 - i. Consolidate comments in Final Report and submit
16. During the Inception Meeting the Terms of Reference was clarified. The consultant developed an understanding of expectations of the Project Team and agrees on the methodology, timeframes, reporting during the evaluation and clarifies logistical arrangements. It was agreed between the consultant and the Project Leader 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.

-
17. 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.
 18. The questionnaire was distributed electronically to project contact persons to gather individual responses.
 19. 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.

C. Limitations to the evaluation

20. Due to time limitations and distances between countries, not all contact persons could be interviewed on a face-to-face basis. Interviews were based on telephone conversations and responses on questionnaires via email. This had a negative impact on the assessment as individual inputs per recipient country could provide different facts, opinions, reflections and suggestions that could enrich the report. These limitations were addressed through the triangulation of data such as project reports and minutes of meetings. Additional meetings were scheduled with the UNODC Project Team to clarify some issues.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

A. Design

21. 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. This approach has limited the opportunity to gather specific information per country, ensure buy-in and strengthening ownership.
22. Communication channels between project and executive level per recipient country; coordination structures per recipient country; and decision-making processes on all levels related to this project were not well assessed and defined during project design phase. It caused serious delays and had a negative impact on effective implementation.
23. The initial project assumption was that none of the SADC Member States had commenced with drafting or promulgation of specialized legislation in this regard. In reality, once the project started, some of the Member States such as Zambia and Mozambique had already adopted specialized or amended legislation and some of the beneficiary countries were either in the process of drafting specialized legislation or had commenced with law reform research, independent of the project activities (Swaziland, South Africa, Malawi and Namibia).
24. As a result, the needs of individual Member States as well as commitment to the UNODC project varied. A number of the beneficiary countries – especially Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Swaziland in Phase I as well as Lesotho in Phase II – indicated that they would require assistance in relation to either drafting of legislation or development of national policies, but that the support and assistance would need to be tailored according to its respective level of progress and specific requirements.
25. The original project design made provision to be implemented in two phases (each phase with one-year duration) with separate outputs and activities for each of the phases. The activities were clearly defined and contained in the one-

year periods and the outcome of the activities was planned to be self-sustainable as capacity was build within the selected SADC Member States in the initial phase of the project. The continuation in the second phase would thereafter mainly comprise the provision of assistance to four additional SADC Member States as well as continuous provision of legal and technical advice and assistance to all SADC Member States with regards to anti-trafficking legislation, policies and national plans of action. Cumbersome communication channels and difficulty experience with access to key institutions per recipient countries forced changes to the implementation schedule and some activities were implemented in parallel.

26. The partners and beneficiaries are well identified in the project document. All external institutional relationships were correctly identified and efforts were made to manage partnerships.
27. There is a clear and logical consistency between the objectives, inputs, activities, outputs in terms of quality, and cost-efficiency. Targets and performance indicators are well defined in the project documents. UNODC ROSAF used UNODC monitoring and reporting system during project implementation and detailed reports were prepared.
28. A baseline legal assessment was concluded by an independent consultant in each of the four beneficiary countries of Phase I. Based on the information received from the baseline study and inputs from beneficiaries, it was concluded that different countries are at different levels regarding legislation and implementation models and therefore a “one-size-fits-all” approach will not be effective and tailor-made solutions for each country should be developed.
29. A generic approach was followed in all beneficiary countries although activities were formulated in a manner that allows for assistance to be provided based on specific needs of countries when it comes to developing national legislation and policy frameworks.
30. The work plan is practical, logical, cohesive and relevant. The planned project duration was realistic.

B. Relevance

31. Overall, trafficking in persons remains a concern within Southern Africa and there is an increasing awareness for the need of well-coordinated joint initiatives at the regional and sub-regional levels.
32. XASS69 is aligned with SADC regional priorities and to a lesser extent to national plans and strategies of beneficiary governments. While SADC and some of the beneficiary countries perceive trafficking in persons as a key priority, some member states deemed it to be of a lesser concern. This resulted in delays in the selection of Member States to participate in the project.
33. UNODC ROSAF had to adapt its approach significantly in compensating for the various levels of progress and readiness from respective SADC Member States. Unlike the original project, UNODC ROSAF had to engage each Member State individually and had to contend with and negate the various individual national constraints and hurdles in order to implement envisaged project activities in line with country-specific requirements and actual needs.
34. The project was revised during December 2011 and extended until December 2013 in line with the new funding agreement governing a new grant received from the United States Department of State. The revised project makes provision for six SADC Member States to directly benefit from project activities and for all SADC Member States to continue to receive legal and technical advice when so requested. The revised project also allows for assistance and advice to be provided to SADC in the promotion of implementation of the SADC Strategic Plan of Action and related counter-trafficking in person's activities.
35. Since both Lesotho and Swaziland have promulgated comprehensive legislation and are in the process of adopting national plans of action, the number of beneficiary countries was reduced from eight to six (Angola, Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Seychelles and Zimbabwe).

-
36. Overall the project is appropriate. There are no other actors providing a similar type of technical assistance in the selected countries, targeting the same stakeholders.
37. The particular added value of the project is that it developed a common understanding and legal foundation in the region to address issues related to human trafficking. It also starts the process of awareness and capacity building to deal with Human Trafficking. It would be valuable to replicate best practices and lessons learned from the project to future or ongoing projects in the SADC region.
38. The project remains highly relevant and although the theoretical design of the project remains valid, practical implementation proved to have been much more difficult and strategic in nature than originally foreseen.

C. Efficiency

42. Sufficient funds were available to cover planned activities and the budget allocated has been spent accordingly. The 2011 Revised Costed Work and Monitoring Plan reflects a total project budget of USD 432 756.00 until March 2012. Total disbursement according to UNODC Management Expenditure Reporting by 31 December 2011 was USD 363 869.00 All figures include project support costs. Certified financial reporting is provided by the UNODC Financial Resource Management Service and is available in ProFi.
43. Project delivery was delayed due to reasons highlighted in Paragraph A above. These delays were addressed by changes made in programming of activities and UNODC ROSAF taking responsibility for improved communication between project beneficiaries.
44. Costs were sufficient for project implementation and overall good value for money was achieved. This can be contributed to the fact that the UNODC has the 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 provides much more than just a project management unit and therefore provides more value for money than any other project management unit can offer.
45. Service providers appointed during project implementation performed satisfactorily and delivered the required outputs. Project counterparts fulfilled the obligations/responsibilities agreed upon towards the implementation of the project, although with considerable delays.
 46. 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.
 47. Project management arrangements put in place performed well and also make up for some of the constraints experienced by the slow SADC internal processes and procedures.
 48. 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.
 49. Although almost all outputs regarding the original Phase I have been achieved and activities in relation thereto successfully implemented, delays necessitated continuous implementation of the original Phase I whilst initiating and implementing Phase II. Implementation of the activities of Phase I and phase II therefore run in parallel during the last phase of project implementation and it was no longer feasible or possible to implement the project in two linear phases as originally planned.
 50. The project was revised in December 2011 and extended until December 2013 in order to accommodate a new grant received from the United States Department of State. As part of this revision, all project activities; work plan implementation as well as duration of the project were reviewed and revised. As part of this project revision, the work plan was amended in order to reflect the extension of the project up until December 2013.

D. Partnerships and cooperation

51. The project was implemented in a consultative/participatory manner between UNODC and SADC. The focal points that were successfully established per beneficiary country strengthened the consultative approach and provided a more effective communication channel between UNODC ROSAF and beneficiary countries than through the SADC mechanism.
52. The UNODC maintained an effective relationship with International development partners, in particular with Austria and United States who were the funders of this project. Due to the relationship that was developed over years, US Department of State agreed to provide funding for a follow-up phase for the project that will strengthen the results and impact of this project.
53. 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 proofed as an example of such proactive discussions and experience.

E. Effectiveness

54. The effective project start date of May 2008 was delayed until July 2008 due to finalization of working arrangement with the SADC Secretariat and Gender Unit as well as the subsequent appointment of Legal Advisor/Project Coordinator that was only finalized in December 2008.
55. UNODC Southern Africa has experienced difficulty in securing participation by the nominated countries for Phase I. After obtaining commitment from these countries, further constraints in establishing communication with beneficiary countries were experienced, as most of the countries did not have a dedicated focal point or lead department responsible for combating trafficking in persons. These challenges have caused significant delays in implementing a number of activities in relation to the project. It was partially addressed during a meeting between UNODC Southern Africa and SADC Secretariat in April 2009, when the roles and responsibilities of the respective organizations were discussed and it was agreed that, in order to ensure that the project moves forward in a satisfactory pace, UNODC Southern Africa would take over some of the direct communication with Member States.

-
56. In response to the lack of dedicated entry points per country, focal points were established to provide a single point of entry for project activities in the respective recipient countries and they were also responsible for coordinating activities related to the project per beneficiary country. These focal points also ensured commitment on behalf of the national authorities from the respective countries and contributed towards sustainability of the project, as capacity will remain after project's lifetime.
57. The legal assessment and implementation activities are completed or started in all the other countries except Angola in Phase 2. A continuous delay in establishing the cooperation and focal points for Angola has impeded the initial legal assessment and key activities that need to be initiated.
58. The SADC working mechanism has its own protocol and lengthy communication channels that caused delays. In addition, project activities often require a lengthy consultation process 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.
59. UNODC ROSAF has continuously consulted and followed up with SADC Gender Unit on all these matters in an effort of speeding up project implementation and rectify the above said constraints. Despite all the delays and cumbersome procedures, UNODC ROSAF and SADC have, through its Secretariat, established a good working relationship.
60. Delays during implementation of the original Phase I and Phase II means that it was no longer feasible or possible to implement the project in two linear phases and necessitated continuous implementation of the original Phase I whilst initiating and implementing Phase II simultaneously.
61. Despite these delays, the foreseen objectives and results were achieved. For a detailed breakdown of results achieved see Annexure V.
62. The project has been implemented with sufficient cooperation and dialogue with other UNODC projects (ZAF/T54 "Strengthening Law Enforcement Capacity (Border Control Operations) and Criminal Justice Response to Smuggling of Migrants and Trafficking in Persons" and XAS/T17 - Development of effective law enforcement responses to violence against women in the Southern African Region), so as to effectively complement these efforts.

-
63. UNODC ROSAF engaged with SADC and its Member States as well as SARPCCO on continuous basis in order to support, enhance and strengthen the technical and legal capacity of the competent drafting national authorities of SADC Member States in the ratification and incorporation of the Protocol. This included provision of legal advice on the drafting of specialized legislation when so requested.
64. UNODC ROSAF participated in various regional and national public symposiums, workshops and work sessions and gave presentations on the Convention and the Protocol and promoted the need to implement international obligations provided for therein through promulgation of legislation in terms of international standards and best practices.
65. Results achieved are due to the project's intervention rather than of external factors as no other actors are involved in activities in this specific field.
66. UNODC Southern Africa submitted narrative and financial reports to the donors and has also submitted quarterly, semi-annual and annual reports to UNODC Vienna.
67. This project is subject to examination by the United Nations Internal Audit Division and the United Nations Board of External Auditors.

F. Impact

70. Since commencement of the project, regional awareness within SADC increased with regards to the necessity to ratify and implement the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children. It also increased awareness to adhere to their respective international obligations including effective incorporation of the provisions of both the Convention and the Protocol into specialized national legislation.
71. For example, Swaziland and Zimbabwe, following continuous engagement by UNODC ROSAF under this project, have indicated to UNODC ROSAF during meetings with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Swaziland as well as the Attorney General of the Government of Zimbabwe respectively, that

their governments have now taken the decision to ratify the Protocol in line with growing international sentiment. Both governments have also requested the assistance of UNODC ROSAF in briefing their respective Parliaments and senior officials in this regard. It is furthermore evident from a number of SADC Member States to prioritize drafting and promulgation of legislation against trafficking in persons, or amending existing legislation to incorporate provision of the Protocol. (Governments of Botswana, Lesotho, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe, Malawi and Namibia). These legislation and supporting strategies to follow is expected to have a wider overall effect on the people of Southern Africa and indirectly on countries using Southern Africa as an in-transit route or final destination for trafficking in persons.

72. UNODC tools and templates such as the Convention and Protocol, the *UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons*, the *UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol*, the *UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons - A Handbook for Parliamentarians* and the *UNODC Anti-Human Trafficking Manual for Criminal Justice Practitioners* were distributed to a wide variety of users.
73. Project output is of high quality as international tools and models were used. An increased awareness about trafficking in persons is experienced since the implementation of this project.
74. Although not originally envisaged and planned for in the project design, UNODC ROSAF has identified the continuous need for training, both on substantial legal matters related to relevant international obligations, but also technical operationalization of these obligations.
75. Project activities furthermore highlighted the urgent need from within the region to address the thematic issue of Smuggling of Migrants and the implementation of Protocol on Smuggling of Migrants in conjunction with implementation of the Protocol on Trafficking in Persons.
76. The original project design did not make provision for the possibility of assessing impact. Delays during implementation also did not allow for sufficient time to realize measureable impact at this stage.

G. Sustainability

77. The UNODC supported interventions have potential to be sustainable as governments of the respective beneficiary countries is in the process of drafting and promulgating legislation against trafficking in persons, or amend existing legislation to incorporate provision of the Protocol - most notably the Governments of Botswana, Lesotho, South Africa, Swaziland, Zimbabwe, Malawi and Namibia.
78. The issue of sustainability was considered during project design and implementation phases as proofed by the capacity building components. This project also initiated the establishment of focal points per beneficiary country that improved coordination. These capacities will remain after the lifespan of this project and strengthen the capacity per recipient country to sustain activities.
79. Ownership by recipient countries and political will to address human trafficking, however will determine the level of sustainability after project closure.
80. The interventions have the potential for scaling up or replication in other countries in the region.

III. CONCLUSIONS

81. The overall impression is that the project design was relevant, although specific needs of recipient countries could be included in the original planning and design of the project. All countries involved in the project were not on the same level regarding internal capacity; advancement in process of adopting UN Conventions; and capacity to manage projects where an integrated approach is required. Communication and coordination constraints caused massive delays that could have been addressed in some way during project planning and design.
82. Ownership of beneficiary countries could have been strengthened if executive level representatives per country were included in initial consultations during project design. Issues related to current status of adopting UN Conventions, capacity constraints, management and coordination mechanisms and institutionalization could be addressed during such consultations.
83. The entry point to beneficiary countries was through SADC structures and following SADC communication channels that are long and complicated. These communication structures are not conducive for a project management approach that requires quick and effective communication and decision-making processes. The project design did not address communication channels, decision-making and mandates of country representatives (focal points) well enough. This can be regarded as the weak point of the project that contributes to various delays and frustrations.
84. Although there were considerable delays during phase I of this project, overall project delivery was acceptable. A time extension was requested that allows implementation of activities to take effect.
85. Beneficiaries rated the quality of the inputs very highly and the UNODC as implementing structure provided good value for money. Based on their international experience and capacity they were able to provide additional support and expertise. The level of expertise of UNODC officials was the strong point of this intervention.

-
86. 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 trafficking in persons in the region in a more effective manner.
 87. Measures were put in place during implementation to ensure activities are entrenched in day-to-day activities of beneficiary departments. There are therefore clear indications that most of the activities will be sustainable after the lifespan of this project.
 88. 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 beneficiaries.
 89. In general, the project has been successful in achieving its objectives up to this point and with the changes recommended has high potential to achieve all outputs and outcomes at the end of the extended implementation period.
 90. The particular added value of the project is that it developed a common understanding and legal foundation in the region to address issues related to human trafficking. It also starts the process of awareness and capacity building to deal with Human Trafficking.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Recommendations for UNODC

It is recommended that:

88. Future planning and design activities should make provision for inputs from the beneficiaries to gather base-line information, understanding of management and decision-making process and structures, coordination mechanisms for the purpose of project implementation, ensure buy-in and alignment with government priorities and to establish ownership.
89. It is also recommended that systems and structures be established in individual recipient countries as well as on regional level, to ensure effective implementation of the Conventions. It is recommended that implementation strategies, procedures and management structures per country receive special attention, followed by strengthening regional coordination capacity.

B. Recommendations for recipient countries

It is recommended that:

90. Recipient countries take ownership to develop comprehensive implementation strategies based on the foundation that was laid through this project, to ensure the Convention and Protocols are institutionalized. Such a strategy should also provide structures and mechanisms to coordinate activities across departmental boundaries and strengthen an integrated approach.
91. The functioning of the focal points should be reviewed with a specific focus to build on existing capacity and experience and to utilize these capacities in support of an integrated approach for implementing national and regional projects and strategies. The focal points should be fully mandated to fulfil their functions.

C. Recommendations for Development Partners:

92. Future financial support is critical to ensure that the effects of this project and its activities are entrenched and capacity is developed (human, institutional as well as infrastructural capacity) to ensure effective implementation of the UN Conventions and subsequent legislation, policies and strategies. Organized crime has across-boundary effect and has international implications; therefore the real beneficiaries of such a project

are much broader than the beneficiary countries, but also include the international community.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

A. Planning and Design

93. Project planning and design was done with participation of representatives from SADC and not with representatives from the respective member-states. Different countries were at different level of readiness and in some cases had already started with own initiatives related to ratification and the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its two first additional Protocols. Specific needs and conditions of the respective member states were therefore not covered in the design and a generic approach was followed. The lesson learnt is that it might be constructive in future if recipient countries are active involved in planning and design phase to make sure project activities address specific needs and gaps. It will also increase the level of ownership of the recipient countries and will contribute towards alignment of project activities with recipient country priorities and needs.
94. Assessment of existing implementation and coordination structures needed for project implementation, or lack thereof, during the planning and design phase could influenced project design to make provision for development of such capacity as part of project implementation. .

B. Implementation

95. Although identification and appointment of focal points per recipient country enhanced coordination and flow of communication, it could have been even more effective if focal point representatives received clear mandates and authority from the respective recipient countries with a clearly defined job description.

VI BEST PRACTICES

98. Joint inter-departmental workshops provided by UNODC ROSAF on the international legal framework pertaining to trafficking in persons to representatives from 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.
99. Although it was not part of the original design of the project, establishment of focal points per recipient country to address the communication problems experienced during implementation phase proved to be effective and provides a central point for coordination purposes. It increases the understanding of and need for an integrated management approach when dealing with projects and strategies of a cross-cutting nature where more than one government department/institution is responsible for implementation.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCES OF THE EVALUATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR XASS69 and XAST17 EVALUATIONS

Project titles and Numbers:	XASS69 - Capacity building for Member States of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) in the ratification and the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its two first additional Protocols. And: XAST17 - Development of effective law enforcement responses to violence against women in the Southern African Region
Duration:	XASS69 - 1 May 2008 - 31 August 2011 XAST17 - 7 July 2008 - 31 December 2011
Location:	South Africa
Executing agency:	UNODC
Cooperating agencies:	SADC; SARPCCO
Total approved budgets:	XASS69 - US\$454,800 XAST17 - US\$886,265

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

a) XAST17

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 Regional Office for Southern Africa (UNODC ROSAF), in partnership with the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Secretariat and the Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organisation (SARPCCO), is 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.

b) XASS69

Trafficking in persons has become of major concern in many parts of the world, including in Southern Africa. There is growing awareness of the need for well-coordinated joint initiatives at the regional and sub-regional levels. In this context, comprehensive and harmonized legislation and policy is particularly crucial. At present, none of the countries in the Southern African region have yet enacted a comprehensive anti-trafficking legislation. The lack of specific legislation covering criminalizing trafficking in persons undermines all the ongoing efforts by governments, NGOs and international organizations to counter trafficking in persons in the region. The main objective of this project is to strengthen the technical and legal capacity of the competent drafting national authorities of SADC Member States in the ratification and domestication of the UN Trafficking Protocol. The total budget for the project was US\$454,800

1.1.PROJECT OBJECTIVES

XAST17 - 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.

XASS69 - The technical and legal capacity of the competent drafting national authorities of SADC Member States in the ratification and domestication of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, is strengthened.

1.2.PROJECT OUTCOMES

XAST17 - Law enforcement officials use the acquired skills and knowledge in effectively responding to cases of violence against women.

XASS69 - Selected SADC Member States will ratify, draft and adopt specific national anti-trafficking legislation, in accordance with the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children and SADC will develop and adopt a Declaration and Plan of Action against Trafficking in Persons.

XAST17 Objectives & Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>OUTPUTS:</p> <p>Output 1: 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>Output 2: By the end of 2009 an intensive training and capacity building initiative to promote effective police responses to violence against women has been developed and implemented in 6 countries in the SADC region.</p> <p>Output 3: 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 2010.</p>	<p>Sound working relations around project implementation and oversight involving project countries.</p> <p>Needs accurately assessed</p> <p>Interactive training module and materials developed</p> <p>Materials produced in relevant languages</p> <p>Capacitated law enforcement agencies in project countries.</p> <p>Receipt of materials acknowledged</p> <p>Materials and training experience reflected in similar initiatives in the region and internationally</p>	<p>Working agreement</p> <p>Process minutes/documentation.</p> <p>Assessment report</p> <p>Module and materials</p> <p>Reports and attendance registers from training events</p> <p>Training evaluation reports.</p> <p>Correspondence/ acknowledgement of receipt form</p> <p>Training materials</p> <p>Reports</p>	<p>Key project stakeholders (SADC, SARPCCO, National Police of target countries, ADA and UNODC) will be able fully to cooperate with each other.</p> <p>Value of needs assessment in relation to gender-based violence is acknowledged</p> <p>Cooperation of relevant agencies Value of training is acknowledged</p> <p>Good participation/Good training</p> <p>Internalisation/institutionalization of training lessons/learnings.</p> <p>Value of training intervention is acknowledged.</p>

XASS69 Objectives & Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Output 1.1: Four SADC Member States identified to benefit from the project's activities in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be identified in phase two when funding is secured.</p> <p>Output 1.2: National, in-depth legal assessments on anti-human trafficking measures and provisions carried out in four of the SADC Member States in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be assessed in phase two when funding is secured.</p> <p>Output 1.3: Legal advice provided to all SADC Member States and draft legislation (in line with the UN instruments) developed in selected four countries in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be assisted in drafting legislation and continuous legal advice will be provided to all SADC Member States in phase two when funding is secured.</p> <p>Output 1.4: The drafting of national policy, including a plan of action against trafficking</p>	<p>SADC Member States identified and their participation ensured.</p> <p>Report of the legal assessments available.</p> <p>Outline of prerequisites for anti-trafficking legislation completed.</p> <p>National policies and plans of action drafted.</p>	<p>Project reports.</p> <p>Reports submitted to SADC and the selected Member States.</p> <p>Reports on advice requested by Member States and provided by UNODC.</p> <p>Drafts of national policies and plans of action.</p>	<p>Commitment from SADC and each selected Member State to designate a national focal point. Adequate resources provided for each focal point.</p> <p>SADC Member States provide access to necessary information for legal assessments.</p> <p>Member States cooperate in legislative and police review.</p>

<p>in persons, supported in four SADC Member States in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be assisted in drafting a plan of action against trafficking in phase two when funding is secured.</p> <p>Output 2.1: In phase one, a SADC Declaration and Plan of Action on Trafficking in Persons is drafted and adopted.</p>	<p>Preparation of Declaration and PoA endorsed by a decision of SADC; Draft Declaration and PoA submitted to SADC; Recommendations by SADC to approve and adopt the Declaration and PoA.</p>	<p>Decision by SADC. Draft available.</p>	<p>Political commitment of SADC.</p>
---	--	---	--------------------------------------

2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

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 should be drawn from this evaluation which can then serve as a basis for instituting improvements to further project planning, design and management. The evaluation will further seek to draw good practices which will be used to improve project management in the office.

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 to the programme (please see the attached annexure VIII for the list) will provide information and assistance to the evaluator/evaluation team. They will also comment on key steps and key documents of the evaluation such as the draft evaluation report.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE

The final evaluation is designed to be a project life span evaluation which should cover both projects period, XAST17, 3 years, and for XASS69, 3 years.

The geographical coverage will be at the regional level.

Evaluation should answer the following key evaluation questions:

- *Addressing Relevance*
 - 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?
 - How well do the activities implemented by the project reflect the specific problems and needs of the prisoners?
 - Was the targeted prison population relevant to the project?
- *Addressing Effectiveness*
 - 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?
- *Addressing 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

-
- *Addressing Efficiency*
 - 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?
 - *Addressing 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?
 - *Addressing Lessons Learned and 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?
 - *Addressing Partnership:*
 - Is there effective coordination between UNODC and other implementing partners?

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluator will conduct an impact assessment through assessing the before-and-after situation using multiple evaluation tools, such as qualitative and quantitative instruments and applying triangulation techniques.

The independent evaluation should include but not necessarily limit itself to the following evaluation methods:

- A thorough Desk review of relevant documents (project document, quarterly, semi-annual and annual project reports, minutes of technical meetings, reports on project activities, relevant national policy documents etc)
- Individual and/or group interviews with main governmental stakeholders, the service provider and project coordinator;
- Interviews with representatives of the project beneficiaries;
- Field visits to services developed/supported under the project;
- Conference calls with representatives from the UNODC, SADC and SARPCCO
- Questionnaires with beneficiaries / other stakeholders

The evaluation consultant will present a detailed statement of proposed evaluation methods in an inception report.

In order to successfully conduct primary research (i.e. interviews, questionnaires), the evaluator may undertake regional trips to countries where the project has been implemented. The purpose of the missions would be to benefit from the direct interaction with the beneficiaries and other key stakeholders concerned.

5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

An Independent Evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation expert without prior or foreseeable involvement in the project. The evaluator will not act as representative of any party and has to remain independent and impartial throughout the evaluation.

6. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Management arrangements and logistical support

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in Vienna will backstop the development of evaluation tools and methodology. The evaluation will be planned and conducted in close consultation with UNODC office in South Africa. The office in South Africa will provide background information and logistical support. Further, the country office in South Africa as well as IEU will comment on key steps and key documents of the evaluation.

The evaluator will be free to discuss all matters relevant to this assignment with the authorities concerned. He/she is, however, not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of UNODC.

The evaluator will present his/her findings evidence based in a draft evaluation report to the country office in South Africa, IEU and Core Learning Partners, who are then invited to comment on the document. If disputes arise in this process, the rules and regulations of United Nations Evaluation Group and the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) apply to solve the situation accordingly. The report needs, in its length, to take account for the scope of the evaluation. The report should be developed with respect to the following chapters, following the Evaluation Handbook of UNODC:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Major findings and analysis
- Outcomes, impact and sustainability
- Lessons learned and best practises
- Recommendations
- Conclusions

Annexes will include every relevant document for the evaluation like Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation, list of persons interviewed, field visit schedule and evaluation assessment questionnaire.

After completing the evaluation process, the evaluation consultant is supposed to fill in the Evaluation Assessment Questionnaire (Annex 1).

Timeframe for the Evaluation It is expected that the evaluation process will utilize full 60 working days starting from the 29 July to 15 September 2010.

Task	Number of w/days	Timeline	Deliverables
Briefing of evaluator by the Programme Manager and/or Head Quarters.	4		Draft inception report with detailed evaluation plan and methodology prepared; including draft evaluation tools (interview sheets; questionnaires)
Desk review of project documents, reports, preparation of methodological tools as per the TOR, and other relevant documents	10		Inception report finalised, containing the methodology and evaluation plan. Inception report shared with IEU and CLP. Comments incorporated.
Missions to countries in Southern Africa: Activities: meetings and interviews with identified stakeholders, identified beneficiaries and collaborative partners; debriefing with the Programme Manager	15		Data from major stakeholders and beneficiaries collected
Data analysis and preparation of draft report	8		Evaluation draft report with findings, lessons learned and results submitted to project managers, CLP and IEU for review
Round of comments among relevant stakeholders including meetings	12		Evaluation report refined
Finalisation of the evaluation report	6		Final evaluation report submitted to Project managers and CLP
Interaction with IEU and approval and/or clearance of report	4		Report shared with and published by IEU
Debriefing / Presentation of Findings	1		Debriefing and Presentation of the Evaluation's findings and recommendations to UNODC.

7. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

- Inception Report
- Field visits in region (where necessary)
- one Draft Evaluation Report
- one Final Evaluation Report
- Debriefing / Presentation of Findings

8. PAYMENT

An Independent Evaluator will be issued with consultancy contract and paid in accordance with the United Nations rules and regulations. Payment will be made as three instalments and as per the above expected deliverables (Inception report - 30%, Draft Evaluation report – 30% and 40% - Final Evaluation report).

9. DESK REVIEW

The following will but not limited to be the preliminary list of documents to be consulted:

XAST17

- Project documents
- Project amendments
- Project revision documents
- UNODC Handbook and Training Manual on Effective Law Responses to Violence against Women
- Annual Project Progress Report
- XAST17 Project Steering Committee Meetings Minutes
- National and Regional Workshop Reports
- Consultant Workshop Reports
- Evaluations completed by workshop participants
- National Contextualised Pocketbooks
- Budgets and statements of expenditure detailing how funds under the budgets were utilized
- Any documents and materials related to the project which the evaluator may request
- Monitoring and Evaluation checklists
- Relevant national policy documents

XASS69

- Project documents
- Project amendments
- Project Revision documents
- Annual Project Progress Report
- Phase 1 and 2 Legal Assessments
- Budgets and statements of expenditure detailing how funds under the budgets were utilized
- Any documents and materials related to the project which the evaluator may request
- Relevant international and national policy documents
- Monitoring and Evaluation checklists

10. CORE LEARNING PARTNERS

- Southern African Development Community (SADC) Secretariat
- Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organisation(SARPCCO)
- Consultants XASS69 and XAST17
- Focal Points from six pilot countries(names to be provided)

- UNODC Regional Office for Southern Africa National Project Coordinator (SADC) Human Trafficking and Violence against Women Programmes

11. COMPETENCIES AND SKILLS REQUIRED FOR EVALUATION EXPERT

- Advanced university degree in law, criminology, law enforcement, and social sciences with specialized training in evaluation and project/program management;
- At least 5 years experience in designing and managing program/project evaluations including in the area law enforcement and international policy's)
- Familiarity with Human Trafficking and Gender based violence in Southern Africa;
- Proven experience in conducting independent evaluations on training interventions;
- Knowledge of the UN Protocols and guiding principles/ recommendations on Human Trafficking and Violence against Women;
- Personal skills: good communication, analytical and writing skills;
- Fluency in English is an asset in South Africa

12. BUDGET BREAKDOWN

ACTIVITY	AMOUNT IN US\$
Desk review of project document, reports and other relevant documents x 2 days	US\$ 720
Briefing of evaluator by the Programme Manager and/or Head Quarters (HIV and AIDS Unit) by telephonic call x 2 days	US\$ 720
Missions to countries in Southern Africa: x 10 days Activities: Meetings and interviews with identified stakeholders, identified beneficiaries and collaborative partners; debriefing with the Programme Manager	US\$ 3,600
Data analysis and preparation of draft report x 4 days payment	US\$ 1,440
Round of comments among relevant stakeholders including meetings x 5 days payment	US\$ 1800
Finalisation of the evaluation report x 2 days	US\$ 720
DSA costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodation • Daily Subsistence Allowance 	US\$ 1460
Travelling costs + terminals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flights • Car rental 	US\$ 1,400
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS	US\$ 11, 900
TOTAL BUDGETED COSTS	US\$ 20,100

ANNEX II: LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED DURING EVALUATION

A copy of the questionnaire was emailed to the list of contact persons below. Responses were received from the following contact persons:

Ms. Susan Chemurema	-	SARPCCO, Harare
Mr. Richard Butali	-	Botswana Police Service, Training Division
Ms. Elizabeth Kakukuru	-	SADC Secretariat, Programme Officer: Gender
Noel Frank Kayira	-	Malawi Police Service, Deputy Head for Community Policing Services

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

BOTSWANA:

Kwena Rammekwa

Ministry of Defence, Justice and Security – Deputy Permanent Secretary

Augustine Makgonatsotlhe

Ministry of Defence, Justice and Security – Secretary for Defence; Justice and Security

Mr. Richard Butali

Botswana Police Service – Training Division

LESOTHO

Puleng Mbangamthi

Lesotho Ministry of Home Affairs, Public Safety and Parliamentary Affairs – Chief Legal Officer

MALAWI

Joseph Mkandawire

Malawi Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security – Director of Administration

Noel Frank Kayira

Malawi Police Service – Deputy Head for Community Policing Services

Chizaso Eric Nyirongo, Esq

Malawi Law Commission – Assistant Chief Law Reform Officer

NAMIBIA

Ms. Sirkka Ausiku

Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare – Permanent Secretary

Mr. Victor Shipoh

Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare – Director

Ms. Penoshinge Shilifa

Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare – Deputy Director: Research and Legislation

SEYCHELLES

Joseph Francois

Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Director General of Protocol, Treaties and Consular Affairs

Ian Madeleine

Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Third Secretary: Treaties and Consular Affairs

Samantha Aglae

Attorney General Chambers – Senior Legal Draftsperson & Assistant Official Notary

SOUTH AFRICA

Thoko Majokweni

National Prosecution Authority, South Africa – Special Director of Public Prosecutions: Sexual Offences and Community Affairs (SOCA) Unit

Ms. Nolwandle Qaba

National Prosecution Authority, South Africa – Project Manager

SWAZILAND

Nomphumelelo Lukhele

Swaziland Inter-sectoral Task Force on Trafficking in Persons

ZIMBABWE

Owen Machokoh

Ministry of Home Affairs

Florence Ziyambi

Zimbabwe Attorney General's Office – Director of Public Prosecutions

Ms. Isabella Sergio

Zimbabwe Republic Police – Assistant Commissioner

SADC Secretariat

Ms. Magdeline Mathiba-Madibela

SADC Secretariat – Head: Gender Unit

Ms. Elizabeth Kakukuru

SADC Secretariat – Programme Officer: Gender

SARPCCO Liaison Office

Ms. Susan Chemurema

SARPCCO - Harare – Regional Specialized Officer

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 extent 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?
- Extend 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. DESK REVIEW LIST

Annual Report 2008

Annual Report 2009

Annual Report 2010

Annual Report 2011

Project Revision 2011

Project Document

Baseline assessment on the legislative framework on trafficking in persons

Terms of Reference

Workshop Reports

ANNEX V. RESULTS ACHIEVED

Outcomes/Outputs	Achievements
<p>Outcome 1: Selected SADC Member States will ratify, draft and adopt specific national anti-trafficking legislation, in accordance with the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and children</p>	<p>UNODC ROSAF, in consultation with UNODC Anti-Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Unit (AHTSMU), has assisted either with drafting of legislation or providing legal and technical advice on draft legislation developed to Lesotho, Malawi, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe. Legal and technical advice provided, pertained to more effective drafting and inclusion of certain text into draft legislation in order to ensure adherence to provisions and obligations as provided for in the Convention and the Protocol.</p> <p>Lesotho has promulgated legislation in January 2011. Malawi has developed a draft Bill. UNODC ROSAF is currently in the process of providing legal and technical advice on the Zimbabwe draft Bill as well as on the Swaziland legislation aimed at strengthening the adopted Act.</p> <p>UNODC ROSAF has assisted Lesotho and Swaziland with the development of a national plan of action and national strategic plan respectively and has assisted Swaziland with training of prosecutors in order to operationalize its anti-trafficking in persons legislation.</p>
<p>Output 1.1: Four SADC Member States identified to benefit from the project's activities in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be identified in phase two when funding is secured.</p>	<p>Four SADC Member States, namely Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Swaziland, were identified in October 2008, in consultation with SADC, as countries to benefit from outcomes of the project during Phase I; and Angola, Lesotho, Seychelles and Zimbabwe to benefit from Phase II.</p>
<p>Output 1.2: National, in-depth legal assessments on anti-human trafficking measures and provisions carried out in four of the SADC Member States in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be assessed in phase two when funding is secured.</p>	<p>In-depth legal assessments have been conducted in the beneficiary Countries. Although no comments have been received from all the beneficiary countries (Lesotho, Seychelles and Zimbabwe) the report will be used to guide legislative and policy development in the respective Member States.</p>
<p>Output 1.3: Legal advice provided to all SADC Member States and draft legislation (in line with the UN instruments) developed in selected four countries in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be assisted in drafting</p>	<p><i>Phase I:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Botswana</i> – UNODC ROSAF assisted in drafting of the Cabinet Memorandum for Botswana government seeking Cabinet approval to draft comprehensive legislation against Trafficking in Persons. Approval was received in October 2011, to commence with drafting of comprehensive legislation. UNODC ROSAF had also provided input and legal advice regarding initial drafting to amend the Serious Offences Act with a view to incorporate some of the provisions of the Protocol on Trafficking in Persons.

<p>legislation and continuous legal advice will be provided to all SADC Member States in phase two when funding is secured.</p>	<p>UNODC has had discussions on hosting a 2-day national coordination work session to enhance national coordination and cooperation among relevant stakeholders and to discuss legislative and policy framework development. UNODC ROSAF provided the national focal point with a number of copies of the <i>UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons - A Handbook for Parliamentarians</i>, the <i>UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol</i>, the <i>UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons</i> and the UNODC CD-ROM <i>Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools</i>.</p> <p>UNODC ROSAF provided training on the international legal framework pertaining to trafficking in persons to the Strategic Leadership Programme of the Botswana Police Training College.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Namibia</i> – Namibia revised its Prevention of Organized Crime Act and has criminalized Trafficking in Persons by including a definition of Trafficking in Persons in this Act. UNODC ROSAF hosted and facilitated a 2-day national inter-departmental work session that was attended by 28 participants from all relevant government departments and aimed at strengthening national coordination. The work session adopted recommendations and a way forward, including on the development of comprehensive legislation, a national plan of action and the establishment of a national coordination mechanism. UNODC provided all participants <i>UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons - A Handbook for Parliamentarians</i>, the <i>UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol</i>, the <i>UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons</i> and the UNODC CD-ROM <i>Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools</i>. • <i>Malawi</i> – UNODC ROSAF provided assistance regarding the legislative process. <p>UNODC ROSAF also supported the Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) regional workshop on Human Trafficking Regional Best Practices in Lilongwe, Malawi.</p> <p>UNODC provided assistance to Swaziland to draft a National Strategic Framework.</p> <p>UNODC hosted and facilitated a 3-day national interdepartmental work session aimed at national coordination in the amendment, harmonization and implementation of legislation as well as the development and implementation of a National Strategic Framework.</p> <p>UNODC provided all participants <i>UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons - A Handbook for Parliamentarians</i>, the <i>UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol</i>, the <i>UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons</i> and the UNODC CD-ROM <i>Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools</i>.</p> <p>Swaziland is currently in the process of amending and strengthening its comprehensive legislation and in this regard, UNODC is providing legal and technical advice in support of the amendments.</p> <p>UNODC supported technical drafting involving 5 policy</p>
---	--

and legal drafters from all relevant government departments during which substantial amendments were suggested aimed at strengthening the existing comprehensive legislation.

Phase II

- *Angola* – UNODC ROSAF tried various options to set up a meeting with the Government of Angola, but was unsuccessful. UNODC ROSAF has received information, albeit informal, that Angola has ratified the Convention and acceded to the Protocol on Trafficking, although instruments of ratification have not yet been deposited.

- *Lesotho* – Completed legal assessment. Lesotho has promulgated specialized legislation in January 2011. In March 2011, UNODC ROSAF supported and facilitated a 2-day inter-sectoral workshop on the development of a National Plan of Action hosted by the Government of Lesotho. UNODC also provided input on the draft plan and facilitated the plenary and working groups of the workshop. UNODC ROSAF provided all participants *UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons A Handbook for Parliamentarians*, the *UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol*, the *UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons* and the UNODC CD-ROM *Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools*. UNODC ROSAF is expecting the final draft of the National Plan of Action during the first quarter of 2012.

- *Seychelles* – Completed legal assessment. UNODC ROSAF hosted a national inter-departmental work session aimed at strengthening national coordination in relation to the development of comprehensive legislation, policy framework and national plan of action and will continue assisting the Government of Seychelles in the development of comprehensive legislation and a national plan of action. UNODC ROSAF provided all participants with the *UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons - A Handbook for Parliamentarians*, the *UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol*, the *UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons* and the UNODC CD-ROM *Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools*. UNODC ROSAF continues to engage the focal point for Seychelles in order to determine a way forward for the drafting of legislation and development of a national plan of action.

- *Zimbabwe* – Completed legal assessment. Zimbabwe has developed comprehensive draft legislation on trafficking in persons, but is yet to table the legislation in Parliament. UNODC ROSAF provided assistance on the ratification of the Protocol, promulgation of legislation and the development of a national policy and strategy framework. Zimbabwe is still to accede to the Protocol on Trafficking although the President has formally indicated that Zimbabwe will be acceding to this instrument during the first session of Parliament in 2012. UNODC provided the national focal point with copies of the *UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons - A Handbook for Parliamentarians*, the *UNODC International Framework for Action to*

	<p><i>Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol, the UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons and the UNODC CD-ROM Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools.</i></p> <p>Zimbabwe has developed draft legislation on trafficking in persons.</p> <p><i>Cross-cutting legal and technical advice</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNODC supported the Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Coordinating Organization (SARPCCO) Coordinating Office (as a division of SADC) with regards to various training and technical working group activities for Member States in relation to trafficking in persons, smuggling of migrants and organized crime. A total of 22 law enforcement officers were trained during that regional training workshop, all of which received all relevant UNODC resource material on CD-ROM including the <i>UNODC Anti-human Trafficking Manual for Criminal Justice Practitioners</i>. • UNODC ROSAF reprinted 500 copies each of the <i>UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons - A Handbook for Parliamentarians</i>, the <i>UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol</i>, the <i>UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons</i>, the <i>UNODC Needs Assessment Toolkit on the Criminal Justice Response to Human Trafficking</i> and the <i>United Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its Addition Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children</i>, for dissemination to SADC Member States and for use during regional training and national coordination activities.
<p>Output 1.4: The drafting of national policy, including a plan of action against trafficking in persons, supported in four SADC Member States in phase one; an additional four SADC Member States will be assisted in drafting a plan of action against trafficking in phase two when funding is secured.</p>	<p><i>Phase I: (Continued assistance and advice is provided to countries included in Phase I)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Malawi</i> – UNODC ROSAF assisted Malawi to reinvigorate the legislative process and commence with the development of a policy and strategy framework. • <i>Namibia</i> – UNODC ROSAF assisted the government on a way forward on the development of comprehensive legislation, a national plan of action and the establishment of a national coordination mechanism. The recommendation was submitted to Cabinet for approval. • <i>Swaziland</i> – UNODC ROSAF assisted Swaziland to start drafting a National Strategy Framework. The first draft of the National Strategy Framework was developed and UNODC ROSAF will provide further advice and assistance on the adoption of the final policy and strategy document. UNODC ROSAF has also provided 20 copies each of the <i>Convention and Protocol on Trafficking in Persons</i>, the <i>UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol</i>, and the <i>UNODC CD-ROM Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools</i> to members of the Task Team. UNODC ROSAF hosted and facilitated a 3-day national inter-departmental work session aimed at national coordination in the amendment, harmonization and implementation of legislation as well as the development and implementation of a National Strategic Framework.

	<p><i>Phase II</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lesotho</i> – UNODC ROSAF provided assistance on the development of National Plan of Action. UNODC ROSAF provided input on the draft plan. UNODC ROSAF disseminated 80 copies each of the <i>Convention and Protocol on Trafficking in Persons</i>, the <i>UNODC International Framework for Action to implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol</i>, and the UNODC CD-ROM <i>Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools</i>. • <i>Seychelles</i> – UNODC ROSAF provided assistance towards strengthening national coordination in relation to the development of comprehensive legislation, policy framework and national plan of action. UNODC ROSAF proposed a framework for the development of a national plan of action which was in principle adopted. • <i>Zimbabwe</i> – UNODC ROSAF provided assistance towards a way forward on the ratification of the Protocol, promulgation of legislation and the development of a national policy and strategy framework. UNODC ROSAF provided assistance towards the development of a national plan of action. <p><i>Cross-cutting legal and technical advice</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>South Africa</i>– UNODC ROSAF facilitated a 2-day inter-departmental work session in May 2011 on the development of a National Strategy Framework hosted by the Government of South Africa. UNODC ROSAF also disseminated 20 copies each of the <i>Convention and Protocol on Trafficking in Persons</i>, the <i>UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol</i>, and the UNODC CD-ROM <i>Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools</i> to all participants at the workshop.
<p>Outcome 2: SADC will develop and adopt a Declaration and Plan of Action against Trafficking in Persons</p>	<p>Outcome 2 has been achieved in 2009. The SADC Council of Ministers approved the <i>10 Year SADC Strategic Plan of Action on Combating Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (2009 – 2019)</i> in September 2009.</p>
<p>Output 2.1: In phase one, a SADC Declaration and Plan of Action on Trafficking in Persons is drafted and adopted.</p>	<p>This output was achieved in 2009. UNODC ROSAF continues to engage with the SADC Secretariat with regards to future implementation and operationalization of the SADC Plan of Action. UNODC, together with the African Union Commission (AUC), hosted a 2-day regional conference aimed at launching the AU.COMMIT programme in Southern Africa and strengthening regional coordination and cooperation among SADC Member States in relation to development of legislation, national plans of action and regional cooperation. UNODC also provided delegates with copies of the <i>UNODC Combating Trafficking in Persons - A Handbook for Parliamentarians</i>, the <i>UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Trafficking in Persons Protocol</i>, the <i>UNODC Model Law against Trafficking in Persons</i> and the UNODC CDROM <i>Trafficking in Persons - A Compendium of Documents and Tools</i>. In total approximately 80 copies were disseminated during this conference and the subsequent MME/EU continental conference.</p>

	<p>UNODC ROSAF continues to engage with the SADC Secretariat with regards to future implementation and operationalization of the SADC Plan of Action and has printed 800 copies of the English version and 300 copies each of the French and Portuguese versions of the Plan of Action which was disseminated to the SADC Secretariat (300 copies of the English version and 150 copies each of the French and Portuguese versions) and distributed during the AU/SADC/UNODC regional conference held in Johannesburg during November 2011.</p>
--	---