

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

Independent project evaluation of

**Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement
Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime
Migrant Smuggling in South East Asia**

XSP / X65
Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand

Independent Evaluation Unit
June 2013



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2013

This independent evaluation report was prepared by Peter Allan, Director, Allan Consultancy Ltd. in cooperation with the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

The Independent Evaluation Unit of 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, June 2013. 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	v
Summary matrix of findings, evidence and recommendations.....	xi
I. Introduction.....	1
Background and context	1
Evaluation methodology	2
II. Evaluation findings.....	4
Relevance.....	4
Effectiveness.....	7
Efficiency.....	8
Impact	10
Sustainability	10
Partnership and Cooperation.....	11
III. Conclusions.....	13
IV. Recommendations.....	15
V. Lessons learned.....	18
<i>Annexes</i>	
I. Terms of reference of the evaluation	19
II. Evaluation questionnaire.....	28
III. Stakeholders interviewed.....	29
IV. Desk review list	30

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACCBP	Anti-Crime Capacity-Building Program
AFP	Australian Federal Police
CAU	Coordination and Analysis Unit
CMIS	Case Management Information System
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JCLEC	Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation
PATROL	Partnership Against Transnational crime through Regional Organized Law Enforcement
PIU	Port Intelligence Unit
RCEAP	Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific
RCMP	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
SoM	Smuggling of Migrants
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TiP	Trafficking in Persons
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

UNODC through its Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific (RCEAP) has been actively involved through, for example, its Partnership Against Transnational crime through Regional Organized Law Enforcement (PATROL) and Coordination and Analysis Unit (CAU) Projects in attempting to tackle the phenomena of Smuggling of Migrants (SoM). UNODC is also a contributor to ‘the Bali Process’. This is a voluntary international forum and among its core objectives are more effective information and intelligence sharing and improved cooperation among regional law enforcement agencies to deter and combat people smuggling, trafficking in persons (TiP) and related transnational crime.

In recent years organized crime groups, particularly in South and South East Asia, have made increasing use of boats as a means of transporting large numbers of irregular migrants at relatively low cost. The vessels are typically not sea-worthy, and many migrants have lost their lives. Expert opinion argues that one of the most effective ways of dealing with this problem is through interdiction of vessels prior to departure. This can only be achieved through the development and sharing of reliable criminal intelligence followed by targeted operational activity in a manner that is coordinated locally, regionally, and internationally.

There is reporting¹ that Smuggling of Migrants (SoM) in Southeast Asia “has not attracted a critical amount of attention within the research community”. Consequently gaps in the current knowledge of the phenomenon have been highlighted. It has also been established that the national statistics are often fragmented and not easily accessible, which makes cross-country comparisons and analysis difficult if not impossible: “The reviewed literature reflects the paucity of and/or shortcomings in official quantitative data in many countries and the difficulties in accessing data that would allow a better grasp of both the extent of irregular migration and to what extent irregular migration is facilitated by migrant smugglers.”

Given the above the international community was keen to improve this situation and in January 2012 Canada – through their Anti-Crime Capacity-Building Program (ACCBP) – pledged CAD \$ 1.2 million to fund the activities of UNODC XSP / X65 project (the Project) from 1st January 2012 to 31st March 2013. The overall objective of this Project was “Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia”. The Project proposal also reflects the overall goal of UNODC’s *Regional Programme Framework for East Asia and Pacific 2009 to 2012* by aiming to *reduce illicit trafficking of people, drugs, illicit natural resources and hazardous substances*. Outcome 1.5 of the regional programme framework requires that *smuggling of migrants is identified and effectively acted upon*. This project specifically addresses a number of outputs under component 1.5 that include:

- (a) *1.5.1 Systems to generate, manage, analyze, report and use migrant smuggling information established and operational*
- (b) *1.5.3 Informed and capable law enforcement officers, prosecutors and judges*

¹ UNODC - Migrant Smuggling in Asia: A Thematic Review

The proposal reflects the provisions of the *United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime*, its *Protocol against the smuggling of migrants by land, sea and air*, as well as the *United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice* to which UNODC is guardian.

The Project has a geographic scope covering Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand. According to the approved Project proposal document the overall Project's objective was to be achieved through Port Intelligence Units (PIUs) Their reach:

“will extend well beyond their immediate locations however, and through the channels for cooperation and coordination that will be established, the units will be able to respond to intelligence from international as well as national sources, from border control units at land, sea and air entry points, and from criminal police. The PIUs will be multi-disciplinary and will include immigration officials, criminal police, maritime police, and where appropriate liaison from the national navy. with capacity to collect, evaluate, analyze and disseminate intelligence regarding criminal activities related to border violations, with particular focus on SoM. The Project further aimed to appropriately train the PIUs staff and establish effective coordination and communication channels between the relevant national and international actors”.

The project was organised under three thematic areas:

- (a) **Building infrastructure** – establishment of Port Intelligence Units (PIUs), equipment, Standard Operating Procedures, and IT
- (b) **Officer training and mentoring** – in intelligence and investigative skills
- (c) **Cooperation and Coordination** – MOUs, links to national, regional and international bodies for the purpose of effective intelligence sharing.

This Project evaluation looks to focus on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, partnerships and cooperation of the project as specified in the Terms of Reference (ToR) and will seek to identify lessons learned and formulate recommendations for the future development of the Project.

Major Findings

First and foremost it should be recognised that the Project has managed to achieve a lot in a short space of time and has laid the building blocks for potential PIU operational success in the future. In all three countries;

- (a) the location for the PIUs have been agreed and the physical refurbishment and equipping of the
- (b) buildings to be used for PIU purposes is almost complete
- (c) steering committees have been established
- (d) appropriate PIU Officers have been identified and assigned PIU specific roles
- (e) numerous training courses for those officers have been provided
- (f) Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) have been (or are in the process of being) ratified

(g) political buy-in and ownership (to differing levels) has been won

For a Project that has been running for only 17 months and that has stayed within a total budget of CAD \$ 1.2m these achievements should not be understated. The Project has been managed well by a relatively small number of UNODC staff. There is a Project Coordinator based in the UNODC RCEAP for whom this is officially not a full-time commitment though – in practice – has required their effective full-time involvement. They are supported by a full-time Programme Assistant who joined the team in November 2012. The Country Offices in Cambodia and Indonesia have also supplied staff dedicated to supporting the PIU implementation in their respective countries and their positive impact in moving the Project forward must be recognised. This evaluation contends that for the PIU concept to be given every chance of success the presence of UNODC country offices is crucial.

There is little doubt that the Project objective is relevant to donors, beneficiaries and the strategic objective(s) of UNODC in the region. That said it is a very broad objective and within the short period of the Project's existence there is no empirical evidence to support the argument that the Project has achieved this objective. The outputs however, built around the three thematic pillars of capacity building, officer training and mentoring and cooperation and coordination, can demonstrate achievement or partial achievement to date. The logical structure of those outputs supporting the overall objective is sound although this evaluation contends that the Project must examine in far more detail how it is going to measure the impact the PIUs have on the Project's objective.

The Project suffered in the conception phase from a lack of preparation time. It appears that donor funding was being made available and required a relatively quick response from prospective implementing partners. An original UNODC project proposal for the PIU concept was provided in November 2011 and budgeted at CAD \$ 5m. Although the concept was approved the funding made available was CAD \$ 1.2m which UNODC accepted and modified their budget to take account of the reduced funds. This modification of the Project removed an element on judicial reform but retained the bulk of the original proposal and scope by simply 'scaling back' the various budget lines. This is not ideal and at this point it could have made sense to suggest this should now be a minimum two year Project, however the funding modality of UNODC relying on year-to-year extra-budgetary project funding (c.88%) does not encourage long-term strategic thinking or planning.

This left a Project that had an ambitious project plan given the time available. For example the Project envisages *“through the channels for cooperation and coordination that will be established, the units will be able to respond to intelligence from international as well as national sources, from border control units at land, sea and air entry points, and from criminal police”*. At the conclusion the Project has managed to establish channels for future cooperation and coordination locally (e.g. multi-agency workshops), regionally (e.g. joint PIU training courses) and internationally (e.g. through the FANC). However it has fallen short in getting the PIUs fully operational and able to *“respond to intelligence from international as well as national sources”* of which the mentoring aspect is a crucial part. This evaluation saw little documentary evidence of feasibility studies, risk assessments, needs assessments etc. being undertaken prior to the launch of the Project. If these had been concluded it is quite possible that some of the more 'ambitious' elements of the Project would have been modified or given more time for delivery.

Subsequent Project reporting identifies some of the barriers to full implementation of the Projects outputs and these included:

(a) reaching agreement with beneficiary governments on various aspects of project implementation, including location and the multi-agency make-up of the PIUs, took a long time.

(b) delays in implementation can be caused by a number of factors most notably in the procurement process with delays in recruiting staff and employing suitable contractors.

This evaluation concludes that these are not ‘unforeseeable’ barriers and that any future Project – or extension of this Project – should include time and resources to fully scope the work and provide realistic objectives over a realistic timeframe.

Notwithstanding these difficulties the evaluation finds that the Project has used the funds at its disposal in an efficient manner. There were no obvious inefficiencies in the appropriation of funds and as highlighted earlier the Project has delivered a lot with the budget at its disposal. Thirty six different PIU officers from the three countries have attended a total of 15 different training courses. Some of these courses were joint with UNODC CAU and PATROL training courses, one was with the support of the Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC) and others have been supported by trainers from the Australian Federal Police (AFP) and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).

Although the overall quality of the training provided has been generally commented upon as being of a good standard the evaluation notes pockets of disquiet with some of the training. It was stated that on occasion it was felt that too much was crammed into too small a timeframe, not allowing the slower learners in the group to assimilate and practice the information being imparted. This shortcoming could have been mitigated if the mentoring aspect of the Project had occurred however (again due to lack of time) the mentoring of PIU Officers in their work has not yet happened. This is one key failing of the Project to date and any subsequent extension to this Project must ensure that mentoring is given a high priority.

Attempting to replicate a PIU model across three different countries has proved challenging and has been more successful in some countries than in others. In Cambodia the PIU will be staffed by 20 officers, with a multi-agency make-up, in a bespoke building and with a formal agreement signed by the Cambodian government. In Indonesia the PIU will be staffed by 5 officers for whom the PIU will form only part of their duties. It is single agency made up of immigration officers and is housed in part of an existing small office. There is no formal agreement in place with the Indonesian government on the PIU and its operations. This apparent disparity in potential capability could have a negative impact once the PIUs become operational and attempt to work in harmony across international boundaries.

The Project has recognised that sustainability must be built into the PIUs and that government buy-in and ownership is crucial. It made what this evaluation suggests was a good policy decision in not setting precedence by funding the salaries of PIU officers or to contribute to the long-term running costs of the PIUs. Instead assistance has been given in the three thematic areas already described and the states have – to date – accepted that the financial commitment to maintain the PIUs will have to be met by the states involved. The Project has not been running long enough to test the resolve of the governments to continue funding the PIUs. This evaluation would suggest that obtaining formal signed agreements on the role and position of PIUs within the national law enforcement architecture would be an important step in helping to ensure the national viability and existence of the PIUs in the future.

As noted the Project was ambitious and in attempting to provide all the deliverables with limited human resources priorities were made and attention was directed at delivering results ‘in the

field'. This evaluation does not suggest that this was incorrect; however there appears to have been a lack of balance when the third thematic area (Cooperation and Coordination) was being addressed. Attempts were certainly made to include major partners in the area and region such as INTERPOL and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). UNODC and the Project were transparent in their dealings with those organizations and the Project Coordinator did maintain email communication on an ad-hoc basis with his counterparts in those organizations. This evaluation suggests that any new Project (or new phase of this Project) should endeavour to more fully engage with other actors in the area, potentially involving donor community support in this task. Additionally the UNODC RCEAP should have a pro-active role in assisting the Project to engage with relevant actors and ensure the Project is fully integrated into the appropriate Regional and Country Programmes.

The issue of communication also stretches to the Project's communication with its donor. Although the strict requirements placed upon the Project with regard to donor reporting were met stakeholder interviews suggested that the communication between the Project and the donor could be improved. There is a misunderstanding between the donor and the Project regarding both the prominence given by the Project in reflecting the source of funding for the Project and the use of UK experts in the 15 Project training courses. These misunderstandings can be solved with relative ease through increased ad-hoc reporting by the Project on progress and activities of the Project and face-to-face meetings between the Project team and the donor where any areas of concern can be raised.

Main Conclusions

The Project is relevant to the donor community, UNODC strategic objectives and state beneficiaries and has achieved a great deal in a short space of time. It has done this efficiently through the hard work of a small number of UNODC officers dedicated to the Project based in UNODC RCEAP and the country offices of Cambodia and Indonesia.

It has fallen short in some of its key deliverables and this has occurred due to an overly ambitious project plan which was not informed by any detailed feasibility study and which did not recognise at the outset some critical limiting factors. Key in those limiting factors was the rate of implementation of the Project due to procurement delays and slow political ownership. As a result, although the PIU concept appears and remains sound, it has yet to be tested in an operational environment. There remains work to be completed before the success of the PIUs can be assessed. The focus of any new Project (or continuation of the existing Project) should be on ensuring the three PIUs created to date are fully functioning and are having the impact expected before rolling out the concept to any other countries.

The ability of the PIUs to share information between each other and work on intelligence generated and supplied across international boundaries is still aspirational rather than fact. It will require substantial effort at a political level to establish the protocols required to facilitate this and to then empower the appropriate officials to make it happen at an operational level.

Key Recommendations

The Project should be extended to ensure the PIUs reach operational capacity.

Any extension of the Project should be preceded by a full feasibility study.

The general *modus operandi* of UNODC in its delivery of the Project outputs should be continued. In particular the engagement of the country offices is seen as crucial in pushing the Project forward.

No expansion of the PIU concept into other countries should be attempted until the operational capability and impact of the existing PIUs can be assessed.

Conclude formal agreement with Indonesia on the PIUs and ensure all PIU agreements include;

- (a) the PIU role within each state's law enforcement architecture
- (b) the Standard Operating Procedures for PIUs
- (c) the level of – and commitment to maintaining – state support for the PIUs including continuity of staff.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings²: problems and issues identified	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations³
The Project was and remains relevant to donors, UNODC programming and beneficiaries. The concept of the PIU appears sound. The Project fell short in some of its key deliverables partially through delays in implementation caused by the speed of partner response. However all three PIUs are now close to operational capability.	Desk review of Project and other documentation including non-UNODC research and feedback from field interviews with the various stakeholder groups. Review and comparison of Project objectives, outputs and outcomes against the evidenced deliverables of the Project to date.	UNODC/Donors/Beneficiaries: The Project should be extended to ensure the PIUs reach operational capacity.
The Project failed to invest enough resources at the beginning of the Project to identify possible barriers and risks to the implementation of the Project. This led to an overly ambitious objective for the Project.	A lack of any feasibility study or needs assessment coupled with a basic, sparse Project document.	UNODC X65 Project Team: Any extension of the Project should be preceded by a full feasibility study. This study should include a comprehensive Project Plan with relevant milestones and strategies for overcoming the identified risks and barriers to PIU implementation in each of the three countries. Realistic timeframes and objectives should be set.
The Project has managed to achieve a large amount in a relatively short space of time. There is agreement from the three countries to establish the PIUs, locations and officers have been identified, offices almost fully equipped and a substantial amount of training delivered.	Review of Project documentation, evaluator visit to all three countries and interviews with appropriate stakeholders.	UNODC X65 Project Team / Country Office: The general modus operandi of UNODC in its delivery of the Project outputs should be continued. In particular the engagement of the country offices is seen as crucial in pushing the Project forward.
The PIUs, whilst sound in	None of the three PIUs are yet	UNODC: No expansion of the

² A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement.

³ Recommendations are proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a project/programme; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions.

concept and attracting donor and beneficiary support, have still to prove operationally effective.	fully operational and providing any support to investigating and disrupting the SoM.	PIU concept into other countries should be attempted until the operational capability and impact of the existing PIUs can be assessed.
The Project has attempted to build sustainability into the PIUs by not providing funds for PIU staff or other running costs but concentrating on procurement of equipment, training and mentoring. However with a lack of a signed formal agreement from Indonesia on the implementation of the PIU Project there is a possibility that long-term state commitment to the Project will disappear.	Desk review of Project and associated documentation did not reveal explicit, concrete beneficiary commitment to the long-term sustainability of the PIUs from national budgets. Both the desk review and the interviews only elicited generalisations about state sustainability.	UNODC / Beneficiaries: Conclude formal agreement with Indonesia on the PIUs. Ensure all PIU agreements between all three countries include: - their role within each state's law enforcement architecture - the Standard Operating Procedures for PIUs - the level of – and commitment to maintaining – state support for the PIUs including continuity of staff.
The general approach of the Project in providing training then backed-up by on site mentoring within the PIUs is sound. To date no mentoring has yet been achieved and the training – while on the whole well received – has been subject to some criticism.	Desk review of intended outputs against those actually delivered and stakeholder interviews.	UNODC: If the Project continues the mentoring aspect should be pursued with vigour and the consistency of the mentoring message and approach across all three PIUs should be agreed at the outset and maintained. Any new or associated training should be subject to more rigorous debrief and evaluation.
The Project has attempted to interact with other actors in the region with varying degrees of success. Most notable among the absentees in this cooperation and coordination aspect are INTERPOL and IOM. The evaluation recognises that the Project has made efforts to engage with both those actors.	Review of documents including emails from the Project Coordinator and stakeholder interviews.	UNODC / Donors: Use the resources and expertise of UNODC RCEAP and engage more fully with the donor community to ensure 'Phase 2' of the Project works as closely as possible with the other actors and stakeholders in the region including INTERPOL and IOM.
The Project has not communicated with the donor community and in particular the Project donor as effectively as necessary. This has led to the perception that the Project has not recognised or represented the importance of the donor to the Project with other national and international stakeholders.	Desk review and stakeholder interviews.	UNODC Project Team: To instigate a reporting regime and communication strategy with the donor that meets their expectations. Regular face-to-face debriefs and ad-hoc Project updates should form part of this regime.

<p>This perception is largely inaccurate but the fact it exists indicates communication difficulties that have to be resolved.</p>		
<p>The current Project appears to be aligned in general with the Regional and Country Programming of UNODC. Any extension of the Project should ensure that full advantage is taken of the potential benefits from integrating the Project with other regional Projects and Programmes including the CAU and PATROL Projects and should ensure it is relevant to the appropriate country programmes. The Project has already liaised closely with CAU and PATROL and this approach should be continued.</p>	<p>Desk review of Project documents and UNODC regional and country programmes along with interviews with UNODC staff.</p>	<p>UNODC: The feasibility study on the extension of the Project should include an examination of how and where the Project will fit and interact with the Regional and Country Programmes of UNODC and the other thematic areas of UNODC.</p>
<p>The PIUs are almost exclusively staffed by male officers and this has led to gender imbalance in the training courses that have been delivered.</p>	<p>Analysis of training group participants.</p>	<p>UNODC Project / SPU: The Project should attempt to find a better gender balance or detail why this balance cannot be achieved.</p>

I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The aim of UNODC X65 project (the Project) is the “Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia” which started in January 2012 with geographic scope covering Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand. Thematically the evaluation focuses on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, partnerships and cooperation of the project as specified in the Terms of Reference (ToR) and will seek to identify lessons learned and formulate recommendations for the future development of the Project.

According to the approved Project proposal the overall project’s objective of disrupting migrant smuggling operations in South-East Asia was to be achieved through Port Intelligence Units (PIUs) with capacity to collect, evaluate, analyze and disseminate intelligence regarding criminal activities related to border violations, with particular focus on smuggling of migrants (SoM). The PIUs were to be multi-disciplinary institutions staffed with immigration officials, criminal police, maritime police, and where appropriate liaison from the national navy. The project further aimed to appropriately train the PIUs staff and establish effective coordination and communication channels between the relevant national and international actors.

The Project contributes to the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime. Development of more effective information and intelligence sharing and improved cooperation among regional law enforcement agencies to deter and combat people smuggling and trafficking networks are among the core objectives of this voluntary international forum.

The Co-chairs’ statement concluding the Fifth Ministerial Conference of the Bali Process held in Indonesia on the 2nd of April 2013 recommends participating states to “proactively share migration-related information and e-Learning opportunities”. The statement also directly endorses UNODC activities by encouraging member states “to participate in the Voluntary Reporting System on Migrant Smuggling and Related Conduct developed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to strengthen its value as an information database to enhance and better inform policy development in response to migrant smuggling.”

The Project documentation refers to the recent comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon “Migrant Smuggling in Asia: A Thematic Review” supplemented with an annotated bibliography. The review for the first time consolidates existing research literature on migrant smuggling in 14 countries across Asia (Afghanistan, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Pakistan, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam).

One of the general findings of the report is that SoM “has not attracted a critical amount of attention within the research community”. Consequently gaps in the current knowledge of the phenomenon have been highlighted in the report, to direct research to those areas. It has also been established that the national statistics are often fragmented and not easily accessible, which makes

cross-country comparisons and analysis difficult if not impossible: "The reviewed literature reflects the paucity of and/or shortcomings in official quantitative data in many countries and the difficulties in accessing data that would allow a better grasp of both the extent of irregular migration and to what extent irregular migration is facilitated by migrant smugglers."

The Project addresses this very problem by creating an environment in which intelligence of the phenomenon could be developed and increasing communication and exchange of this accumulated knowledge. The three pillars of the project are institutional capacity in the form of PIUs, coordination between various actors active in the area of countering SoM and developing and distributing knowledge to enable intelligence-led, investigative efforts that aim at dismantling the criminal networks responsible for SoMs. This evaluation suggests that the Project aims to fill these identified gaps in the regional effort to counter SoM through information gathering and operational activity targeted at SoM.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The following methodology was utilised in the evaluation of the Project.

The elements that combined to create the initial logic model for the X65 Project were identified and broken down into their component parts. From this the appropriate indicators that existed at the time of the conception and initial implementation of the Project were identified. This was a key step in determining the baseline from which the Project started to determine if the design of the Project was logical given circumstances at the time. The desk review assisted in determining this baseline along with interviews of appropriate individuals, most notably those involved during the inception of the programme. The field visits, interviews and additional research helped elicit the additional information required to cover the list of ToR questions as detailed in Annex I and complete the evaluation. The data to complete the evaluation as described came from three main sources:

- (a) Desk review of the Project documentation a list of which is supplied at Annex IV.
- (b) Semi-Structured Interviews. These interviews introduced a quantitative as well as qualitative approach. Likert Scale questions were asked in some of the key areas of the evaluation as detailed in Annex II. The qualitative aspect was covered through the MSC narration analysis.
- (c) MSC narration analysis. The theory and use of MSC narration is a well-documented and researched approach to evaluating and monitoring change projects. It is particularly useful in the evaluation of outcomes and impact and does not rely on the identification and monitoring of indicators. It is a systematic collection and then analysis of significant changes over a defined period of time. It allows interviewee respondents to answer an open-ended question in a way which highlights their own personal understanding and appreciation of the project / programme.

To ensure objectivity was built into the evaluation methodology, the analysis is triangulated by analysing data received from different sets of stakeholders. By doing this the effect that inherent biases have on the analysis and evaluation process can be reduced. As noted in UNODC Evaluation Guidelines, UNODC evaluations are "selective investigations aimed at collecting and analyzing data, formulating conclusions and making recommendations of practical relevance to the operations of UNODC and its partners." It is a trans-discipline at the intersection of the social sciences and a tool for management and policy which requires its own bespoke approach. Bearing the latter in mind for the purpose of this evaluation, and in order to keep it as manageable as

possible, a simple categorization of interviewees has been developed: UNODC staff, partners, beneficiaries and donors. This categorization, developed on the basis of the roles each category plays in relation to the implementation of the Project rather than on the basis of random selection, helped ensure proper representation in the overall research sample. A full list of those interviewed can be found at Annex III.

LIMITATIONS TO THE EVALUATION

The limitations were:

(a) The lack of time to develop an Inception Report beyond a basic document. The evaluation contract began on the 19th April 2013 and on the 22nd April the evaluator was travelling to begin the field visits and interviews. This had a knock-on effect on the initial preparedness of the evaluator during the field visits. This manifested itself in the realisation in the early stages of the interview process that some of the interview questions developed for the field visit were not as relevant as they should have been and thus the objective of gaining useful quantitative data was compromised. To mitigate against this the evaluator adapted the questions to suit the relevant stakeholder groups when in the field.

(b) An initial lack of detailed desk review material at the start of the evaluation process left the evaluator with many knowledge gaps regarding the Project. The Inception Report was constructed by reference to twelve documents. Over the course of the evaluation process both during and after the evaluator's field visit this number of documents had grown to sixty eight and helped fill many of those knowledge gaps.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

RELEVANCE

Relevance of a project is defined for the purposes of an evaluation as “the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the beneficiaries’ requirements, the country’s needs, global priorities and the partners’ and donors’ policies.

In line with the principle of tripartite review, the evaluation needs to assess the extent to which the Projects objectives are continuously consistent with recipients’ needs, UNODC mandate, overarching strategies and policies and the expectations of the donor community.

Relevance for UN regulations and UNODC programming

UNODC has established its role in setting standards in countering and prevention of crime. Some of these standards have received sufficient support of the international community and are now enshrined in international conventions to which UNODC is a guardian. In the area of SoM the relevant source of law is the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime with its Protocol against the smuggling of migrants by land, sea and air. The UNODC’s efforts to ensure effective implementation of the convention by the contracting parties must remain in accordance with the United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.

In line with the aforementioned documents UNODC mandate encompasses regional capacity building in preventing and effectively tackling the SoM through various forms of assistance, most notably creating a knowledge base of the phenomenon, various forms of organisational support for the relevant institutions and fostering international cooperation. The last two areas have become two pillars of the Project, which aimed at adding a focal point in the national law enforcement institutional architecture in the form of PIUs, at the same time trying to enhance cooperation among agencies both within countries and internationally.

Even though the project documentation does not contain the usual Logical Framework the project’s design ensured its relevance to the UNODC Strategy (2012 – 2015). Also the majority of subsequent activities of X65 were assessed by the interviewees as reflecting the office’s strategic objectives. The approved project proposal document refers the outcome 1.5 of the “Regional Programme Framework for East Asia and Pacific 2009 to 2012”, namely that “smuggling of migrants is identified and effectively acted upon”. Under this outcome the Project is relevant vis a vis two outputs:

(a) 1.5.1 Systems to generate, manage, analyze, report and use migrant smuggling information established and operational

(b) 1.5.3 Informed and capable law enforcement officers, prosecutors and judges

It needs however to be noted that the first output could be realised by the Voluntary Reporting System on Migrant Smuggling and Related Conduct (VRS-MSRC), which will feed into the Project's objective of "Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia", once all PIUs have achieved full operational capacity. The interface between the PIUs and the VRS-MSRC must be considered.

Also the judicial component of the Project had to be abandoned, consequently the judiciary have not been the focus of X65 training activities and the output 1.5.3 has not been fully embraced by the project.

Relevance for the partner countries

The recently conducted major review of literature of the subject - "Migrant Smuggling in Asia: A Thematic Review", highlighted the need to overcome shortcomings in official quantitative data on SoM. The Project objective encompassed not just that, but also, prospectively, analysing the accumulated data and adding value to it in the process of intelligence analysis. To achieve this ambitious goal the support of the regional countries needed to be ensured, which has been achieved with varying levels of success. The ToR for this evaluation observes that difficulties in negotiating the terms of assistance have caused delay to the delivery of the Project: "*This project has met with some inevitable delay resulting from a design process that involved very limited initial consultation with partner Governments. As a consequence the early months of the project were dominated by negotiation with the host Governments on the best way to implement the project.*" The fundamental need to introduce standards in data collection and improve cooperation in the sensitive area of intelligence, was however recognised by all three participating states.

Transnational Organized Crime in East Asia and the Pacific A Threat Assessment (TOCTA) published in April 2013 identified in the region twelve illicit flows, four among them including human beings:

- (a) movement between the countries of the region for general labour,
- (b) movement between the countries of the region for sexual exploitation,
- (c) smuggling of migrants from the region to the rich countries of the West,
- (d) migrants smuggled through the region from the poor and conflicted countries of South and Southwest Asia.

The TOCTA established a close link between the SoM and TiP in the region: "While the crimes of human trafficking and the smuggling of migrants are distinct, in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region (GMS), they are closely interlinked. Away from their home communities and in their destination countries illegally, smuggled migrants have little basis to assert their rights as workers, and what begins as a voluntary journey towards a better life can descend into exploitation."

The project attempts to approach this clearly complex and multi-faceted criminality in a comprehensive way through creation of information hubs in the form of PIUs, staffed with national experts trained and mentored by the consultants provided by the Project and ensuring effective cooperation between the three PIUs, which have been created so far.

Successful intelligence analysis requires highly qualified analysts, therefore provision of technical assistance, know-how and readily available expertise in the form of tailor made educational

materials, trainings and mentoring were the core project activities. It must therefore be said that the Project was successful in creating both physical and intellectual environment in which intelligence analysis of the phenomenon could begin to be developed. The foundation was created, but fully operational PIUs will need to see much greater cooperation between the partner countries, which would allow sharing relevant information. This needs to be reflected in changes in the national legislations, as operational activities touch upon sensitive area of human rights (right to privacy, presumption of innocence etc.) and the investigative powers need to be carefully regulated.

The available literature of the phenomenon, along with the project documentation and opinions expressed by the interviewed project stakeholders confirm continuing, high relevance of the Project's objective to the regional needs. This relevance has also achieved a formal confirmation in the initial agreements concluded with the partner countries. This potential for achieving a positive change can only be realised by fully operational PIUs, which should be at the center of any further Project activities.

Relevance for the donors

The Project came to existence because sufficient funds have been made available by the Canadian donor. The relevance of the Project to the donor stems from the fact that Canada is a target country of much of the migration flows from the region.

According to TOCTA "While Canada is a secondary destination for asylum seekers from South and West Asia, it is the destination of choice for those from Sri Lanka. Most smuggled migrants reach Canada by air, but boat arrivals have increased in recent years, including notable cases in 2009-2011. (...) The smuggling networks involved in bringing migrants to Canada from Sri Lanka are closely linked to the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)." Ottawa is home to a very large Tamil diaspora - approximately 300,000 persons - the largest Tamil population outside Sri Lanka.

The implications of this situation to national security require coordinated, international response and involvement of Canada in the Project forms a part of the country's assistance to the region. In addition to providing the funds, Canada has been actively involved in the project implementation, with experts from the RCMP taking part in delivering the project's outputs (mainly trainings).

SoM, closely linked to TiP has a profound effect on the societies of both source and target countries of illicit migration. In addition to continuing exploitation of large numbers of migrants, the use of the waters around South East Asia to conduct this criminality has led to a number of documented deaths. The smuggling of migrants by sea accounts for only a small proportion of the total number of migrants smuggled worldwide yet it accounts for the highest number of deaths among smuggled migrants. The serious nature of this type of criminality and an impact it has on the region's population are a challenge not only to the immediately affected countries, but to the international community in general. There is little doubt that tackling the SoM in South East Asia remains a topic of continuing relevance and the Project fills an important gap in the efforts to form a more coordinated approach to the problem.

EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness is defined by the UNODC Evaluation Handbook (EH) as a measure of ‘the extent to which a project or programme achieves its objectives and outcomes.’ The objective of the project, its outputs and outcomes are detailed in the ‘Workplan and Budget’ document of November 2011 and Project proposal document of January 2012 as ratified by the Canadian donor within their ‘Letter of Agreement’ of 14th February 2012. The objective of the Project is ‘to disrupt migrant smuggling operations in South-East Asia’ and its one outcome is noted as ‘strengthened operational law enforcement capacity to prevent and combat migrant smuggling in South-East Asia’.

The Project is due to end on the 30th May 2013 and the evaluation can provide no evidence that the objective has yet been achieved. Some progress toward achieving the outcome has been made with the PIUs nearing operational capacity and certain training courses having been delivered to the nascent PIU officers. These have not yet translated into positive action and thus this outcome has not – as yet – had an effect on the overall objective.

The Project has three outputs namely:

- (a) Building infrastructure
- (b) Officer training and mentoring
- (c) Coordination and cooperation

Of these three outputs the evaluation can conclude that substantial progress has been made toward building infrastructure with all three PIUs either ready or very close to being ready for operational work. Officer training has been provided however delays in achieving operational capacity for the PIUs have meant that no mentoring has – as yet – taken place. The extent of coordination and cooperation is progressing with respect to the Project’s interaction with the appropriate national state bodies in each of the three countries. Formal agreements for the implementation of the PIUs and adoption of Standard Operating Procedures are being negotiated. However the level of coordination and cooperation with actors outside the immediate circle of UNODC Project team and relevant state actors is not as well developed.

The effectiveness in delivering the various outputs that have contributed to establishing the PIUs have in general been good and to date the following outputs have been delivered in all three countries:

- (a) the location for the PIUs have been agreed and the physical refurbishment and equipping of the
- (b) buildings to be used for PIU purposes is almost complete
- (c) steering committees have been established
- (d) appropriate PIU Officers have been identified and assigned PIU specific roles
- (e) numerous training courses for those officers have been provided
- (f) Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) have been (or are in the process of being) ratified
- (g) political buy-in and ownership (to differing levels) has been won

For a Project that has been running for only 17 months and that has stayed within a total budget of CAD \$ 1.2m these achievements should not be understated. The Project has been managed well by a relatively small number of UNODC staff. There is a Project Coordinator based in the UNODC RCEAP for whom this is officially not a full-time commitment though – in practice – has required his effective full-time involvement. He is supported by a full-time Programme Assistant who joined the team in November 2012. The country offices in Cambodia and Indonesia have also supplied staff dedicated to supporting the PIU implementation

The Project suffered in the conception phase from a lack of preparation time. It appears that donor funding was being made available and required a relatively quick response from prospective implementing partners. An original UNODC project proposal for the PIU concept was provided in November 2011 and budgeted at CAD \$ 5m. Although the concept was approved the funding made available was CAD \$ 1.2m which UNODC accepted and modified their budget to take account of the reduced funds. The revised CAD \$ 1.2m Project proposal supplied by UNODC did not materially alter the concept, scale or scope of the Project with the exception of removing a judicial review element. In accepting a 76% reduction in funding this evaluation contends that the initial Project objective, outputs and outcome should have been substantially revised.

This left a Project that had an overly ambitious project plan. For example the Project envisages *“through the channels for cooperation and coordination that will be established, the units will be able to respond to intelligence from international as well as national sources, from border control units at land, sea and air entry points, and from criminal police”*. At the conclusion of the Project progress has been made toward this however the PIUs are not yet fully operational and still a substantial way short of being able to *“respond to intelligence from international as well as national sources”*.

The evaluation notes that the overall Project objective is ambitious and as a result the overall effectiveness of the Project i.e. ‘the extent to which a project or programme achieves its objectives and outcomes’ must be judged as having fallen short although good progress has been made toward the overall objective.

EFFICIENCY

The UNODC Evaluation Handbook (EH) defines efficiency of a project as “a measure of how well resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) are converted into outputs”. According to UNODC Guidelines for Evaluation Reports one of the aims of a project evaluation is to assess the extent to which the planned outputs have been delivered and how they contributed to the attainment of the objectives.

The evaluation views the Project as generally efficient with good use being made of the various inputs including expert knowledge in developing and delivering training and in developing the SOPs for the PIUs. A spot check on the audit trail of the finances of the Project did not reveal any inefficient or inappropriate use of funds.

A large output area for the Project is training and it has efficiently ensured that thirty six different PIU officers from the three countries have attended a total of 15 different training courses. Some of these courses were joint with UNODC CAU and PATROL training courses, one was with the support of the Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC) and others have been supported by trainers from the Australian Federal Police (AFP) and the Royal Canadian Mounted

Police (RCMP). Although generally well received some of the training, specifically the training on computer software, has been criticised as being delivered too quickly. In a similar vein it was felt that the week long investigative skills course had too much squeezed into too little time. It will make sense for the Project to instigate a more thorough post-course evaluation regime to determine what aspects of the courses may need altered.

Human rights training is a component of the training package being delivered, and all trainees are urged to base their actions on a respect for human rights and the dignity of those with whom they deal. The selection of staff for training has been made by each participating agency and in practice has been based primarily on the chosen location as a determining factor. Staff working at the chosen locations have been put forward by the agency for training / participation in the project, and across all three countries only one female officer has been selected. While the evaluation recognizes the difficulties the Project faces in influencing participant choice for training courses efforts must be made to ensure gender balanced composition of the training groups in line with the UNODC human rights obligations outlined in the relevant international documents and an internal position paper “UNODC and the promotion and protection of human rights”, which clearly states that, “*In all fields, in particular in the political, social, economic and cultural fields, all appropriate measures, including legislation, shall be taken to ensure the full development and advancement of women. All appropriate measures shall be taken to modify the social and cultural patterns of conduct of men and women, with a view to achieving the elimination of prejudices and customary and all other practices which are based on the idea of the inferiority or the superiority of either of the sexes or on stereotyped roles for men and women.*” The Project does vet the trainees for known human rights violations.

However there were (and are) some barriers and impediments to efficient Project implementation, specifically:

(a) reaching agreement with beneficiary governments on various aspects of project implementation, including location and the multi-agency make-up of the PIUs, took a long time.

(b) delays in implementation can be caused by a number of factors most notably in the procurement process with delays in recruiting staff and employing suitable contractors.

For example the Programme Assistant for the Project did not start until November 2012 and local contractors that have the ability to provide the background and history required by UNDP procurement regulations meant that refurbishment of the PIU building in Sihanoukville, Cambodia was also delayed by several months. Additionally there appear to have been some delays, or at least lengthy processes, in the negotiation with state partners to push the PIUs forward.

“Reaching agreement with the beneficiary Governments on various aspects of the project implementation, such as the multi-agency make-up of the PIUs and the identification of premises, proved to be highly time-consuming. A formal agreement has only been signed in Cambodia, although in all three countries there is clear commitment from the key partner agencies to support the development of the PIUs.”⁴

Although there are potentially many reasons outside UNODC control for this time consuming process the desk review finds no identification of these potential risks (delays in the procurement

⁴ 11. IGC Narrative reporting Interim report Jan 2013

and negotiating processes) being made at the outset of the Project. Indeed there is no reference to any risks in the project proposal document.

This evaluation saw little documentary evidence of feasibility studies, risk assessments, needs assessments etc. being undertaken prior to the launch of the Project. If these had been concluded it is quite possible that these barriers and risks would have been identified and strategies developed or plans changed to cope with them. This evaluation concludes that these are not 'unforeseeable' barriers and that any future Project – or extension of this Project – should include time and resources to fully scope the work and provide realistic objectives over a realistic timeframe.

IMPACT

As noted previously this Project has not reached its objective however that is not to say that it hasn't had an impact in different areas. It is noted that individual actors, falling within the Project's scope, have been given some of the tools to ensure they can provide a future impact on the overall objective. Furthermore investment in the infrastructure of the PIUs has also improved the potential of the three countries (Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand) to tackle maritime SoM. The profile of UNODC in the three countries has been raised in the field of tackling SoM through the dedication of the Project team in Bangkok along with their counterparts in the country offices in highlighting the issue (e.g. the production of brochures) and their continual efforts to establish the PIUs. Finally the establishment of three similar PIUs in three different countries also improves the likelihood of information exchange and subsequent international cooperation in tackling SoM.

Having noted this, however, it is still impossible for this evaluation to state that there has been any tangible, positive impact on the overall objective of the Project. Should the Project be extended greater thought must be invested in determining how the impact of the PIUs are going to be measured.

SUSTAINABILITY

The Project has recognised that sustainability is best achieved if the host state is willing to accept from the outset that staff and accommodation costs should be met by the government. It is to the credit of the Project that they have stuck to this policy and all three PIUs are in buildings that have been refurbished by the Project but are supplied by the government. Similarly the staff of the PIUs – while receiving training from the Project – is being paid by their respective governments. This greatly improves the likelihood of longer term sustainability. There will still be on-going running costs with all PIUs and while Project funds may support these in the short-term agreement will have to be reached with the beneficiaries to absorb these costs as well. Ultimately the long term sustainability of these PIUs will be determined by their success or failure as viewed by the beneficiary states.

Another key issue to sustainability will be the mentoring of PIU officers. This forms part of output two but as yet no mentoring has taken place due to lack of time. This evaluation is of the opinion that mentoring will be a critical aspect to any success that the PIUs might achieve in the future and should be prioritised in any Project extension. When the mentoring of PIU staff begins it is critical that a standard and consistent message is delivered across all PIUs if future cross border work between the PIUs is to stand any chance of success.

A final issue that must be considered with any extension of the Project is the ability of the PIUs to retain their newly trained and mentored staff. There is a distinct possibility that staff rotation in the PIU will reduce the number of trained officers over a period of time. Thought must be given by the Project on how this knowledge can be institutionalized into the PIUs.

PARTNERSHIP AND COOPERATION

As noted the Project was ambitious and in attempting to provide all the deliverables with limited human resources priorities were made and attention was directed at delivering results ‘in the field’. This evaluation does not suggest that this was incorrect; however there appears to have been a lack of balance when the third thematic area (Cooperation and Coordination) was being addressed. The Project has handled cooperation and coordination between the Project, other UNODC regional projects (CAU and PATROL) and the national state actors well. Locally multi-agency working and cross disciplinary training, workshops, awareness raising have all contributed to spreading knowledge of PIU activities across law enforcement agencies at a national level. Regionally by training PIU officers from different countries together the Project has ensured that PIUs know of the regional nature of the project and are acquainted with officers serving in other PIUs. Internationally awareness of the PIUs has been raised with foreign law enforcement agencies through the FANC and through bilateral liaison.

In other areas however partnership and cooperation has not worked as effectively. Attempts were certainly made to include major partners in the area and region such as INTERPOL and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). UNODC and the Project were transparent in their dealings with those organizations and the Project Coordinator did maintain email communication on an ad-hoc basis with his counterparts in those organizations. Yet the current level of active cooperation and coordination between UNODC and those other actors remains poor although it is envisaged that INTERPOL will become involved with the PIUs in the future.

This evaluation suggests that any new Project (or new phase of this Project) should endeavour to more fully engage with other actors in the area, potentially involving donor community support in this task. Additionally the UNODC RCEAP should have a pro-active role in assisting the Project to engage with relevant actors and ensure the Project is fully integrated into the appropriate Regional and Country Programmes.

The issue of communication also stretches to the Project’s communication with its donor. Although the strict requirements placed upon the Project with regard to donor reporting were met stakeholder interviews suggested that the communication between the Project and the donor could be improved. This was given particular importance when the evaluation uncovered a number of discrepancies between donor perception and Project deliverables. The donors perceived that there were far too many UK experts involved in the 15 training courses run (or partially run) by the Project. In fact the only UK trainer was the Project Coordinator. There was a perception that the Project did not properly ‘brand’ the Project and give due recognition to the donor as the main funding partner. This evaluation could only find one minor example of this ‘lack of branding’ and some of the examples highlighted by the donors were inaccurate. There was a perception that there was a lack of Canadian and Australian expertise used in the training. Of the 15 courses there was an Australian expert used in 14 courses and a Canadian expert in 4 courses. This evaluation does not argue there is anything other than miscommunication between donor and Project team and these (mis)perceptions are simply indicative of the need to improve communication. Any extension of the Project must include a strategy for more fully engaging with other actors and stakeholders and this includes a communication strategy with the donor and UNODC HQ. There

are opportunities for the Project to exploit the work being done in different UNODC projects and thematic areas much of which will be best informed from UNODC HQ. To date the Project has had little HQ input but an extended Project should aim to make greater use of that expertise. In particular there may be merit in closer cooperation with the Maritime Crime Programme and UNODC SPU on human rights issues.

The issue of future cooperation and coordination is especially pertinent when considering how this might be achieved between the PIUs. As the PIUs are not yet fully operational it is difficult to assess how successful they may be in reaching their objectives of working with the other PIUs and exchanging meaningful, operational information across state borders. This will require intense and almost certainly protracted negotiations with all state actors to provide the protocols required to allow this to happen. Where there is already reticence for agencies within each state to work together (e.g. Immigration and National Police in Indonesia) then the scale of the difficulties in achieving this international exchange of information cannot be understated. These difficulties will be further compounded by the necessity to have the appropriate data protection regimes, hardware, software and training to facilitate the exchange of information. One encouraging aspect to this ambition is the PIUs are all using the same Case Management Information System (CMIS) database. There is a need for the PIUs to be as uniform as possible and this does not appear to be the case e.g. multi-agency and single agency, differing staffing levels and differing levels of state ownership. When the mentoring of PIU staff begins it is critical that a standard and consistent message is delivered across all PIUs if future cross border work between the PIUs is to stand any chance of success. This evaluation suggests that the Project should focus on ensuring the existing PIUs become operationally effective first nationally and then internationally (and this effectiveness assessed) before any more PIUs are contemplated.

III. CONCLUSIONS

There is no doubt that the Project has managed to achieve a substantial amount in the 17 months of its existence. In all three countries:

- (a) premises for the PIU have been identified and the refurbishment and equipping of those
- (b) premises is almost complete.
- (c) the participating agencies have been agreed
- (d) steering committees have been established
- (e) the PIU officers have been identified
- (f) numerous training courses have been delivered
- (g) Standard Operating Procedures are being developed and are close to completion

In some countries greater progress has been made toward establishing an effective PIU than in others. Cambodia is staffing its multi-agency PIU with 20 officers from immigration, marine police, national security, anti-human trafficking, as well as provincial police from Koh Kong province. Thailand is staffing its multi-agency PIU with 6 officers from Royal Thai Police, Marine Police Division, the Immigration Department and the Anti-Human Trafficking Division. Indonesia is staffing its single agency PIU with 5 immigration officers.

Substantial progress has been made toward the first output of the Project namely ‘capacity building’ and partial progress toward the second and third outputs of ‘officer training and mentoring’ and ‘coordination and cooperation’. The evaluation cannot, however, state that the overall objective of the Project of “Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia” has been met. The PIUs are not yet operational and have not contributed to any SoM investigations. What can be stated is that there is now greater potential for the three countries to be able to contribute to the overall Project objective. Given how close the Project is to delivering functioning PIUs this evaluation suggests the Project should be extended to allow for the final delivery of the intended outputs and to evaluate their effectiveness once operational.

This Project supplied a CAD \$ 5m proposal to the donor and was advised that the concept was sound but only CAD \$ 1.2m was available over one year. The revised CAD \$ 1.2m Project proposal supplied by UNODC did not materially alter the concept, scale or scope of the Project with the exception of removing a judicial review element. In accepting a 76% reduction in funding this evaluation argues that the initial Project objective, outputs and outcome should have been substantially revised. The fact that there was no feasibility study or needs assessment conducted and the Project proposal document itself was sparse and lacked detailed planning did not assist matters. If these had existed the initial Project proposal and its subsequent revision would have identified some of the barriers and risks to full implementation of the Project. Most notable of these barriers have been the lengthy process of encouraging state buy-in and ownership of the PIU implementation process coupled with the long administrative procedures of these state

organs. Additionally the UN procurement processes and procedures (and difficulties in identifying suitable staff / contractors) have slowed delivery of the Project outputs on occasion. In neither conducting these feasibility studies, thereby failing to identify these Project risks; and by not substantially altering the Project upon the budget revision, the Project became overly ambitious and as a result has fallen short in some of its key deliverables.

Most notable of these missing key deliverables is a fully operational PIU in any of the three countries although they are all close to operational capability and it is envisaged that they will all be technically operational by 31st May 2013. However operational effectiveness is connected to the mentoring component as stated within output two which will not have been started by 31st May 2013. There has also only been partial success in output three where cooperation and coordination is happening between the Project, other UNODC regional projects (CAU and PATROL) and the national state actors but little is occurring with other actors and stakeholders in the general environment of tackling SoM in the region. Any extension of the Project must include a strategy for more fully engaging with other actors and stakeholders and this includes a communication strategy with the donor and UNODC HQ. There will be opportunities for the Project to exploit the work being done in different UNODC projects (for example the Maritime Crime Programme) and thematic areas much of which will be best informed from UNODC HQ.

As the PIUs are not yet operational it is difficult to assess how successful they may be in reaching their objectives of working with the other PIUs and exchanging meaningful, operational information across state borders. This will require intense and almost certainly protracted negotiations with all state actors to provide the protocols required to allow this to happen. Where there is already reticence for agencies within each state to work together (e.g. Immigration and National Police in Indonesia) then the scale of the difficulties in achieving this international exchange of information cannot be understated. These difficulties will be further compounded by the necessity to have the appropriate data protection regimes, hardware, software and training to facilitate the exchange of information. There is a need for the PIUs to be as uniform as possible and this does not appear to be the case e.g. multi-agency and single agency, differing staffing levels and differing levels of state ownership. When the mentoring of PIU staff begins it is critical that a standard and consistent message is delivered across all PIUs if future cross border work between the PIUs is to stand any chance of success. This evaluation suggests that the Project should focus on ensuring the existing PIUs become operationally effective first nationally and then internationally (and this effectiveness assessed) before any more PIUs are contemplated.

Overall the Project has delivered a substantial amount but was unrealistic in what could be achieved in the given time. This was a minimum two year Project that was squeezed into one year and as a result failed to deliver in some areas. Having made so much progress however it would make sense to extend the Project to allow delivery of the intended outputs so the PIU concept, which still appears sound, can be tested. The element of international cooperation between PIUs is one area of concern and this must form a central part of the future feasibility study for the effective implementation of the three PIUs.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Project should be extended in order to complete the work already begun in establishing the three PIUs in Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand.

It has been noted throughout this evaluation that the initial Project objective and outputs were overly ambitious. As a result some of the deliverables written into the initial Project document have not been delivered primarily because of a lack of time. The PIU concept is still relevant, appears sound and the Project team have efficiently used the resources available to make much progress toward bringing the PIUs to operational capacity. It would make sense to continue the Project in order to complete the outputs envisaged for delivery at the outset of the Project.

Conduct an in-depth feasibility study for the extension of the Project identifying potential barriers and risks to the practical deployment of the PIU concept in each of the three countries and setting realistic objectives and timeframes.

The Project suffered from a lack of planning at the outset. In part this was driven by the funding modality of UNODC which pressurises the Office into quick Project development (and a donor keen to finance for only one year) however this did lead to unrealistic objectives and outputs being proposed by UNODC and accepted by the donor. With some additional time now available a full feasibility study should be conducted ahead of any Project extension. This should identify potential risks and barriers to effective PIU implementation in each of the three countries and propose strategies to eliminate or reduce the impact of these risks and barriers. One key element of this study should be the protocols and mechanisms required to deliver effective information exchange between the PIUs.

The general modus operandi of UNODC in its delivery of the Project outputs should be continued. In particular the engagement of the country offices is seen as crucial in pushing the Project forward.

The Project team have committed much time and effort into driving forward the PIU on many fronts. Two areas that do require greater priority within the Project are ‘communication’ and ‘cooperation’ and this is dealt with under a separate recommendation. With those exceptions this evaluation sees no need to change the general approach of the Project to the delivery of its outputs. In particular the continuing engagement of the country offices in maintaining the momentum required to deliver the PIUs is seen as critical.

There should be no expansion of the PIU concept into other countries until the operational capability and impact of the existing, embryonic PIUs can be assessed.

Although the PIU concept is assessed as sound and donor and beneficiaries can see the potential benefit there is no empirical data as yet to confirm the impact that the PIUs have had on the overall objective. It is imperative that the current PIUs come to operational capacity and begin delivering results before any additional PIUs are contemplated in other countries. The lessons learned from full implementation of the PIUs in all three countries should be learned before a decision on the expansion of the PIU network is taken.

Conclude formal agreement with Indonesia on the PIUs and ensure all three agreements include:

- (a) the PIUs role within each state's law enforcement architecture
- (b) the Standard Operating Procedures for PIUs
- (c) the level of – and commitment to maintaining – state support for the PIUs

The lack of formalised agreements on the implementation of the PIU in Indonesia leaves question marks over the state's willingness to commit long-term to the PIUs. This is particularly important given the sensible approach to sustainability that the Project has adopted in not contributing to the daily running costs of the PIUs. Thus long-term sustainability requires express and explicit commitment from each state. The Standard Operating Procedures for the PIUs should include the protocols for exchanging information between the different PIUs.

Ensure that effective mentoring of the PIU staff is provided and that the message is consistent across all three PIUs.

A key aspect in delivering an effective PIU has been identified as the mentoring of PIU staff. Due to lack of time the Project has not yet been able to deliver on this output however the evaluation concurs that this type of approach should greatly improve the effectiveness and impact of the PIUs. It is important that the mentoring programme is well planned and consistent across all three PIUs. Any new training that is delivered should include substantial input from the mentors who will be best placed to judge the level of knowledge and skills their PIU members possess. Any subsequent training delivered under this Project should be subject to greater post-training evaluation.

Use the resources and expertise of UNODC RCEAP and engage more fully with the donor community to ensure the extension of the Project works as closely as possible with the other actors and stakeholders in the region including INTERPOL and IOM.

This evaluation recognises that the Project attempted to engage with various actors during the early stages of the Project and at periodic times throughout the life of the Project. The evaluation also recognises that you cannot 'force' third parties to engage if they are opposed to the idea of engagement. However the evaluation also argues that with any extension of the Project another opportunity may be created to try and re-engage with those appropriate third parties. The Project team, in close cooperation with their Regional Office partners and the donor community, should promulgate an approach to enhance cooperation with those other actors which should include INTERPOL and IOM.

Instigate a reporting regime and communication strategy with the donor that meets their expectations. Regular face-to-face debriefs and ad-hoc Project reports should form part of this regime.

The Project supplied the required reporting to their donor however the general aspect of donor reporting was not prioritised within the Project. This has had a direct impact on donor perception of the Project and issues which could have been quickly and easily resolved grew into donor frustration. The donor perceived (largely inaccurately) that the Project was guilty of a lack of branding of Project outputs, they also perceived (wholly inaccurately) that the Project overused

UK expert knowledge. They also perceived (partially inaccurately) that the Project did not engage with Canadian or Australian expertise fully enough in the training courses. In order to dispel these inaccurate perceptions the Project must formulate and instigate a more comprehensive and regular donor communication strategy which should include regular face-to-face meetings and debriefs.

Ensure that the extension of the Project is aligned and fully integrated into the appropriate Regional and Country Programmes and that appropriate UNODC thematic areas and expertise are utilised where appropriate.

The current Project has attempted to ensure its work falls within the appropriate UNODC Country and Regional Programmes. Any extension of the Project offers an opportunity for the feasibility study to examine where the 'new' Project fits within current UNODC Programming and how it could engage with other UNODC Projects and thematic areas. For example the new Maritime Crime Programme (MCP) which has evolved from the Counter Piracy Programme (MCP) may offer possible benefits for cooperation. In a similar vein the expertise of Vienna HQ in enshrining Human Rights into existing and new Projects and Programmes could offer advantages to the Project.

Gender balanced selection to training groups

The evaluation revealed that even though numerous training courses have been provided, only one female officer was trained. While various factors, not necessarily discriminatory, played a part, more effort must be made to ensure gender balanced composition of the training groups in line with the UNODC human rights obligations outlined in the relevant international documents and an internal position paper "UNODC and the promotion and protection of human rights". The expertise in this area held at UNODC HQ within the SPU should be sought and the Project should engage with those thematic experts to devise an appropriate strategy.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

An in-depth feasibility study and / or project proposal document is vital.

The need to properly define the objective(s) of the project, develop the output(s) and consider the outcome(s) is of paramount importance. Time spent in the planning phase will save time during the execution phase and can highlight potential impediments to a successful implementation.

A communication strategy should be agreed with the donor(s).

Communication between the donor(s) and the Project is vital in building and maintaining an effective working relationship. This should include regular face-to-face debriefs where possible through donor meetings, regular telephone and e-mailed updates as well as the required donor reporting. Invitations to the donor(s) to view Project achievements should be issued where appropriate. The goodwill generated by this type of engagement should not be underestimated.

BEST PRACTICE

Engagement of country offices in assisting to deliver a trans-national Project is important.

The ability of a country office to supply local knowledge, contacts and day-to-day monitoring and management of the Project in their environment is a key element to the success of such a Project. They can maintain (and increase) the momentum of the Project with greater ease than individuals based in an office in another country.

Employing the right individuals for the job is a key to success.

Employing individuals with the right skill sets and management abilities to inspire both their colleagues and other stakeholder representatives contributes greatly to the potential success of a project.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION

Term of Reference

Independent Project Evaluation (Final Evaluation) TCXSPX65

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Overview of the Project and Its Evaluation

Project number:	TCXSPX65
Project title:	Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia
Duration:	1 Jan 2012 – 31 May 2013
Location:	Southeast Asia (i.e. Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand)
Linkage to Country Programme:	n/a
Linkage to Regional Programme:	n/a
Linkage to Thematic Programme:	Outcome 1.1 and 1.5 of the Regional Programme Framework for East and South-East Asia and the Pacific (2009-2012), i.e. 1.1 Border Control – Improved Border Security, and 1.5 Smuggling of Migrants – Smuggling of migrants identified and effectively acted on
Executing Agency:	UNODC RCEAP
Partner Organizations:	Cambodian National Police (Cambodia) Immigrasi (Indonesia) Royal Thai Police (Thailand)
Total Approved Budget:	CAD\$ 1.2 million
Donor:	The Government of Canada
Project Manager/Coordinator:	Martin Reeve, Regional Advisor (Human Trafficking)

Type of Evaluation (mid-term or final):	Final evaluation
Time period covered by the evaluation:	Project period: January 2012 – May 2013 Evaluation period: April-May 2013
Geographic coverage of the evaluation:	Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand
Core Learning Partners (entities):	Cambodian National Police (CNP) Immigrasi (Indonesia) Royal Thai Police (Thailand)

Project overview and historical context

Over the past decades there has been a dramatic increase in the movement of peoples around the world. Increased global trade, and improved communications and transport networks have facilitated the international migration of many hundreds of thousands of people across continents, a large percentage of whom follow irregular or illegal routes to their chosen destinations.

In response to the growing demand for opportunities to migrate, the smuggling of migrants across international boundaries has become a lucrative criminal enterprise. Organized Crime Groups (OCGs) charge migrants large sums for the smuggling process, in some cases tens of thousands of dollars, but often offer the migrants very little in return. There is little certainty for migrants who purchase these services of arrival at the chosen destination, but what is almost guaranteed is a long journey marked by cramped and unsanitary conditions, poor diet, and the distinct possibility of injury or death en-route.

Typically irregular migrants are attracted by countries of relative prosperity when compared to their countries of origin and the prospect therefore of economic betterment for themselves and their families. In some cases migrants have been, or intend to be, involved in criminal activity or in other activities which pose a threat to the national security of the destination country.

In recent years OCGs, particularly in South and South East Asia, have made increasing use of boats as a means of transporting large numbers of irregular migrants at relatively low cost. The vessels obtained for the purpose are typically not sea-worthy, and many migrants have lost their lives as a result. The arrivals in Canadian waters of the MV Ocean Lady in October 2009 and the MV Sun Sea in August 2010 with respectively 76 and 492 Sri Lankan nationals on board, as well as the interception of the MS Alicia carrying 84 Sri Lankan nationals in June 2011 by the Indonesian authorities amply illustrate both the extent to which relatively wealthy countries are seen as destinations of choice for migrants from the developing world, and the complete disregard for human life typical of those engaged in human smuggling. Many countries around the world now face the combined challenges of protecting the integrity of their borders while reducing the opportunity for people smugglers to endanger would-be migrants.

The most effective way of achieving both of these goals is through interdiction of vessels prior to departure combined with increased, intelligence-led, investigative efforts that aim at dismantling the criminal networks and prosecuting the key perpetrators that organize and drive such migrant smuggling operations. This can only be achieved through the development and sharing of reliable criminal intelligence followed by targeted operational activity and must be done through a coordinated regional approach and increased regional law enforcement cooperation in order to mitigate the risks of only displacing major migrant smuggling routes, hubs and points of embarkation to another country in the region.

Therefore, UNODC RCEAP initiated the “Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia” project with an aim to establish **Port Intelligence Units (PIUs) in Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand** with capacity to gather, develop and disseminate intelligence, tactically situated in order to allow them to respond effectively to maritime migrant smuggling.

With multi-disciplinary approach, so far each PIU center is able to seek collaboration from different functions including immigration officials, criminal police, maritime police, and liaison from Anti-Human Trafficking division as intended. However the nomination of staff to attach to the PIUs largely depends on the suitability and the availability of each country’s personnel resource. Through this multi-agency collaboration, their reach will be beyond their immediate locations however, and through the channels for cooperation and coordination that will be established, the

units to enable them to respond to intelligence from international as well as national sources, from border control units at land, sea and air entry points, and from criminal police.

Unit staffs are nominated officials from responsible divisions within the government counterparts. They have been trained in the disciplines of intelligence gathering, development, analysis and exchange with a strong focus on international cooperation. Trainings which have been provided so far are (1) Operational Intelligence Analysis training, (2) Strategic Intelligence Analysis training, (3) Migrant Smuggling Related Money Laundering and Financial Investigation Techniques training, (4) Operational and Strategic Intelligence Analysis training for Senior Management, (5) Case Management Information System (CMIS) training, (6) Anti-Smuggling training, (7) Photographic training, and (8) other basic skills training e.g. IT literacy and English speaking skill training. The project intends to equip each unit with operational interdiction capacity but draw upon other national law enforcement assets as required and depending on the relative state of capacity developed in each beneficiary country.

UNODC basic and in-depth training manuals for investigators of migrant smuggling are already available in modular format, and can quickly be adapted to meet the particular needs of each beneficiary country again depending on assessed needs.

An indicator of success of the project, and therefore a key objective, will be the establishment of effective mechanisms for cooperation and coordination nationally, regionally and internationally, including MOUs where necessary to allow for intelligence sharing. By building tactical elements into the national criminal intelligence handling capacity with respect to migrant smuggling and strengthening operational, investigative law enforcement capacities, the project will build on and complement the work already being undertaken by UNODC in the region to strengthen national and regional capacity in the strategic analysis of migrant smuggling.

Justification for the Project:

Smuggling of migrants has been identified as a significant threat across South East Asia, facilitated by organised criminal enterprises along irregular or illegal routes. It is a crime which undermines the national security of affected sites and poses grave risks to the migrants concerned.

Research* undertaken by UNODC confirms that irregular migration within, through and out of South-East Asia is a major issue of concern and largely facilitated by migrant smugglers. Migrant smuggling undermines national security and state sovereignty and poses grave risks to the migrants concerned. The smugglers, in particular those who organize it, face little risk of detection and punishment.

* See the reports *Migrant Smuggling in Asia: A Thematic Review* and *Migrant Smuggling in Asia: An Annotated Bibliography*, published in 2012, available at <http://www.unodc.org/eastasiaandpacific/en/2012/08/cau-thematic-review/story.html> and the three migrants smuggling chapters of the *Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessment – East Asia and the Pacific*. UNODC will publish the report in 2013. The final draft is available upon request. *Catalogue of Actors and Activities Working to Combat Migrant Smuggling and Human Trafficking in 13 Countries*. This report was prepared for the Bali Process and maps out legislation, policies and coordination mechanisms with regard to human trafficking and migrant smuggling. It is available upon request.

Challenges:

This project has met with some inevitable delay resulting from a design process that involved very limited initial consultation with partner Governments. As a consequence the early months of the

project were dominated by negotiation with the host Governments on the best way to implement the project. This was to an extent anticipated and explains the intention from the beginning to start training and procurement of equipment only late in 2012.

Recruitment of staff, as can be seen in the section above, proved problematic. Some of the delay was caused by what proved to be an unnecessary focus on staff with law enforcement experience. Such experience proved impossible to find in tandem with strong administrative skills, and once the former quality was abandoned in favour of the latter the process moved somewhat more quickly. Even so, there were several occasions on which selected candidates, both staff members and consultants, dropped out late in the process.

In some cases there was delay caused by rent seeking behaviour – attempts at diverting project funds into personal gain, which were strongly and successfully defended, but which nonetheless cost time. Additional problems were encountered though, as a result of the generally low capacity of partner agencies and others. For example, additional IT training had to be delivered to Cambodian officers on discovering that some of them had never before used a computer. Refurbishment of the PIU site in Cambodia became problematic when asbestos was discovered and there was difficulty identifying a contractor able to deal with that issue and the requirements of the United Nations in terms of bidding for such contracts.

A significant challenge also rested in agreeing a multi-agency composition for the PIUs. While in Cambodia the Commissioner General of Police was able to agree very quickly on the component parts of the PIU, in Indonesia it has not proved possible to reach agreement between the principle agencies dealing with migrant smuggling – the police and immigration departments. In consequence only immigration staff will man the PIU. In Thailand, after slow beginnings, the project gathered pace quite quickly, and with the involvement of Deputy Commissioner General Watcharapol came strong leadership within the RTP

The short overall duration of the project is also an issue of some concern, particularly in terms of providing effective capacity development support that builds government ownership and prospects for the sustainability of benefits. Such endeavours take time. The challenges identified above have been overcome only through persistence, diplomacy, and adherence to strict standards of transparency and probity. Continued support will be necessary to ensure that the investment of time and money to date leads to tangible operational success.

Project documents and revisions of the original project document

The original project document and its revision request made in Feb 2013 are attached in Annex 2. The revision was made as accounting for gain in exchange rate on the Canadian's pledge and the extension of implementation period approved by the Government of Canada.

UNODC strategy context

This project reflects the overall goal of UNODC's *Regional Programme Framework for East Asia and Pacific 2009 to 2012* by aiming to *reduce illicit trafficking of people, drugs, illicit natural resources and hazardous substances*. Outcome 1.5 of the regional programme framework requires that *smuggling of migrants is identified and effectively acted upon*. This project will also specifically address a number of outputs under component 1.5 that include:

1.5.1 Systems to generate, manage, analyze, report and use migrant smuggling information established and operational

1.5.3 Informed and capable law enforcement officers, prosecutors and judges

The project also reflects the provisions of the *United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime*, its *Protocol against the smuggling of migrants by land, sea and air*, as well as the *United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice* to which UNODC is guardian.

The project draws on the strength and depth present in UNODC in terms of the agency’s long experience of capacity building in the criminal justice sectors of developing countries and the extensive knowledge and experience of migrant smuggling and its investigation held by its staff in the region. Furthermore, it takes advantage of the ability of UNODC to operate in countries which are difficult for external law enforcement agencies to access.

It is in line with and contributes to supporting the Bali Process in its efforts to counter migrant smuggling. UNODC is a recognized player in the Bali Process having strengthened its ties with the Bali Process and its member states over the last years. The Co-Chairs’ Statement of the Fourth Bali Ministerial conference, which called upon states to increase efforts to address human trafficking and migrant smuggling, reaffirms the high value the Ministers placed on the work of UNODC and states that “Ministers agreed to strengthen engagement on information and intelligence sharing underscoring the high value and utility that would derive from enhanced information sharing. In this regard, Ministers welcomed assistance from UNODC ...”

2. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

Overall Budget (Jan 2012 – May 2013)	Total Approved Budget (Jan 2012 – May 2013)	Expenditure (Jan – Dec 2012)	Expenditure in % (Jan – Dec 2012)
US\$ 1,213,961	US\$ 1,194,000	US\$ 440,259	36.87%

3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is required by UNODC rules and regulation, decided on by the Project Manager to conduct this evaluation for the purpose of implementation efficiency and strategic reason.

The evaluation is being undertaken at this point due to the project approaching its end date in May 2013. According to UN rules, independent project evaluations are required for all projects and initiated 4-6 months in advance.

The evaluation seeks to independently assess:

- The quality of the original design, its relevance to the identified needs of partner countries, and its continued relevance during project implementation.
- The efficiency of project implementation, including with respect to both UNODC and partner government mobilisation and management of resources.
- The effectiveness of the project in terms of achieving its planned objectives, including outputs delivered and contribution to outcomes.
- The likely overall impact of the project and the sustainability of benefits arising from the project; and
- Whether or not there were unanticipated results, either positive or negative, arising from project implementation.

The main evaluation users include the Project Manager, the beneficiary Governments, and the donor.

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The project TCXSPX65, Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia, will be evaluated from April – May 2013. The evaluation will assess the project at the National level (i.e. Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand) due to the implementation coverage.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Please refer to the project document and the logical framework for reference and adaptation of the questions as necessary.

Relevance:

- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid according to current situation/environment?
- How relevant is the project to target groups', including Governments', needs and priorities?
- Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

Efficiency:

Considering the current situation/environment and other influencing factors as necessary:

- Is the project providing the planned services and products within optimal cost and standards?
- Is the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- Are the activities being performed as planned and in a timely manner?
- Are the activities being adjusted in response to change in situation/environment in order to maintain efficiency?
- Are the activities leading to the expectations of implementing agencies (i.e. UNODC and its counterparts) to combat maritime migrant smuggling?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent were the objectives and outcomes in the project document achieved / are likely to be achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- How satisfied are the stakeholders with their involvement in this project?
- How should the planned activities be modified to work better?
- Have all intended participants received planned trainings?
- What could the project have been done differently to complete the project more effectively?
- What outcomes should be considered if an organization wants to repeat this or conduct a similar project (e.g. to improve collaboration, fasten the implementation speed, satisfy the beneficiary counterparts, etc)

Impact:

- Has the project met the needs that led to this project? Do these needs still exist?

- What are the effects of the project towards current organizational and individual performance (e.g. enhanced networking, partnership, investigation ability, etc)?
- How many people have been affected?
- Did the stakeholders experience any improvement in their skills, knowledge, and ability to operate the unit?
- Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environment changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the project?

Sustainability:

- To what extent do the benefits of this project continue after donor funding ceased?
- What are the major factors that influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- How do the counterparts plan to maintain the unit itself and the collaboration among PIU centers established during this phase? Otherwise, what support the project needs to provide in order to build such capacity?

Partnerships and Cooperation:

- To what extent have partnerships and cooperation been sought and established (including UN agencies) and synergies been created in the delivery of assistance?
- To what extent do stakeholders (e.g. counterparts, UN agencies, etc) involve in planning and implementation of the project?
- Do expected participating members actively engage in the project activities and through out the implementation period?
- Do participating members understand their role and responsibilities under the project scope?
- What are main factors influencing participation and non-participation of expected members?

Lessons Learnt:

- What are the lessons learnt for the future?

6. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methods to be used to collect and analyze data include the following:

Desk review, observation, interviews, focus groups, and field visits. The sources of data should be both Primary and secondary sources.

1. Desk Review

For this independent project evaluation exercise, the desk review is intended for the evaluator to review and assess the situation prior to UNODC intervention, raise issues with IEU/project manager, find information from reliable sources to clarify them, and report in the inception report.

Documents recommended for desk review are listed in Annex 2.

2. Field Visits and Individual Interview

The methodology shall include open-ended, closed-ended and structured interview guides. Each respondent is able to respond in a way that represent accurately and thoroughly their point of view about the project to ensure that the evaluator understand how stakeholders perceive benefits, implementation effectiveness, rooms for improvements, what they see as key elements to resolve it, relevance to the initial implementation objective, and progress towards outcome.

Among others, participants to be interviewed are the assigned steering committee members and the nominated Port Intelligence Unit officers to attach to the PIU.

When refining the methodology, the evaluator will assess whether other stakeholders should be interviewed or involved through other means.

7. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluation is scheduled to take place during 1 April – 15 May 2013 (1.5 months)

The lead evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables as specified below:

- Inception report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools by 12 April 2013
- Notes from field visits containing trip purpose, list of interviewee, interview questions, findings, and recommendations by 26 April 2013
- Draft evaluation report in line with UNODC evaluation policy and guidelines by 3 May 2013
- Final evaluation report including annex with management response by 17 May 2013
- Presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations to CLP and other key stakeholders before end of May 2013.

8. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

This evaluation envisages 1 independent evaluator with qualified experience and expertise to undertake the exercise. Please see Item no.9 and Annex 1 for further information.

The evaluator shall not act as a representative of any party and must remain independent and impartial. For more details on required competencies of each team member, please see Annex 1.

IEU will act according to Item no.9 and quality assurance role from UNODC HQ.

9. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS

The independent evaluation will be carried out following UNODC's evaluation policy and UNEG norms and standards. The Independent Evaluator will work closely with UNODC's Independent Evaluation Unit.

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)

- Guides the process of this evaluation, endorses the TOR
- Approves the selection of the proposed Evaluation Team and liaises closely with evaluators throughout the entire evaluation process.
- Comments on and approves the selection of evaluation consultants and the evaluation methodology and provides methodological support throughout the evaluation
- Comment on the draft report, endorse the quality of the final report, support the process of issuing a management response, if needed
- Participates in disseminating the final report to stakeholders within and outside UNODC
- Ensures a participatory evaluation process by involving Core Learning Partners during key stages of the evaluation.

Project manager

- Responsible for the provision of desk review materials to the evaluation team
- Review the evaluation methodology
- Liaise with the Core Learning Partners
- Review the draft report and develop an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations
- In charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team
- For the field missions, the evaluation team liaises with the UNODC regional/field offices and mentors as appropriate.

Core Learning Partners

- Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are selected by the project manager in consultation with IEU
- Members are selected from the key stakeholder groups, including UNODC management, mentors, beneficiaries, partner organizations and donor member states
- Comment on key steps of the evaluation and act as facilitators with respect to the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action.

Independent Evaluator

- Carry out the desk review
- In coordination with the IEU team, provide methodological evaluation quality assurance throughout the evaluation process and inputs
- Develop the inception report, including sample size and sampling technique
- Draft the inception report and finalise evaluation methodology incorporating relevant comments
- Lead and coordinate the evaluation process and the oversee the tasks of the evaluators
- Implement quantitative tools and analyse data
- Triangulate data and test rival explanations
- Ensure that all aspects of the terms of reference are fulfilled
- Conduct planned missions and apply methodological tools
- Draft an evaluation report in line with UNODC evaluation policy
- Finalise the evaluation report on the basis of benefits received
- Include a management response in the final report
- Present the findings and recommendations of the evaluation at the donor briefing at the time of its annual mentors' meeting

Logistical support for the evaluators will be provided from the regional office and/or the respective visited field offices.

ANNEX II. EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. There is still a need for UNODC through X65 and the Port Intelligence Units to Strengthen Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia. Please indicate;

“1” if you strongly disagree

“2” if you disagree

“3” if you neither agree nor disagree

“4” if you agree

“5” if you strongly agree

2. UNODC through X65 and the Port Intelligence Units has been effective in Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia. Please indicate;

“1” if you strongly disagree

“2” if you disagree

“3” if you neither agree nor disagree

“4” if you agree

“5” if you strongly agree

3. UNODC through X65 and the Port Intelligence Units has been efficient in Strengthening Operational Law Enforcement Capacity to Prevent and Combat Maritime Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia. Please indicate;

“1” if you strongly disagree

“2” if you disagree

“3” if you neither agree nor disagree

“4” if you agree

“5” if you strongly agree

4. What – in your opinion – has been the most significant change that X65 has achieved?

ANNEX III. STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

<u>STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS</u>		
Individual	Stakeholder Group	Role
BAUMEISTER Sebastian	UNODC	Project Coordinator, CAU Project, RCSEAP
BROUSSARD Giovanni	UNODC	Programme Officer, PATROL project, RCSEAP
BUABUTTRA Tutiya	UNODC	Programme Assistant, RCSEAP
BUNNA Chhay Brig. Gen.	Beneficiary	Deputy Head of Immigration Dept. and Chief of PIU
CHOLSUK Apapan Col.	Beneficiary	Deputy Commander, Foreign Affairs Division, Royal Thai Police
CHUAYJIT Nirat Lt. Col.	Beneficiary	Chief of Ranong Marine Police and PIU Center
DUPAS Richard	Donor	Liaison Officer, RCMP, Embassy of Canada, Bangkok, Thailand
DUPASQUIER Donald	Partner	Training Program Coordinator, RCMP, JCLEC
GINTING Sely	UNODC	Finance and Administrative Assistant, Indonesia
GREEN Julianar	Donor	First Secretary, Embassy of Canada, Bangkok, Thailand
INDRAWANSYAH Rizki	UNODC	Programme Associate, Indonesia
LAPRESSE Sieng	Beneficiary	Under-Secretary of State Ministry of Interior, Cambodia
LERMET Olivier	UNODC	Country Manager, Cambodia
LIN Lao Lt. Col.	Beneficiary	Chief of Office, AHTJP Dept.
LUMAKSONO S.H.	Beneficiary	Sub-Director, International Co-operation, Immigration, Indonesia
NORIN Tauch	UNODC	Programme Associate, Cambodia
ONSUB Attawoot Col.	Beneficiary	Deputy Commander, Marine Police Division, Thailand
PHAL Sok Lt. Gen.	Beneficiary	Deputy Commissioner General, Cambodia
PHAN Helene	UNODC	National Project Officer, Cambodia
PHAUK Kolkomar Col.	Beneficiary	Deputy Director, Anti-Human Trafficking and Juvenile Protection (AHTJP) Dept.
REEVE Martin	UNODC	Regional Advisor, RCSEAP
SCIASCIA Alban	UNODC	Consultant, Indonesia
SEYHA Mony Capt.	Beneficiary	Chief of Section, AHTJP Dept.
SODARANYN Pen 2nd Lt.	Beneficiary	Maritime Police Department, Sihanoukville, Cambodia
STANLEY Mark	UNODC	Chief of Programme Support Unit, RCSEAP
STERRITT Joe	Donor	Senior Project Manager, Anti-Crime Capacity Building Program, Ottawa
TANUHANDARU Monica	UNODC	Officer-in-Charge, and Project Coordinator
TRANN Quin	Donor	First Secretary, Immigration and Citizenship, Australian Embassy

ANNEX IV. DESK REVIEW LIST

01. Workplan and Budget 04 (29 Sept 2011)
02. Workplan and Budget 05 (7 Nov 2011)
03. Project proposal Maritime Migrant Smuggling 06 (26 Jan 2012)
04. Canadian Funding Agreement X65
05. Signed LoA UNODC and CNP
06. Signed LoU RTP-CAN 23mar12
07. ACCBP 11-155 UNODC RBPF – interim report July 2012
08. IGC Narrative Reporting Interim report July 2012
09. letter from BG. Chhay Bunna
10. ACCBP 11-155 UNODC RBPF – interim report Jan 2013
11. IGC Narrative reporting Interim report Jan 2013
12. APR 2012 RCX65_05 (30 Jan 2013)
13. Indonesia Draft SOP v6 021113
14. Cambodia Final SoP
15. RTO Approved SoP Thailand 25Feb13
16. PIU Presentation – Short
17. Port Intelligence Unit Project Description
18. UNODC Short-form ProDoc 01 (6 Feb 2012)
19. Attachment A Information Note – Operational Analysis Training
20. Attachment A Information Note – Strategic Analysis Training
21. Draft SoP v6 0213_Indonesia
22. Immigration Disposition – Lumaksono
23. Letter – Courtesy Audience – Director for International Cooperation – Indonesia
24. Letter – Director Teuku Sjahrizal – Facilitate meeting with Independent Evaluator
25. Letter – Director Teuku Sjahrizal – Facilitate meeting with Intelligence Division on SoP 2
26. Letter – Director Teuku Sjahrizal – Facilitate meeting with Intelligence Division on SoP
27. Letter – Invitation for Senior management Workshop
28. Letter – Nomination of Participants to Financial Training at ILEA
29. Letter – PIU Site Visit for Computer Server Setup and Installation
30. Letter – PIU Site Visit
31. Letter of Invitation – Anti Smuggling training at JCLEC
32. Letter of Invitation – 5 day strategic analysis training
33. UNODC Indonesia CPF 2012 – 2015
34. Agenda – Anti-Smuggling Training Course 11Feb 2013
35. Draft Agenda – Anti-Smuggling Training Course 11Feb2013
36. JCLEC practical exercise Feb 2013
37. Practical Scenario
38. Minutes of meeting – Internal UNODC 20 March 2012
39. Minutes of meeting with 3 CNP Officers 13 March 2012
40. Minutes of meeting with Commissioner General 14 March 2012
41. Minutes of meeting with Sok Phal 19 June 2012
42. Minutes of meeting with Sok Phal 24 April 2012
43. Minutes of meeting with Deputy Commissioner General 21 August 2012
44. Minutes of meeting with the provincial Commissioner in Sihanoukville 10 May 2012

45. Minutes of meeting with Van Chhoeurn 30 April 2012
46. Minutes of meeting to Sihanoukville 27 June 2012
47. Mission Report Phnom Penh Martin (06 – 07 August 2012)
48. Mission Report Phnom Penh Martin (9 – 12 May 2012)
49. Mission Report Phnom Penh Martin (10 – 13 September 2012)
50. Mission Report Phnom Penh Martin (11 – 14 November 2012)
51. Mission Report Phnom Penh Martin (18 – 20 June 2012)
52. Mission Report Phnom Penh Martin (20 – 21 August 2012)
53. Mission Report Phnom Penh Martin (23 – 25 Apr 2012)
54. Mission Report Phnom Penh Martin (26 – 28 June 2012)
55. Minutes of meeting on 27-3-2013 with LG. Sok Phal
56. Anti-Smuggling Training Evaluation – Cambodia JCLEC 18-22 Feb 2013
57. Anti-Smuggling Training Evaluation – Indonesia JCLEC 18-22 Feb 2013
58. Activities report on the PIU project. Jan 2013
59. Awareness raising meeting – 7th March 2013
60. Presentation – PIU to IOM meeting in Vietnam (21 Feb 13)
61. Catalogue of Actors and Activities (22.08.2012)
62. Exchange of emails with IOM
63. Final Draft – Workplan Cambodia PIU Project
64. Hoagland Nicole IOM training partnership
65. Maltoni Bruno IOM Partnership Cambodia
66. One page flyer on PIU Cambodia – March 2013
67. Immigration Law 6 2011 – Indonesia
68. Ordering letter PIU Cambodia