

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

Independent project evaluation of the

**Strengthening Law Enforcement
Capacity (Border Control Operations)
and Criminal Justice Response to
Smuggling of Migrants and Trafficking in
Person**

ZAF/T54
South Africa

July 2013



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2013

This evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of Pieter du Plessis with the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

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

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

Disclaimer

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

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

© United Nations, July 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

Executive summary	vi
Summary matrix of findings, evidence and recommendations.....	x
I. Introduction.....	01
A. Background and context.....	01
B. Methodology.....	05
II. Evaluation findings.....	07
A. Design.....	07
B. Relevance	08
C. Efficiency	09
D. Partnerships and Cooperation	10
E. Effectiveness	10
F. Impact	15
G. Sustainability	16
H. Institutional and Management Arrangements	16
III. Conclusions.....	19
IV. Recommendations.....	21
V. Lessons learned.....	23
<i>Annexes</i>	
I. Terms of reference of the evaluation.....	25
II. Desk review list	37
III. Evaluation tools: questionnaires and interview guides	38
IV. List of persons interviewed during the evaluation.....	43
V. Performance Against Project Objectives and activities	44

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BCOCC	Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee
BMA	Border Management Agency
CAS	Case Administration System
CLP's	Core Learning Partners
DDG	Deputy Director General
DG	Director General
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EUD	European Union Delegation
EUROPOL	European Police Organisation
DHA	Department of Home Affairs
GoSA	Government of South Africa
IACF	Inter-Agency Clearing Forum
INTERPOL	International Police Organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPB	Integrated Programme and Oversight Branch
JCPS	Justice, Crime Prevention and Security Cluster
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
NPA	National Prosecuting Authority
PM	Project Manager
PSC	Project Steering Committee
ROSAF	Regional Office for Southern Africa
SACTAP	Southern African Counter-Trafficking Assistance Programme
SADC	Southern African Development Communities
SANDF	South African National Defense Force
SAIL	South African Immigration Liaison group
SAPS	South African Police Service

SARS	South African Revenue Service - Customs
SoM	Smuggling of Migrants
SSA	State Security Agency
TiP	Trafficking in Persons
TOR	Terms of Reference
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Republic of South Africa has ratified the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC), and the supplementing Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Air and Sea and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children. In a response to this action, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) took initiative to partner with the South African Government's Border Control Operational Coordinating Committee (BCOCC) in order to strengthen capacity amongst South African Port of Entry officials to effectively deal with the smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons. This was made possible through a mainly European Union (EU) funded project.

The mainly EU-funded project "Strengthening Law Enforcement Capacity (Border Control Operations) and Criminal Justice Response to Smuggling of Migrants and Trafficking in Persons" was developed. The project design made provision for a three-year implementation period, starting on 1 September 2009. A time extension was later granted, bringing implementation to an end by March 2013. The total budget of the project is US\$ 3,054,008 (Euro 2,480,000), including support costs. A contingency of Euro 110,339 is not included in the UNODC project budget. The Funding Agreement between the European Commission (EC) and the UNODC stipulates that the EC undertakes to finance a maximum of 79,83% of the total eligible cost. The additional approximately 20% of costs need to be covered by additional funding sourced by the UNODC.

BCOCC is the main partner in the implementation of the project and the associate partners of the project are the Government of The Netherlands and Europol. The Core Learning Partners (CLP's) are the South African Revenue Services (SARS), the Department of Home Affairs (DHA), South African Police Service (SAPS) and State Security Agency (SSA).

The overall objective of this project is to stem illegal migration by preventing and combating smuggling of migrants and trafficking in human beings from Africa to Europe, in line with the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, the UN Protocol against trafficking in Persons, particularly women and children, the EC Regulation No 491/2004, and international Human rights conventions.

The project objective, results, outcomes and activities were revised in 2011 to put more emphasis on operational issues and to enhance the detection and initial investigative actions.

Some external factors had a serious influence on project implementation. The project was implemented at a time when South Africa hosted two major events (2010 Soccer World Cup; and 2012 African Cup of Nations). The legislation on Human Trafficking is in process to be adopted and the decision to establish a Border Management Agency was taken, but not implemented yet. These factors had a negative influence on project implementation as it drew attention away from project implementation and caused some level of uncertainty in the environment about mandates, decision-making authority and implementation responsibilities.

The manner in which the project was planned and designed further contributed to an environment that was not conducive for project implementation. Consultation during design phase was limited to the BCOCC and did not include consultation with senior officials of the border management departments. The BCOCC is a coordinating body without decision-making authority. Decision-making and resource management is the responsibility of members of the BCOCC (DHA, SARS, SAPS, SSA). Officials representing the CLP's on the BCOCC are on middle management level and do not have direct access to

executive levels of the respective departments. It therefore created an initial lack of ownership where key stakeholders on executive level did not have any knowledge of the project and did not plan in their medium term strategies and expenditure frameworks for such interventions.

The overall environment for implementation was therefore not favourable.

Project objectives and planned activities were relevant and in support of EU, UN and UNODC policies and it was also in support of the South African National Integrated Border Management Strategy.

Although most of the planned activities were implemented, effectiveness, efficiency and impact were negatively influenced due to various factors such as:

- (a) CLP's were slow to respond when nominations to attend training interventions were requested;
- (b) The job description and placement of some nominees did not correspond with the course content and some nominees were not placed in posts relevant to the training after attending the training interventions;
- (c) Some officials trained under the project were transferred to areas where the knowledge acquired through training is not relevant;
- (d) No operational procedures related to the equipment placed at airports were developed to provide guidance to users from different government institutions on how to share information gather through the use of the equipment. The equipment is therefore used in a fragmented manner and there is no consistency between use of the equipment between the different airports.

Future sustainability is dependent on ownership and future resource allocation by individual CLP's. The original project design provide for training of trainers to ensure sustainability. Some of the CLP's, such as SAPS and Customs incorporated training material developed through this project into their course material, while the DHA only incorporated less training content of the new material into their existing course material.

The delay in adopting legislation and uncertainty about the Border Management Agency (BMA) has a negative influence on future sustainability. There is for instance no certainty how the BMA to be established will incorporate any of the project results into new processes, procedures or training curricula.

Coordination and cooperation between border management agencies are not institutionalized, but are rather based on individual commitment, passion and networks created between individuals on middle-management levels.

South African government are not yet at a point where they fully take ownership and manage issues related to human trafficking and smuggling of persons as a matter of priority. At the time of this evaluation, government did not have a common understanding and definition for human trafficking and smuggling of persons and legislation on human trafficking is still in process.

Some level of capacity on how to deal with TiP and SoM has been developed, but it is dependent on how the Government of South Africa how they incorporate project results in future plans and build on the foundation that was laid through this project.

The project produced some valuable lessons learned for future projects:

- (a) Comprehensive consultation is necessary during project design with all key stakeholders on decision and policy-making level and to ensure buy-in, ownership and alignment with local policies, strategies and priorities
- (b) If the beneficiary country is not fully involved in day-to-day project management activities it can lead to lack of ownership. Chances are then high that results achieved are not institutionalized on optimal level.
- (c) Reporting outside the recipient county's reporting structures misses out on the opportunity to ensure alignment with government strategies and the possibility to increase synergy with supporting activities implemented by CLP's as part of day-to-day operations.
- (d) Timing of project implementation is important to ensure sufficient absorption capacity by the beneficiary country. If the beneficiary country is not ready for a project, it may frustrate implementation as attention and resources are with other priorities. In this case, legislation was not in place and South Africa was host country for two major events (2010 Soccer World Cup and 2012 Cup of Nations).
- (e) Project implementation is slowed down if representatives on Project Steering Committee (PSC) did not have decision-making authority and a full mandate.
- (f) Persons can be nominated to receive training that are not relevant to their job description if strict criteria are not applied during nomination of trainees.
- (g) It is critical that standard operational procedures are agreed upon between key stakeholders when equipment is provided. This will contribute towards effective utilization and consistency between different offices.

The following are the main recommendations that were developed based on the information gathered through interviews, desk review and observations during site visits. The recommendations are addressed to the UNODC, the beneficiary country (GoSA) and the Donor (EU)

Recommendations for UNODC

- (a) Future programme designs should make provision for sufficient consultation during project design phase with decision-makers of all key stakeholders and individual Memoranda of Understanding should be entered into between the UNODC and each of the key stakeholders to ensure buy-in, ownership and alignment with beneficiary country's priorities and strategies
- (b) The beneficiary country's management structures, such as Cluster arrangements and inter-departmental coordination mechanisms as well as formal reporting and monitoring structures should be utilised as far as possible to ensure alignment and coordination with recipient governments' priorities and strategies. It will also increase levels of ownership by CLP's and beneficiary country and transparency in general.
- (c) UNODC should ensure that train-the-trainer components of training interventions are implemented in full to ensure sustainability of training activities. Management arrangements during project implementation should also make provision for a mechanism to ensure institutionalisation of project deliverables.

Recommendations for UNODC and Beneficiary Country

- (a) UNODC and the beneficiary country should agree during project design phase on the PSC structure and the level of representation on the PSC to ensure the PSC has sufficient decision-making authority to fulfil its mandate and be able to remove implementation obstacles when they arise.

(b) UNODC and Beneficiary country should ensure that results and recommendations of studies, assessments and surveys are optimal utilised and institutionalised. Provision should be made in the log frame to monitor implementation of these recommendations.

(c) It is recommended that future projects make provision for baseline surveys at the start of implementation phase to ensure a sound basis for measuring project results.

Recommendations to the GoSA

(a) The GoSA, led by BCOCC and DHA, should take the necessary steps to ensure the legislation on human trafficking is finalized as soon as possible

(b) The DHA should clarify arrangements regarding establishment of the BMA. All possible efforts should be made to ensure capacities developed through this project are incorporated in the BMA.

(c) The DHA and BCOCC should clarify with GoSA how BCOCC will be incorporated into the BMA.

(d) The DHA should take the lead in developing policies, procedures and management processes to ensure the use of advance equipment procured through this project, will be optimised. DHA, in close collaboration with SAPS, SARS and SSA, should define how information/intelligence produced through using the equipment will be managed.

Recommendations regarding future Project

The GoSA, EU and other development partners should consider a regional project with the objective to develop regional capacity related to Human Trafficking and Smuggling of Migrants. Focus should be on alignment of legislation, policies and procedures between SADC countries. Capacity developed through this project can also be applied in support of other organised crime related issues such as firearms, vehicle theft, drug control and money laundering.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings ¹ : problems and issues identified	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ²
1. Consultation during project design was limited to BCOCC and did not include consultation with senior management of individual border management departments	BCOCC is a coordinating body and does not have decision-making authority. Individual department were not aware of project and did not plan or budget for resources. Limited ownership was a major factor during project implementation	Future programme designs should make provision for sufficient consultation with decision-makers of all key stakeholders
2. Representatives on PSC were from middle management level and did not have decision-making mandate. They experienced difficulty to institutionalise activities in individual CLP's	Initial PSC struggled with access to senior management levels in individual departments. Ownership by senior management was on low level. It improved when Inter- Agency Clearing Forum - IACF (with representation on Directors General (DG) level) took over the role of the PSC late in 2011.	Project design should make use of governmental and inter-governmental management arrangements of the recipient country. UNODC and recipient country should agree during project design on the PSC structure and the level of representation from key stakeholders to ensure the PSC has the mandate and authority to fulfil its mandate
3. Advance document examination equipment is not used on optimal level at all airports where it was installed	Advance document examination equipment is not used on optimal level due to lack of operational procedures that clearly defines how the equipment should be used, role and responsibilities of the different departments (DHA, SAPS, SARS, SSA, etc) and how information produced should be managed	It is recommended that DHA take the lead in developing standard operational procedures and establishing a monitoring system to ensure optimal utilisation of equipment
4. Sustainability of training interventions is questionable as persons trained are not	Training material produced is not incorporated in training divisions of all CLP's and	UNODC should ensure that train-the-trainer components of training interventions are fully

¹ A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement.

² 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.

fully equipped to roll out training	trainers were not sufficiently trained to roll training out. In some instances, training material is not available for reproduction due to intellectual property rights.	implemented in future projects to ensure sustainability of training activities. Project design should make provision for intellectual property arrangements and to ensure that training material can be rolled-out on a broader scale after project life span without conditions.
5. Studies and assessments that were conducted during project implementation were not used to influence policies, procedures and training curricula of individual border management departments	Results of studies and assessments were work shopped with key stakeholders, but no process was put in place to monitor implementation of recommendations in departmental polices, procedures etc.	UNODC and GoSA should ensure that results of studies, assessments and surveys are optimally utilised and provision should be made in the log frame to monitor implementation of these recommendations.
6. It is difficult to measure impact and achievements without baseline information and in the absence of reliable statistics	Reliable information and statistics on the prevalence of human trafficking is not available mainly due to the fact that legislation is not adopted yet and incidents are captured under alternative criminal codes. Other baseline information was not available	It is recommended that future projects make provision for baseline surveys at the start of implementation phase to ensure basis for measuring results and impact.
7. Legislation on Human Trafficking is not adopted yet	Government departments are dependent on legislation to provide the legal framework and to develop policy, standard operating procedures and structural arrangements. Statistics related to human trafficking are currently captured under alternative legislation such as labour laws, fraudulent travel documents etc.	The GoSA, lead by BCOCC and DHA, should take the necessary steps to ensure the legislation on human trafficking is finalized as soon as possible
8. High level of uncertainty is experienced about the future role of BCOCC and capacities developed through this project when new Border Management Agency will be established.	Mandate for establishment of new BMA was firstly with SSA and is now with DHA. It is not clear when it will be established and if or how current resources and capacity will be incorporated in the	The DHA should clarify arrangements about the establishment of the BMA and all efforts should be made to ensure capacities developed through this project should be incorporated in the new

	new structure.	structure.
9. Advance equipment is not used optimally and information/intelligence that could be generated are lost without clearly defined operational procedures and management process	Equipment is not used consistently at different airports. Only limited functions are utilised where it is used and reporting is on ad hoc basis. No guidelines are available to ensure optimal utilisation or standard approach	The DHA should take the lead in developing policies, procedures and standardized operational procedures to ensure optimal use of advanced equipment. The manner in which information and intelligence produced through the use of the equipment is managed, should be defined in close cooperation with SAPS, SARS and SSA.
10. Trafficking in Persons and smuggling of migrants are cross boundary activities that requires a regional approach	Legislation and operational procedures differ from country to country in the SADC region. Different sides of border posts followed different operating procedures.	The GoSA, EU and other development partners should consider a regional project with the objective to develop regional capacity related to Human Trafficking and Smuggling of Migrants. Focus should be on alignment of legislation, policies and procedures between SADC countries. Capacity developed can also be applied in support of other organised crime related issues such as firearms, vehicle theft, drug control and money laundering

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and context

Trafficking in persons has become of major concern in many parts of the world, including Southern Africa. The beneficiary country has ratified the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, and the supplementing Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Air and Sea and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children. However the capacity of the criminal justice system and law enforcement authorities needs strengthening in all sectors (border control management, law enforcement, prosecution and judiciary), in order to effectively fight the smuggling of migrants and human trafficking. There is also a growing awareness of the need for well-coordinated joint initiatives at the regional and sub-regional levels.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) received a contribution from the European Community (EC) for the project entitled: Strengthening of Law Enforcement Capacity (Border Control Operations) and Criminal Justice Response to Smuggling of Migrants and Trafficking in Persons. The UNODC consulted with the Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee (BCOCC) and a partnership between UNODC and BCOCC has been formalised through the exchange of letters of agreement. The associate partners of the project are the Government of The Netherlands and Europol.

Contribution Agreement and the UNODC Project Document (ZAF/T54) guide the execution and implementation of the project in accordance with UN rules and regulations. The project document was signed in May and June 2009 by the UNODC and EC respectively. The total budget of the project is US\$ 3,054,008 (Euro 2,480,000), including support costs. A contingency of Euro 110,339 is not included in the UNODC project budget. The Funding Agreement between the European Commission (EC) and the UNODC stipulates that the EC undertakes to finance a maximum of 79,83% of the total eligible cost. The additional approximately 20% of costs need to be covered by additional funding sourced by the UNODC. The UNODC could not access the additional funding and some of the activities were scaled down during the last part of implementation.

The project implementation began on 1 September 2009. Initially it was intended to be a three-year project, but a time extension was approved during 2011 extending implementation until the end of March 2013.

The UNODC Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSAF) based in Pretoria, South Africa was responsible for the execution of this project. An implementation team based at ROSAF, Pretoria, carried out the day-to-day implementation of the project. The team consisted of an International Law Enforcement Expert and support staff. National and international consultants were recruited for specialised technical tasks and training delivery. A project officer based in Vienna ensured backstopping and provision of technical expertise by the relevant UNODC HQs technical sections.

Financial reporting was done by UNODC through a fund replenishment system, based on an approved yearly work plan. UNODC used its own bank account at the field level. UNODC HQ issued allotments to the UNODC office in Pretoria. The International Law Enforcement Expert performed the duties of a certifying officer.

A PSC was established comprising of BCOCC members (SAPS, SSA, SARS, DHA) and UNODC. The PSC was responsible to:

- (a) Approve annual consolidated work plans and related budgets;
- (b) Provide political and strategic leadership to the project and monitor the overall implementation of the project;
- (c) Discuss and find solutions to challenges to implementation of the project;
- (d) Ensure that any internal or external risks to the successful implementation of the project are brought to light in a timely manner and ensure that potential solutions are found;
- (e) Ensure that there is sufficient information flow between the various stakeholders;
- (f) Monitor and ensure the commitment and buy-in of the counterparts
- (g) Ensure that any change to the project activities is shared and approved by the relevant stakeholders
- (h) Approve any major changes to project activities and ensure that the procedure set forth in the project and donor agreements are followed if applicable;
- (i) Review project reports;
- (j) Participate in review meetings

This project aims to support the South African Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee in the implementation of the National Integrated Border Management Strategy (2008-2010) response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking in and through South Africa, by providing technical assistance to promote integrated border management by enhancing cooperation between all national border management agencies with the aim of achieving cooperation, coordination, mutual support, and information sharing, and joint operations between these agencies.

The project fits the strategy of UNODC and in particular the implementation of the following two Protocols:

- (a) Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.
- (b) Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Air and Sea, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

The implementation of the Protocols requires the criminalization of smuggling of migrants and human trafficking, the promotion of cooperation between states to that end, and protecting the rights of the smuggled migrants and trafficked persons.

The project supports UNODC's strategy for the medium term under Theme 1: Rule of Law and contributes to the following result areas and results:

- (a) Result Area: 1.1: Ratification and implementation of conventions and protocols.
 - (i) Result Area: 1.1.3 Improved capacity of national criminal justice systems to implement the provisions of the above-mentioned conventions and protocols.
- (b) Result Area: 1.2: International cooperation in criminal justice matters.
 - (i) Result Area: 1.2.1 Enhanced capacity for international cooperation against, crime, organised crime, corruption, drug trafficking and terrorism.

The Project Document outlined the following expected outcomes through the planned interventions:

(a) Enhanced capacities of border control agencies to implement the National Integrated Border Management Strategy 2008-2010 with coherent, institutionalized national frameworks established to coordinate and prioritize action as well as analyze information and share intelligence.

(b) Improved knowledge and skills in the detection of fraudulent and fraudulently obtained travel documents.

(c) Enhanced awareness and improved evidence-based knowledge on the smuggling of migrants and trafficking in human beings, perpetrators and criminal groups involved, including information about their modus operandi and routes in order to facilitate operational measures to counter these crimes.

(d) Improved international criminal justice and law enforcement cooperation between South Africa and competent authorities in Member States of the EU, at the bilateral level or through Europol or Interpol, particularly for information sharing and coordination of operational activities among law enforcement agencies, border control authorities and other relevant actors.

(e) Increased awareness on smuggling of migrants and human trafficking.

The strategy and project design was therefore in line with international as well as national priorities and support critical needs in the South African context related to human trafficking and smuggling of migrants.

The aim of the final Independent Project Evaluation as defined in the Terms of Reference (ToR) (see Annexure 1) is to determine the extent to which planned and unplanned objectives and outcomes were achieved, to identify the factors of success or failure, to assess the sustainability of the benefits generated, and to draw conclusions that may inform future programming, policy making and overall organizational learning.

The final evaluation is undertaken to:

(a) Assess the achievements of the project;

(b) Review the effectiveness of the project components and outputs, focusing on the effectiveness of the adjusted project components and outputs, in comparison to the initial design;

(c) Provide advice on the feasibility of the original project design and activities, and on the project revision and re-design process;

(d) Document challenges faced, as well lessons learned by all Core Learning Partners (See list of CLPs and their key roles and responsibilities);

(e) Provide advice on the initial consultative process and modality of signing with a committee rather than each individual department; and

(f) Assess the impact of the project, including unintended impacts, contextualised by challenges that were experienced in assessing the impact of the project.

(g) Assess whether the findings and recommendations from the Mid Term Evaluation have been addressed and implemented

Methodology

The final evaluation started on the 1st February with a briefing session with the UNODC Project Manager (PM). The PM provided an overview of project implementation as well as access to relevant project documentation. The briefing session was followed by the Desk Review phase where relevant project documentation was reviewed (please see Annex II for a detailed list of documents reviewed).

The project was evaluated against the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and partnerships. Overall project management arrangements were added as an additional criterion.

Data Collection Instruments

Data was collected through document review, questionnaire, interviews and direct observation.

The document review included relevant project documents, such as project design documents, revised project document, logical framework, progress reports, minutes of meetings and monitoring reports were studied to get an overall view of project design and implementation. A full list of documents that were reviewed as part of the Inception Phase is attached as Annexure II.

Information gathered from the document review phase was used to identify information needs to be clarified during interviews and site visits. Together with guiding questions provided in the Terms of Reference, it resulted in the development of a questionnaire that was used as guide during interviews and site visits. The purpose was to gather sufficient evidence-based information to provide a sound basis for assessment of performance against the evaluation criteria. See Annexure III for the detailed questionnaire.

Interviews were conducted with key stakeholders and project managers. The purpose of the interviews was to gather supporting evidence to confirm information or to clarify gaps or issues identified during document review phase; and to gather additional information from key stakeholders that were not covered in project documents. It also allows for opinions, views and suggestions on each of the evaluation criteria and additional information that may be considered during synthesis phase to provide a sound base for findings and recommendations. Opinions, views and suggestions were treated carefully to ensure findings and recommendations were based on facts. Annexure IV provides a list of persons interviewed.

Site visits were conducted at OR Tambo and Durban International Airports to do direct observation about use of equipment through this project; establish the level of joint operations between different agencies (SAPS, DHA, SARS, etc) and to observe skills levels of officials. Officials from Cape Town International Airport were not available for a direct interview and provided inputs via telephonic interview and via email. Information gathered was used to triangulate information gathered during document review and interviews.

Sampling Strategy

Representatives from all key stakeholders (BCOCC, UNODC and EU Delegation), and all three major international airports (Oliver Tambo, Cape Town and Durban) were included in the sample size.

Due to time constraints of the evaluation, border posts were not included as part of site visits, but interviews with key stakeholders on national level covered activities implemented on border posts.

Limitations to the Evaluation

Baseline information on capacity and skills levels is not available. This limitation was overcome by getting views and opinions of key stakeholders about the level of improvement of skills and capacity over the period of project implementation.

Reliable statistics on TiP and SoM is not available to make any evidence –based assessment of trends or comparisons over time and there is also not sufficient and reliable information available for reconstruction techniques to support findings.

Counterpart contributions, such as costs covered by beneficiary institutions (SARS, SAPS, DHA, etc) for members to attend and hosting training interventions are not readily available and could not be considered during the evaluation. Interviewees confirmed that individual departments cover some costs related to travelling, accommodation, refreshments and provision of training facilities, but no actual figures are available. Therefore, counterpart contributions were not quantified in this report.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Design

Original planning and design was done between the UNODC and the BCOCC, a coordinating body without any decision-making authority. Senior officials of the individual BCOCC member institutions such as DHA, SAPS and SSA were not included during the consultation process. Decision-making powers are with these institutions and they are also responsible for resource allocations. This exclusion from the consultation process caused a lack of understanding and ownership by these key stakeholders. The lack of ownership later proves to be one of the most important factors that influenced effective implementation of this project.

The original project design made provision for activities to strengthen integrated border management and an integrated approach to address human trafficking and smuggling of migrants. The original design was in line with the strategies and priorities of the South African government at the point in time of the design and remained relevant throughout implementation.

Since the design of the project, other activities and projects were implemented and had impact on the original problem conditions and the counterpart capacity. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) implemented and concluded the Southern African Counter-Trafficking Assistance Programme (SACTAP) that provided some training to the border control departments. Other UNODC programmes provided some counter-trafficking training with particular focus on international cooperation. The South African National Prosecution Authority (NPA) has recently concluded an EU-funded counter-trafficking project developing research reports, awareness material and procedure documents. The project was flexible enough to make necessary adjustments to prevent duplication of activities and the original log frame was adjusted. (Please see paragraph E Effectiveness, below)

BCOCC representatives are from middle management levels of the respective government departments and therefore the entry level of information and communication about the project into the individual departments was not on a decision-making level. The BCOCC representatives also did not have direct access to senior management levels within their own institutions, but have to follow protocol through various levels. This slow communication to senior management and executive levels slows down decision-making and response time.

Existing intergovernmental structures and coordination mechanisms of the GoSA was not fully explored during the design phase and therefore not considered when management and reporting arrangements were considered. It missed out on the opportunity to strengthen ownership and potential synergies with GoSA initiatives related to this project by not utilising Justice, Crime Prevention and Security (JCPS) Cluster coordinating and management structures. It was only in 2012 that the IACF was identified as a potential structure, represented by senior officials, to take over responsibility of the PSC.

The design of the project does not make provision for detailed project reporting, including detailed financial reporting to the South African government and there is a sense that the South African government was not fully involved in project management. Although UNODC provide some level of feedback to via PSC, detailed reporting, including financial reporting, was an internal process between UNODC ROSAF and UNODC Head Office Vienna. This aggravated the low level of ownership by key stakeholders GoSA.

Relevance

The design of project ZAFT54 is fully aligned with the national plans and strategies of South Africa such as the National Integrated Border Management Strategy; and departmental plans of the Departments of the South African Police Service, Home Affairs, South Africa Revenue Services (Customs) and National Intelligence Agency concerning Trafficking in Persons, smuggling of migrants and enhanced integrated border management. It supports the mandate and functions of the BCOCC to coordinate and strengthen the integration of services related to border control activities. Project activities were also intended to support of the Legislation on Human Trafficking still in process of finalization in South Africa.

TiP is still a fairly new concept in South Africa as the legal and institutional frameworks to address issues related to TiP and SoM are still not in place and functional yet. Therefore, there is still some confusion about definitions on TiP and SoM. The government of South Africa already took the decision to establish a Border Management Agency (BMA), but in the interim, the BCOCC coordinate activities between key stakeholders regarding border control and related issues, such as trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. The responsibility for establishment of the BMA was originally with SSA but was later transferred to the DHA. The current status of establishment of the BMA is unclear and it causes uncertainty about the absorption of BCOCC capacity and resources into the new structure and how outputs achieved through this project will be absorbed into the BMA.

Project objectives and activities, such as training and equipment provided, however remained relevant to the current situation in South Africa as it is focused on operational issues related to trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants.

The particular added value of this project was the installation of the equipment at three international airports and 15 land borders to assist with identifying fraudulent documents and the capacity developed through training provided by Netherlands counterparts.

The UNODC Office in Pretoria recruited well skilled officials on TiP and SoM that provided valuable inputs to GoSA officials. Although individuals benefitted from transfer of skills and knowledge, it was not institutionalized and with all the uncertainties surrounding the legislation and establishment of the new border control agency, there are no guarantees that capacities developed will be retained in the medium to longer term.

This project is well coordinated with other UNODC projects such as XASS69 that focuses on Capacity building for member states of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) in the ratification and implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its two first additional Protocols.

Valuable lessons however can be learnt from this project for future projects with modifications made to planning and design phase to ensure stronger buy-in; ownership on senior management levels; stronger alignment with beneficiary country strategies; management and reporting through recipient country's systems; and direct involvement in all project management activities.

Efficiency

The arrangement between the EC and the UNODC stipulates that the EC would provide 79.8 % of the funding irrespective of how much the project utilises. The UNODC was responsible to raise the remaining 20.2% from other sources. The UNODC was not able to raise this additional funds and it will be recovered by the EC from the UNODC. This information was shared with the South African officials and some training activities were scaled down to save costs. The effect of this was that some training

interventions such as a second phase of training in the Netherlands and components of the train-the-trainer intervention could not be implemented.

The UNODC ROSAF was responsible for decision-making on project implementation and the South African officials were informed and consulted afterwards about decisions been taken. The BCOCC staff was not placed in the project office and therefore was not part of every aspect of project management, such as financial management, monitoring and development of progress reports. Their exposure about day-to-day management of project implementation was therefore limited and an opportunity to develop local capacity and gain additional experience in managing projects of this nature was lost.

Funding was available when needed and was spent as planned. Value for money could be enhanced if monitoring mechanisms were put in place to ensure project outputs were utilised to an optimal level. For instance, standard operating procedures could be put in place to guide optimal use of advance equipment at selected airports. The equipment is currently not being utilised to its full potential as some airports rarely use it and other airports only use a limited number of functions available on the equipment due to insufficient training. Training provided about identification of fraudulent documentation and training provided with practical experience at border posts in the Netherlands, was very relevant, although nominations made by border control departments did not always provide the most relevant people to attend the training. Some persons nominated were either from too senior level or represented functions of the respective departments where the benefits of the training could not be applied afterwards.

Project staff have been selected and recruited in a suitable manner and provided high quality of services throughout project implementation. Staff provided support beyond their normal duties and shared lessons learnt from previous experience with CLP's.

The project was managed well and accountable although not sufficient reporting took place through the GoSA system. The initial PSC was represented on a too junior level to ensure effective monitoring, but the situation was rectified when the Inter-Agency Clearing Forum (IACF) took over the functions of the PSC in 2011. This improved the capacity to monitor project progress against departmental priorities. The IACF has decision-making authority and it addresses the shortcoming that was experienced with the initial level of representation on the PSC.

The quality and timeliness of administrative and financial support provided by ROSAF and UNODC Headquarters was sufficient and did not cause any delays during project implementation.

It is the opinion of the evaluator that the timing of this project was not suitable for the GoSA and the environment was not conducive for implementation of project activities. It may seem that the project counterparts in South Africa did not fulfil the obligations/responsibilities, but one must also take in consideration that key stakeholders (senior officials of the border control departments) were not consulted during project design and planning. There was therefore no commitment from the relevant stakeholders on senior level initially. During project implementation, they did what they could with limited resources to accommodate project activities. Under more favourable circumstances, higher levels of commitment will be expected.

Partnerships and cooperation

Effective coordination mechanisms between UNODC and other relevant development entities, such as the Netherlands, EU, and United Kingdom (UK) have been established. Formal and informal discussions about related initiatives took place on a regular basis .

Due to these coordination efforts, the project objective, outcomes and activities were reviewed and adjusted to prevent any duplication with efforts from other development partners and agencies such as IOM.

The comparative advantages of UNODC as a partnering organisation when it comes to trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, is the pool of expertise available from UNODC, lessons learnt from similar projects internationally and availability of training material that could be made available more efficient than to develop new material. In addition, the UNODC provided support to the project from the Head Quarters in Vienna that other institutions will not be able to do, or do not have the same level of expertise to provide such support. This project benefitted from these advantages.

Effectiveness

Since the design of the project there have been a number of changes in the operating environment that necessitated changes to the original objective and planned project activities. Although activities implemented were focused to achieve the revised objective, the evaluation revealed that the objective was not fully achieved. The main challenges and obstacles for not achieving the project objective in full are due to design and environmental factors such as:

(a) Original planning and design was done with BCOCC that is a coordinating body without any decision-making authority.

(b) Entry level of project into key stakeholder departments was on a too low a level, resulting in slow response time from individual CLP's and slow decision-making processes.

(c) Absence of legislation related to human trafficking that provides mandates and legal basis for definition for human trafficking as a specific crime. It is therefore difficult to keep record of crime statistics and develop a formal management system related to human trafficking. Due to absence of legislation, very limited processes and procedures are defined and it has a negative impact on the use of equipment purchased through this project. There is no policy or operational procedure to guide the use of equipment and capturing, managing and dissemination of information that are generated by the use of the document verification equipment (VSC 400).

(d) Uncertainties about the establishment of single border control agency. This was aggravated by changing the lead department from SSA to DHA and very limited flow of communication on the issue, such as timeframes and specifics about new structure. There is uncertainty about how BCOCC and current activities will be incorporated and maintained in the BMA.

(e) The decision to replace all DHA personnel at Oliver Tambo International Airport with new personnel had serious negative impact on capacity developed and knowledge of equipment purchased through this project. The investment made through this project to develop specific skills was lost when these trained staff were placed elsewhere in departments where their newly developed skills are under-utilised and replaced with new staff that do not know how to use the equipment, do not have the same experience, skills and knowledge related to Trafficking in Persons (TiP) and Smuggling of Migrants (SoM) as the previous staff members, and did not share the same working relationship with members of the other departments operating at the airport.

(f) The South African National Defence Force (SANDF) has been re-deployed to land borders to support SAPS to provide border surveillance capacity. Additional capacity development needs will be

required to ensure members of the Defence Force share the same knowledge and understanding about TiP and SoM as officials already part of this project.

(g) Slow progress to finalize legislation; poorly defined procedures, processes and systems to detect, refer, investigate, record and managing information related to human trafficking and smuggling of migrants, create critical gaps in the strategic approach by GoSA to address human trafficking and smuggling of migrants.

Implementation was slower than envisaged and the original timeframe for implementation was extended from September 2009 – February 2012 to March 2013.

The UNODC and the PSC made an assessment of the project during 2011 and were of opinion that the original scope of the project was too wide considering some components with a change management nature in the original design that is not possible to implement in a three-year project. In addition, the project was faced with budget constraints as the UNODC could not raise the approximately 20% of project costs as agreed with the EC. They agreed to re-prioritize project activities and more emphasis was placed on operational detection of incidents of human trafficking and smuggling of migrants and less emphasis on strategic level capacity development. Joint cooperation was limited to operational cooperation between border control agencies and due to activities implemented by IOM, less emphasis was placed through this project on awareness.

The revised objective of the project is: “to support the implementation of the revised National Integrated Border Management Strategy response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking in and through South Africa, by providing technical assistance to enhance the detection of and initial investigative actions to such crimes at the borders and ports of entry, promoting integrated border management by stressing cooperation between all national border management agencies, particularly in the areas of training, joint operations and mutual support. Through support to information campaigns at the border control areas, prevention of crimes as well as awareness among officials and the general public will be enhanced”.

The revised project outcomes and achievements are summarized in the table below:

Table 1. Revised project outcomes and achievements

Redefined Outcomes	Achievements
Enhanced capacities of border control agencies to implement the revised National Integrated Border Management Strategy response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking with coherent, institutionalized national frameworks established to coordinate and prioritize action as well as analyse information and share intelligence	Outcome not fully achieved. Although capacity in some individuals was developed, it was not institutionalised and therefore the capacity of the agencies was not enhanced. No coherent, institutionalized national framework has been established and may only be possible after legislation is adopted and Border Management Agency is established. Although the project provide advanced equipment to produce information and intelligence, not sufficient training was provided and no system was put in place to ensure effective

	analysis of information and sharing intelligence
Improved knowledge, skills and technical capacity in the detection of fraudulent and fraudulently obtained travel documents	Achieved to some extent. Knowledge and skills were improved in some individuals but is not institutionalised. Not all departments incorporated new training material used in this project into their training curriculums
Relevant authorities take receipt of report on organised crime and the smuggling of migrants in order to use enhanced awareness and improved evidence-based knowledge in operational measures.	Although the report was brainstormed with representatives of key departments, there is no process in place to monitor to what changes were introduced to contribute towards enhanced awareness or improved evidence-based knowledge in operational measures. Knowledge obtained is not institutionalised but only some individuals benefitted from the knowledge presented by the report.
Improved International and Interregional Cooperation on smuggling of migrants and human trafficking.	Although there is an increase in awareness of the benefit of international and interregional cooperation, no real improvement was yet accomplished. There is still a need to develop processes, procedures and establish structures, supported by effective systems, including information and intelligence management systems and procedures
Increased awareness on smuggling of migrants and human trafficking.	Activities that could contributed towards this outcome was downscaled to prevent duplication of work done by the IOM

Annexure V provides a summary of changes made to the original log frame and achievements against planned/ revised activities.

Although it seems that most planned activities were implemented, surrounding factors reduced the effectiveness of these achievements:

(a) Although the existing procedures and policies to respond to smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons has been reviewed and the results being work-shopped with representatives of key stakeholders, the GoSA is not ready to implement these recommendations as the legislation is still not finalized. The review indicates very few policies relating to TiP and SoM are in place, that policies that exist are poorly implemented, and that general knowledge about smuggling of migrants and trafficking in

persons is low among border officials. It is the opinion of the evaluator that there is also no guarantee that the new Border Control Agency to be established, will consider these findings and recommendations when developing policies and procedures.

(b) Planned training interventions were conducted. There is however concern that nominations made by CLP's did not ensure relevant people were nominated. For instance, some trainees nominated for training are not operational persons as intended and training received is not in support with their job descriptions. More suitable persons that are daily involved with operational activities were not nominated for training.

(c) Training needs assessment has been conducted as planned. These needs were shared at a workshop with key stakeholders, but no further action was taken by the individual CLP's and findings and recommendations of the assessment were not incorporated in their respective training programmes.

(d) Advanced document examination equipment has been installed at airports. This project activity was not directly linked to any planned activity within a strategy of GoSA to address specific operational or information/intelligence needs. Utilisation of the equipment therefore was not directly linked with any formal business process in the GoSA and therefore the GoSA did not develop any standard operating procedures to guide the flow of pieces of information to specific departments for their attention. Currently the advance equipment is used on an ad hoc basis when operational personnel choose to use it. There is no obligation to use it for a specific purpose and the real use of the equipment is reduced to a limited set of functions. Some statistics are reported on a monthly basis, but only for statistical purpose and not to enhance operational functions that can contribute to enhanced capacity to deal with combating human trafficking and smuggling of migrants.

(e) A study was conducted on the involvement of organised criminal groups and their modus operandi. The results of the study were shared at a workshop with key stakeholders but how these findings and recommendations were incorporated in departmental strategies and actions to improve capacity to deal with human trafficking and smuggling of migrants was not monitored or managed. The information generated through this study is therefore limited and not effectively put to use.

Improvements can be observed in the detection of suspect travel documents and potential cases of human trafficking or smuggling of migrants, according to feedback from key stakeholders during interviews. Due to unavailability of reliable statistics, it could not be verified. Accurate statistics on human trafficking will only be possible after adoption of the legislation and establishment of a specific crime and crime codes on the Case Administration System (CAS) of the SAPS. Alternative crimes are currently recorded, such as under labour laws, fraudulent document, etc, but it is impossible to distinguish human trafficking and smuggling of migrant cases against cases of another nature. No improvements could be observed in the investigation, prosecution and adjudication of cases pertaining to trafficking of persons and smuggling of migrants in South Africa, following the implementation of the project.

Improved effectiveness in inter-agency and inter-departmental cooperation between South African Counterparts is visible since the implementation of the project began, mainly due to improved networking on individual basis that resulted from joint training sessions, networks established through joint sitting on the PSC and sharing resources at border posts and airports. Joint training interventions and meetings on a regular basis brought better understanding of the role, mandate, operational needs and constraints amongst different stakeholders/departments in the border control environment.

The project takes into consideration and attempt to implement the recommendations from the Mid Term evaluation as far as possible, but only limited time (approximately one year) was available between the Mid Term evaluation and the Final Evaluation. The Project objective, Results and activities were reviewed

and the IACF replaced the previous PSC to ensure higher-level representation (DG/DDG level) on the PSC. Some of the recommendations were dependent on the adoption of the legislation on human trafficking that is still in process.

The project has therefore achieved its foreseen objective and results (i.e. outputs, outcomes and impact) to a limited extent. Although some progress has been made and the project provides plenty of opportunities for the GoSA to embrace, it is dependent on the GoSA on how they will take ownership of results achieved through this project and institutionalise it in the new BMA and address supporting issues mentioned above, that will determine real effectiveness and longer term impact.

Impact

According to inputs received through interviews and collaborated by project documents, the quality of outputs such as the training interventions, studies conducted and equipment purchased were very high due to quality of consultants and service providers. External factors as mentioned in the paragraph on Effectiveness above, however reduced the potential impact of interventions.

Insufficient consultation with key stakeholders during project planning and design phase leads to low levels of ownership and commitment of individual government departments. Due to this limited levels of ownership and commitment equipment procured through this project was is not utilised to its full potential and thus reduces the impact. Similarly, the impact of training interventions is less than expected because training material that was used during training interventions of this project was not fully incorporated into training material of the CLP's.

Two factors prove that this project was implemented at a time when South Africa was not yet ready for it. Firstly, the legislation on TiP was not finalized yet; and secondly, the BMA was not yet established . The BCOCC, which is an interim coordinating body without decision-making authority, performed the functions of such an agency. These two factors also created high levels of uncertainty about the future of the BCOCC and absorption of capacity developed through this project in the BMA. There is currently limited drive to ensure optimal impact is achieved due to a wait and see situation.

In addition to these two factors, two major events (the 2010 Soccer World Cup and 2012 African Cup of Nations) were hosted in South Africa during the period of project implementation. The CLP's were key institutions responsible for arrangements during these two events. These events drew resources and focus away from the project.

On a positive note, project activities brought members from different departments together on operational level and developed a better understanding and working relationships that improved cooperation and understanding for inter-dependencies. This understanding of inter-dependencies is well established and GoSA will continue with efforts to strengthen coordination between agencies and the impact will improve even further.

The impact of training interventions and workshops is clearly visible by the increased level of understanding of human trafficking and smuggling of migrants by officials since the start-date of this project. It increased the ability of officials to identify potential cases of human trafficking.

The advance document examination equipment has the potential to provide support to other organised crime activities, such as money laundering, vehicle theft and fraudulent travel documentation used by

crime syndicates, but it will remain potential impact until such time when the equipment is used optimally.

In general, impact achieved with this project is less than expected, but still has the potential to show higher levels of impact if some of the external factors, such as finalizing legislation on human trafficking and establishment of the BMA can be addressed soon and capacities developed can be absorbed in formal structures.

Sustainability

Sustainability of project results was planned during project design and provision was made for train-the-trainer. The intension was that individual border control agencies' training departments would absorb training material in their respective courses. Some departments, such as SAPS incorporated applicable training material into their training courses. The training divisions of DHA and SARS (Customs) however did not incorporate all training materials in their internal courses.

Some training material was not made available due to protection of intellectual property rights (Netherlands training) and due to the volume of some of the training materials only two sets per department were made available. These are used by operational personnel and were not distributed to training divisions. A third example is where only black and white copies and not colour pictures of fraudulent documents were available. That makes it impossible to use as training material as colour pictures are needed to distinguish fraudulent documents from authentic documents.

Provision was made for sustainability of advanced equipment and it was incorporated in the inventory list of the DHA. It is the responsibility of the DHA to make provision in future Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEF) to cover maintenance, updates and repairs when needed.

Beneficiaries did not take full ownership of project objectives as shown by insufficient absorption of training material in departmental training curricula; under utilization of the document examination equipment and absence of effective systems and processes where outputs produced by the equipment can feed in to enhance overall capacity to address human trafficking and smuggling of persons. Although project activities are very relevant and useful (training and equipment) the uncertainty surrounding the BMA, outstanding legislation and turnover of personnel indicate limited potential of scaling up, replicating and/or institutionalising project activities after project's lifespan.

The delay with adopting the legislation on human trafficking and finalizing the establishment of the BMA has a negative influence on the motivation of government institutions to take full ownership, commitment and sustainability.

Institutional and Management Arrangements

The funding Agreement between the EC and UNODC and the Project Document provide the conditions for the project implementation.

The UNODC ROSAF based in Pretoria, South Africa was responsible for the execution of this project and an implementation team based at ROSAF carried out day-to-day implementation of the project. The team consisted of an International Law Enforcement Expert and support staff. National and international consultants were recruited for specialised technical tasks, such as the review of policies and procedures;

training and equipment needs assessment at border posts and training delivery. A project officer based in Vienna ensured backstopping and provision of technical expertise by the relevant UNODC HQs technical sections as required.

Financial reporting was done by UNODC through a fund replenishment system, based on an approved yearly work plan. UNODC used its own bank account at the field level and UNODC HQ issued allotments to the UNODC office in Pretoria. The International Law Enforcement Expert carried out the duties of a certifying officer.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Pretoria as per UNODC ROSAF instructions was responsible for procurement of equipment, contracts for consultants and national project staff.

The implementation team at ROSAF performed well and according to information gathered during interviews, was always willing to assist where needed. The UNODC ROSAF provided valuable inputs and guidance to the project due to knowledge, skills and experience of staff. According interviewees, it is a pity however, that no provision was made in the management arrangements for South African officials to be part of the implementation team at ROSAF to allow for transfer of knowledge.

A negative aspect of this arrangement was that limited transfer of knowledge and skills related to project management and about human trafficking and smuggling of migrants on this level took place. Therefore limited capacity will remain after project closure.

A PSC has been formed, comprising of BCOCC members from SAPS, DHA, and SSA. In addition to the permanent members of the PSC a representative from the EU delegation and a representative from the Embassy of the Netherlands are invited to attend ex officio. The PSC is responsible to approve annual consolidated work plans and related budgets; provide political and strategic leadership to the project and monitor the overall implementation of the project; discuss and find solutions to challenges to the timely and high-quality implementation of the project; ensure that any internal or external risks to the successful implementation of the project are brought to light in a timely manner and ensure that potential solutions are found; ensure that there is sufficient information flow between the various stakeholders; monitor and ensure the commitment and buy-in of the counterparts in the target countries; ensure that any change to the project activities is shared and approved by the relevant stakeholders; approve any major changes to project activities and ensure that the procedure set forth in the project and donor agreements are followed if applicable; review project reports; and participate in terminal review meetings.

Representatives from government departments on the PSC were not on at senior level and therefore they could not take decisions on behalf of the departments. Within their own departments, the PSC representatives need to follow procedures through their respective hierarchies that were time consuming. During 2011, IACF consisting of DG's and DDG's from the border control departments and chaired by the DG from DHA was identified to assume the role of strategic level PSC for the project. The initial PSC was maintained as a technical implementation committee with the inclusion of the SANDF reflecting their new major role in border management. This change in management arrangement proved to be more effective as the IACF could take decisions immediately and it also improved the issue of ownership by individual departments. The fact that the IACF only became the PSC at the end of implementation period and were not fully consulted during planning and design phase, had an influence on the priority they gave to this project vis-à-vis their normal workload. Communication back from the IACF to the original PSC members was not effective and was dependent on flow of communication from the IACF through the BCOCC to the original PSC members. If this arrangement was in place from the start of

implementation and communication lines could be clarified up front, it could have improved effectiveness, sustainability and impact of this project.

Project monitoring was undertaken through monthly management expenditure reports and semi-annual progress reports prepared by UNODC. Progress reports focused on: a) physical project progress against targets set-out in the projects annual work-plans (i.e. input provision, activities undertaken and results delivered), b) financial progress (i.e. budget allocation vs. expenditures); c) response by target group such as evaluation of trainings provided; d) identify success and analyze any problems encountered in project delivery and propose actions to be taken.

Due to the management arrangements, this detailed reporting was done within UNODC structures, although the South African counterparts were informed in a summarized format. Detailed financial reporting was not done on a regular basis through the South African system. This created the feeling amongst some of the South African officials that it was rather a UNODC project than a South African project.

Monitoring of project implementation was supported through the Project Steering Committee.

As for the project evaluation, external consultants were recruited under the project to undertake a mid-term evaluation in accordance with the guidelines of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit and EC requirements.

The PM met with the NPA, which is not part of the BCOCC, for coordination purposes and the NPA was invited to attend the PSC meetings. In addition, meetings were held with IOM to coordinate with their efforts in the area of TiP and SoM and to build on work already done in the region.

Information is provided to and coordination sought with the representatives in the South African Immigration Liaison (SAIL) group. The group comprises liaison officers from a large number of embassies, UNODC, IOM, representatives from SAPS and DHA as well as from the private contractors working in the field of document control at OR Tambo International Airport.

The cooperation between the BCOCC, UNODC, the EU delegation in South Africa and the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has proved to be very effective.

III. CONCLUSIONS

The project design was relevant; although the timing for implementation might not be at the best moment in time for the South African Government to fully take advantage of deliverables presented by this project. Various factors such as (1) legislation on TiP not finalized created a situation where government departments wait for a formal mandate before they can act; (2) no policies and procedures can be developed in the absence of legislation and crime statistics could only be registered under alternative legislation; (3) The BMA not established yet and mandates, roles and responsibilities of different agencies need to be streamlined.

The Project Agreement was in partnership between the UNODC and BCOCC. The BCOCC acted as a coordinating body with no decision-making authority and during the timeframe of this project, the GoSA was still deciding on establishing a BMA. This created high level of uncertainty about how capacity developed at BCOCC will be accommodated into the BMA to be established.

Two major events, namely the 2010 Soccer World Cup and 2012 African Cup of Nations were hosted in South Africa and drew attention and resources away from the project. The border control agencies were very involved in both of these events.

Consultation during project planning and design was limited to BCOCC and did not include consultation with senior management of the individual departments in the border control environment, such as DHA, SAPS, SSA, SARS, SANDF, etc. This created an environment where key stakeholders were not aware of the project; did not make provision for it in their respective MTSF and MTEF's. This lack of understanding about project objectives led to limited ownership from key stakeholders.

The PSC representatives were on middle management level and did not have easy access to decision-making authorities hence they found it difficult to fulfil their functions.

Taking into consideration the conditions under which the project was implemented, project delivery was acceptable. Most planned activities were implemented but effectiveness and impact were hampered by not sufficient training provided in the use of advanced equipment and lack of a formal system or procedure to ensure optimal use of the equipment. Nominations by border control departments for training interventions some times took a very long time and the most relevant personnel was not always nominated for specific training interventions.

Not all the activities that were planned to ensure sustainability were implemented and factors such as outstanding legislation, low levels of commitment, uncertainty about absorption of capacity into the planned BMA and lack of policies, procedures creates uncertainty about future sustainability.

Valuable lessons can be learnt from this project and the BMA can benefit from capacities developed through this project if steps are taken to address the identified shortcomings. Capacities developed through this project can also contribute meaningfully towards addressing other organized crimes such as drug trafficking, money laundering, vehicle theft, etc.

Project activities presented the opportunity and potential to address TiP and SoM and it is up to the GoSA to embrace contributions made by this project and institutionalize capacities developed.

TiP and SoM is a regional and international threat and South Africa is strategically important as a destination as well as a route in the international landscape. It is therefore critical to strengthen internal, but also participate in strengthening capacity in the Southern African region.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Project Design

Recommendations for UNODC

Future programme designs should make provision for sufficient consultation with all key stakeholders. It is critical that decision-makers and executive management key to the theme of the proposed project is consulted in detail to ensure readiness for support; determine needs; consider local conditions; clarify counterpart contributions; ensure ownership; agree on project management modalities; agree on supporting environment requirements and responsibilities; clarify roles and responsibilities and plan for sustainability. It is also recommended that UNODC should in future enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with each of the key stakeholders, defining the objective and each partner to the Agreement's contributions and commitments

Project design should take cognisance of governmental structures, clusters, sectors, coordination structures and mechanisms, and governmental management, reporting and monitoring structures of the beneficiary country. It is recommended that management arrangements of the project should fit into these management arrangements as it will ensure alignment and coordination with beneficiary governments' priorities and strategies; and it will ensure supporting environment will be managed through the same system. This will prevent parallel implementation and strengthen sustainability.

Recommendations for UNODC and Beneficiary Country

UNODC and beneficiary country should agree during project design on the PSC structure and the level of representatives from key stakeholders to ensure the PSC has the mandate and authority to fulfil its mandate and be able to remove implementation obstacles when they arise.

UNODC and Beneficiary country should ensure that results of studies, assessments and surveys are optimal utilised and provision should be made in the log frame to monitor implementation of these recommendations.

It is recommended that future projects make provision for baseline surveys at that start of implementation phase to ensure the basis for measuring success over time.

Project Implementation

Recommendations to the UNODC

UNODC should ensure that train-the-trainer components of training interventions are fully implemented to ensure sustainability of training activities.

Recommendations to the GoSA

The GoSA, led by BCOCC and DHA, should take the necessary steps to ensure the legislation on human trafficking is finalized as soon as possible

The DHA should clarify the arrangement regarding establishment of the BMA and all efforts should be made to ensure capacities developed through this project would be incorporated in the new structure.

The DHA and BCOCC should clarify how BCOCC will be incorporated in BMA and how capacity developed through this project will be sustained

The DHA should take the lead in developing policies, procedures and management process to ensure the use of advance equipment procured through this project will be optimised. Management of information/intelligence produced through using the equipment should be defined in close cooperation with SAPS, SARS and SSA.

Recommendation regarding future Projects

The GoSA, EU and other development partners should consider a regional project with the objective to develop regional capacity related to TiP and SoM. Focus should be on alignment of legislation, policies and procedures across borders between SADC countries. Capacity developed can also be applied in support of other organised crime related issues such as firearms, vehicle theft, drug control and money laundering

V. LESSONS LEARNED

Project Design

Consultation during the design phase was restricted to only the BCOCC and did not include senior level consultation with border control departments (also member departments to the BCOCC). The BCOCC is a coordinating body and is dependent on member departments for resource allocation and approval of any activity that require their support or impacting on their functional domain. The project therefore experience low level of ownership, commitment and support from the member departments and decision-making was always a slow process. It was aggravated by the representatives at the PSC on behalf of member departments that did not have decision-making authority on behalf of the departments.

Management arrangements of the project do not make sufficient provision for full-time involvement of the local partner (BCOCC and member departments) in day-to-day implementation of activities and therefore loose out on the opportunity for transfer of skills and building capacity that will remain with the recipient after project life cycle.

The GoSA structures for coordinating and reporting on government strategies, such as the Justice, Crime Prevention and Security Cluster (JCPS) and IACF were not utilized for formal reporting. Detailed reporting was done within UNODC structures and therefore provides little opportunity for formal alignment with government strategies and benefitting from supporting activities implemented by government or other partners. This also contributed towards a sense that this project is not part of what government is doing.

The following lessons were learnt related to project design:

(a) Consultation and buy-in from senior management of all key stakeholders are critical to ensure ownership and support during project implementation and future design should make provision for sufficient consultation;

(b) The beneficiary country was not fully involved in day-to-day project management activities. This led to lack of ownership and it took limited responsibility for spending of project's funds and effective utilisation of project outputs. Direct involvement and taking responsibilities for managing project implementation could strengthen ownership and alignment with related initiatives taken by the government of South Africa, such as development of legislation on TiP and establishment of the BMA.

(c) Reporting outside the recipient county's reporting structures miss the opportunity to ensure alignment with government strategies and to benefit from supporting activities that can strengthen project activities; increase ownership, alignment and potential for sustainability

(d) Timing of implementing a project is important to ensure absorption capacity exists and critical external factors needed in support for project activities are in place. If a beneficiary country is not ready for a project, it may frustrate implementation as attention and resources are with other priorities.

Project Implementation

If representatives on PSC do not have decision-making authority and full mandate, they cannot fulfil their functions as PSC and it slows implementation considerably down. Since the IACF took over the role of PSC, it shows immediate results, although it was late during implementation phase.

If strict criteria are not applied during nomination of trainees, persons can be nominated to receive training that is not relevant to their job description. If a person's job description does not fit the requirements the capacity does not remain in the project and the institutional capacity is not developed.

When equipment is provided without clearly organisational systems, processes and procedures, it will not be utilised consistently between different offices and at an optimal level. Value of information that can be produced and contribution it can make towards improved productivity is limited.

Best practices

Training provided by the Netherlands proved to be a best practice as it was well presented, very relevant and practical of nature. Trainees accompanied counterparts of border control agencies to a border post and witness practical experiences in support of training material.

The way the activities were planned to ensure joint training and joint discussions at PSC meetings and workshops, provided a platform for networking across departmental structures. It provides a better understanding of interdependencies and each other's mandates, responsibilities, constraints and needs. It also provided a platform for sharing lessons learnt and best practices from work experience. It improves coordination, working towards a common goal and shortened communication channels.

The advanced document examination equipment has the potential as a best practice as it contributes towards effective ways to identify suspect documentation and currencies, but also keep a paper trail and evidence that can assist investigations and criminal proceedings.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Project number:	ZAF/T54
Project title:	Strengthening Law Enforcement Capacity (Border Control Operations) and Criminal Justice Response to Smuggling of Migrants and Trafficking in Persons
Duration:	48 Months
Location:	Pretoria, South Africa
Linkages to Country Programme:	
Linkages to Regional Programme:	In line with the UNODC Medium Term Strategy 2008-2011, the project supports Theme 1: Rule of Law, and contributes to the following result areas and results: 1.1 Ratification and implementation of conventions and protocols; 1.2 International cooperation in criminal justice matters
Linkages to Thematic Programme:	The project further supports Theme 2: Policy Trend Analysis through the undertaking of research and surveys.
Executing Agency:	UNODC
Partner Organizations:	Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee
Total Approved Budget: (US\$)	Total overall proposed budget: \$3,054,008 Pledges: \$2,611,854
Donors:	EU
Project Manager/Coordinator:	Patrik Engstroem
Type of evaluation (mid-term or final):	Final evaluation
Time period covered by the evaluation:	1 March 2009 to 28 February 2013
Geographical coverage of the evaluation:	South Africa, primarily Pretoria and Johannesburg
Core Learning Partners:	BCOCC, South African Police Service (SAPS), Department of Home Affairs (DHA), Customs (SARS), State Security Agency (SSA)

1.1 Project overview and historical context

The implementation of the four-year project began on 1 September 2009. The project document was signed in May and June 2009. The total budget of the project is US\$ 3,054,008, including support costs. The Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee (BCOCC) is the main partner in the implementation of the project. The partnership between UNODC and BCOCC has been formalised through the exchange of letters of agreement. The associate partners of the project are the Government of The Netherlands and Europol.

The original main objective of the project was to support the implementation of the National Integrated Border Management Strategy (2008-2010) in response to smuggling of migrants and trafficking of persons, by providing technical assistance that promotes cooperation, coordination, and mutual support, information sharing and joint operations between all national border management agencies in South Africa.

1.2 Justification of the project and main experiences and challenges

In recent years, the smuggling of migrants (SoM) from Africa to Europe has increased considerably. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) estimates that around 55,000 Africans illegally try to reach Europe every year at an estimated value US\$ 150 million for the smugglers.

South Africa is both a destination and transit country for the smuggling of migrants originating from the Southern African region and from the rest of the continent. In addition to African migration, Southern Africa has also become a region of transit and final destination for the smuggling of migrants from South and East Asia. A 2009 research report from IOM estimates that some 50% of the Somali and Ethiopians who manage to reach South Africa as irregular migrants will continue to Europe, North America, and Australia.

Trafficking in persons (TiP) has become a major concern in many parts of the world, including Southern Africa which is, according to the UNODC report “Global Report on Trafficking in Persons” (2009) mainly a trafficking destination for victims from countries within and outside the region. Recent cases have indicated also human trafficking from Asia to Southern Africa and trafficking from South Africa to Turkey and the Middle East.

The Republic of South Africa has ratified the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, and the supplementing Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Air and Sea and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children. However the capacity of the criminal justice system and law enforcement authorities needs strengthening in all sectors (border control management, law enforcement, prosecution and judiciary), in order to effectively fight the smuggling of migrants and human trafficking.

With the establishment of the Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee (BCOCC), responsible for the strategic and integrated operational management of the South African border environment, South Africa has the means to put into place structured programmes which address the smuggling of migrants, human trafficking and organized crime in an integrated manner.

1.3 Project documents and revisions of the original project document

At the end of 2011, following difficulties in implementation, the project was revised. It was found that since the original design of the project there had been a number of changes in the operating environment that impact on the problem conditions and the counterpart capacity. These changes as well as preliminary findings from the project activities led UNODC and the South African Government partner, the BCOCC to agree to re-prioritize project activities and focus the remaining activities on actual border control operations. The overall objective was adjusted and the outcomes of the project updated. Indicate how and whom these adjustments were approved.

Initial project description	Revised project description
Objective;	
<p>The main objective of the project is to support the implementation of the National Integrated Border Management Strategy 2008-2010 response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking in and through South Africa, by providing technical assistance to promote integrated border management by enhancing cooperation between all national border management agencies with the aim of achieving cooperation, coordination, mutual support, and information sharing, and joint operations between these agencies. Investigative and prosecutorial capacities will be enhanced and prevention, through information campaigns targeting officials and general public at border control areas, will be fostered.</p>	<p>The main objective of the project is to support the implementation of the revised National Integrated Border Management Strategy response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking in and through South Africa.</p>
Outcomes;	
<p>Outcome 1; Enhanced capacities of border control agencies to implement the National Integrated Border Management Strategy 2008-2010 with coherent, institutionalized national frameworks established to coordinate and prioritize action as well as analyze information and share intelligence.</p>	<p>Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities of border control agencies to implement the revised National Integrated Border Management Strategy response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking with coherent, institutionalized national frameworks established to coordinate and prioritize action as well as analyse information and share intelligence.</p>
<p>Outcome 2; Improved knowledge and skills in the detection of fraudulent and fraudulently obtained travel documents.</p>	<p>Outcome 2: Improved knowledge, skills and technical capacity in the detection of fraudulent and fraudulently obtained travel documents.</p>

<p>Outcome 3; Enhanced awareness and improved evidence-based knowledge on the smuggling of migrants and trafficking in human beings, perpetrators and criminal groups involved, including information about their modus operandi and routes in order to facilitate operational measures to counter these crimes.</p>	<p>Outcome 3: Relevant authorities take receipt of report on organised crime and the smuggling of migrants in order to use enhanced awareness and improved evidence-based knowledge in operational measures</p>
<p>Outcome 4; Improved international criminal justice and law enforcement cooperation between South Africa and competent authorities in Member States of the EU, at the bilateral level or through Europol or Interpol, particularly for information sharing and coordination of operational activities among law enforcement agencies, border control authorities and other relevant actors.</p>	<p>Outcome 4: Improved International and Interregional Cooperation on smuggling of migrants and human trafficking.</p>
<p>Outcome 5; Increased awareness on smuggling of migrants and human trafficking.</p>	<p>Outcome 5: Target populations in receipt of awareness material on smuggling of migrants and human trafficking</p>

Some of the changes made as a result of re-prioritisation were confirmed by the findings and recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation report. The Mid-Term Evaluation was conducted from 21 November 2011 to 28 November 2011 and the purpose of this evaluation was to:

- i. Assess the achievements of the project from March 2009 to ... (date);
- ii. Assess the problems encountered since project implementation began;
- iii. Assess the appropriateness of all project components;
- iv. Assess the impact of the project;
- v. Assess challenges in assessing the impact of the project and what should have been done to resolve such challenges; and
- vi. Recommend possible changes to the general project design, in line with the current border management situation in South Africa.

The Mid-Term Evaluation considered aspects of:

- i. Relevance;
- ii. Effectiveness;
- iii. Efficiency;
- iv. Impact;
- v. Sustainability; and
- vi. Partnership.

The report was received on 13 December 2011 and approved on 25 October 2012.

Specific findings and recommendations were as follows:

FINDING: PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IDENTIFIED	RECOMMENDATIONS
i. Slow start and some delays during project implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make provision for project start-up phase in project design. • Ensure buy-in through extensive consultation process during design phase. • Ensure involvement of Executive management on PSC level. • Ensure project support a comprehensive strategy to ensure support environment is addressed.
ii. Baseline information not available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government led initiative to raise awareness and define concepts. • Finalise legislation on Human Trafficking and Smuggling of Persons as soon as possible. • Establish single database to capture information.
iii. Fragmented approach in dealing with human trafficking and smuggling of people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for a comprehensive strategy with clearly defined management structures; roles/responsibilities and mandates outlined. • Border Management Agency may provide vehicle to address issues related to mandate and formalising processes and procedures.
iv. Coordination and cooperation between border control agencies not institutionalised, but rather based on individual commitment and passion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise legislation on Human Trafficking and Smuggling of Persons • Establishment of Border management Agency might address issues related to mandate, defining processes and procedures, and may be mandated to coordinate and enforce cooperation.
v. South African government to fully take ownership and manage issues related to human trafficking and smuggling of persons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South African government to finalise legislation and regulations; develop comprehensive strategy; develop governance model to ensure effective and efficient implementation.

Implementation of recommendations that falls within the mandate of the project took place as follows:

- Executive management was involved on PSC-level through contacts between the Project Manager and the Inter-Agency Clearing Forum already before the draft mid term evaluation report had been delivered and continued through out the project revision process and beyond. From mid 2012 the IACF has not met with any frequency.
- The South African government has passed adopted the Human Trafficking Bill in Parliament, but it is still pending additional approval before it can enter into force. No specific legislation on Smuggling of Persons exists in South Africa except the Immigration Act.
- The responsibility to establish a single Border Management Agency has passed from the Department of State Security to the Department of Home Affairs, but little actual progress has been made.

1.4 UNODC strategy context, including project's main objectives and outcomes and project's contribution to UNODC country, regional or thematic programme

The project fits the strategy of UNODC in supporting Member States to implement the following two Protocols, which supplement the United Nations Convention on Transnational Organised Crime:

- Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime.
- Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Air and Sea, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime.

In line with the UNODC Medium Term Strategy 2008-2011, the project supports Theme 1: Rule of Law, and contributes to the following result areas and results:

The project further supports Theme 2: Policy Trend Analysis through the undertaking of research and surveys.

1.5 Reference should be made to the background information list (Annex 1), which encompasses materials to be used by the evaluator for the desk review.

Prior to the evaluation, the following documents will be made available to the evaluator:

- i. Project document and project revision documents;
- ii. Semi-annual and annual project progress reports;
- iii. Project-related mission reports;
- iv. Project meeting reports;
- v. Other relevant documents such as samples of evaluation questionnaires, guideline reports on the impact of trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, as well as other relevant correspondence deemed necessary for the overall assessment of the current project status; and
- vi. The Mid-Term Evaluation report and recommendations.

5. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

Overall Budget (Time period)	Total Approved Budget (Time period)	Expenditure (Time period)	Expenditure in % (time period)
2009 - 2013	2009 - 2013	2009 - 2012	2009 - 2012
US\$ 3,054,008	US\$ 2,213,652	US\$ 1,177,752	53.2%

6. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation is foreseen in the project document as part of the normal project management life cycle and as the end of implementation to provide feedback to donors, CLP's and UNODC.

The aim is to determine the extent to which planned and unplanned objectives and outcomes were achieved, to identify the factors of success or failure, to assess the sustainability of the benefits generated, and to draw conclusions that may inform future programming, policy making and overall organizational learning.

The project final evaluation is undertaken to:

- i. Assess the achievements of the project;
- ii. Review the effectiveness of the project components and outputs, focusing on the effectiveness of the adjusted project components and outputs, in comparison to the initial design;
- iii. Provide advice on the feasibility of the original project design and activities, and on the project revision and re-design process;
- iv. Document challenges faced, as well lessons learned by all Core Learning Partners (See list of CLPs and their key roles and responsibilities);
- v. Provide advice on the initial consultative process and modality of signing with a committee rather than each individual department; and
- vi. Assess the impact of the project, including unintended impacts, contextualised by challenges that were experienced in assessing the impact of the project.
- vii. Assess whether the findings and recommendations from the Mid Term Evaluation have been addressed and implemented

The evaluation should provide the donor, the CLP's and UNODC with accountability by determining if project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized as well as to get feedback on the initial planning, design and consultative process. All parties may use the evaluation for future strategic planning and for planning, designing and implementing future projects.

The main evaluation users are the EU as donors, the South African government through the CLP's and UNODC through the project manager. All parties will be available for interviews by the evaluators.

7. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The unit of analysis is this specific project (ZAF/T54), and the evaluation will focus on the implementation period following the adjustment of the project objective, components and outputs, and the Mid-Term Evaluation, i.e. the period from December 2011 to February 2013.

The evaluation will also take into consideration relevant developments outside of the scope and control of this project, and how it has influenced the implementation of, and impact achieved by this project. Particularly, the setting up of a single Border Management Agency under the Department of State Security, subsequently under the Department of Home Affairs; the decreasing relevance of the 2008 – 2010 Integrated Border management Strategy; and the impact of these developments on other main border management departments should be taken into account.

Throughout the evaluation attention should be paid to the underlying assumptions that formed part of the project planning and design, and to what extent these assumptions were explicit and valid. Attention should also be paid to the extent to which the intervention logic was sound (was the theory of change sound?) and to which extent the Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) and sources and means of verification were relevant and feasible.

The evaluation should also assess to what extent the project resulted in improved or enhanced partnerships between the project partners.

8. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will assess the comparative strengths and weaknesses of the project before and after adjustment and implementation of Mid-Term Evaluation recommendations. The evaluation will consider aspects of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and partnership.

a. Relevance

- i. To what extent is ZAF/T54 aligned with the relevant national plans and strategies of South Africa concerning for example Trafficking in Persons, smuggling of migrants and enhanced integrated border management?
- ii. Is the project aligned with the priority needs of the beneficiaries/counterparts within the areas of integrated border management as well as the prevention of Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants?
- iii. Is the main objective of the project still relevant to the current situation in South Africa regarding Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants? Is the objective still relevant to the current situation in South Africa regarding capacity building of law enforcement and integrated border management?
- iv. Are there any other actors providing a similar type of technical assistance in the country, targeting the same stakeholders?
- v. What is the particular added value of the project in comparison to ongoing projects being implemented in the country and/or the region by other actors?
- vi. What is the particular added value of the project in comparison to other ongoing projects with the UNODC such as XASS69 or IOM's SACTAP-project?
- vii. Would it be valuable to replicate best practices and lessons learned from the project, to future or ongoing projects with the UNODC or other actors, with or without modifications, and if so how?

b. Effectiveness

- i. Has the project achieved its foreseen objective and results (i.e. outputs, outcomes and impact)? If not, which progress was made towards these achievements?
- ii. What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of the project objective?
- iii. Can any improvements be observed in the investigation, prosecution and adjudication of cases pertaining to trafficking of persons and smuggling of migrants in South Africa, following the implementation of the project?
- iv. Has there been an improved effectiveness in inter-agency and inter-departmental cooperation between South African Counterparts since the implementation of the project began?
- v. Has the project been implemented with sufficient cooperation and dialogue with other UNODC projects, in particular XASS69, so as to effectively complement these efforts?
- vi. What are the major challenges, opportunities and obstacles encountered by the project as a whole?
- vii. Did the project take into consideration and/or implement the recommendations from the Mid Term evaluation? (or something along these lines)

c. Efficiency

- i. Has the project funding been properly and timely allocated as well as spent as planned?
- ii. Has the project staff been selected and recruited in a suitable and timely manner?
- iii. To what extent have project counterparts in South Africa fulfilled the obligations/responsibilities agreed upon in providing support towards the implementation of the project?
- iv. Which challenges have project counterparts experienced, that has prevented them from fulfilling their obligations/responsibilities to provide support to the project?
- v. Which measures have been taken during the planning and implementation of the project to ensure that resources are used efficiently?
- vi. Is there a well-functioning and accountable project management and monitoring system in place?
- vii. What is the quality and timeliness of the monitoring, administrative and financial support provided by ROSAF and UNODC Headquarters?

d. Impact

- i. What is the general quality of the project outputs to date?
- ii. What difference has the project's intervention made to the operations of the relevant Government agencies and departments affiliated to the Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee (BCOCC), according to the departments?
- iii. Based on the views of stakeholders and actors involved, to what extent has the project had intended and/or unintended impact, whether negatively or positively?
- iv. To what extent have external factors beyond the control of the project affected its implementation, whether negatively or positively?
- v. What was the adequacy and timeliness of the project's response to these external factors?

e. Sustainability

- i. To which extent have issues of sustainability been considered and incorporated into the project outline and activities?
- ii. Have the beneficiaries taken ownership of the project objectives, and have they shown intentions of continuing, scaling up, replicating and/or institutionalising project activities after the funding ceases?
- iii. Are the relevant Government institutions affiliated to the Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee (BCOCC) developing the capacity to efficiently administer the initiative? Is there a motivation with the government institutions to continue administering the initiative?

f. Partnership

- i. Have coordination mechanisms between UNODC and other relevant development entities to the project been successfully established?
- ii. Which lessons can be drawn from the coordination efforts and working arrangements between the project team at ROSAF, the relevant substantive offices at UNODC Headquarters as well as the project counterparts/beneficiaries?
- iii. What are the comparative advantages of UNODC as a partnering organisation when it comes to trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, and was the project implemented with these advantages in mind?

9. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluator will prepare an evaluation methodology and share it with the Programme Manager, the Integrated Programming and Oversight Branch (IPB), Division for Operations as well as the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). He/she will finalise the evaluation methodology, incorporating the substantive comments of the relevant offices. Throughout the evaluation process, the IEU will be available to provide methodological support where necessary.

The Final evaluation will be conducted by means of:

Examination and triangulation of documents and reports associated with the project, site visits at the three (3) international airports in South Africa where project implementation has taken place and interviews with project staff, members of the Project Steering Committee and other South African Government counterparts.

The documents will include the following (see Annex for preliminary list):

- i. Initial and revised project document;
- ii. Consultant and activity documents;
- iii. Semi-annual and annual project progress reports;
- iv. Mid-Term Evaluation report;
- v. Budgets for ZAFT54 and statements of expenditure, detailing how the funds of the two budgets have been utilised to date; and
- vi. Any other documents and materials related to the project, which the evaluator may request.

10. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluation will take place during the last months of the project, starting in January 2013, through to February 2013 within a contracted period of thirty one (31) days including weekends.

The Project Manager and the evaluator will develop and finalise the evaluation agenda/work plan, specifying the dates on which the evaluation will be carried out, the locations to be visited as well as the tasks that will be carried out by the evaluator.

The agenda/work plan should also specify the specific period in which the Core Learning Partners will be expected to comment on the evaluation report. The evaluator, following prior consultations with ROSAF, will revise the final agenda.

Activities	Timeframe	Responsible party	Location
1. Meeting ZAFT54 project team	1 day	ZAFT 54 project team	UNODC Offices
2. Project documentation evaluation	7 days	Evaluation team	Evaluators offices
3. Presentation of inception report including detailed work plan, methodology and evaluation tool	1 day	Evaluation team	UNODC Offices
4. Meeting and interviews	5 days	Evaluation team	UNODC/ Evaluators offices
	5 days	ZAFT54 Project team &	Cape Town, King Shaka and O.R. Tambo Airports

5. Site visits and site interviews	1 day	evaluators	UNODC and Partners' offices in Pretoria
	5 days	Evaluation team & ZAFT54 project team	
6. Debrief meeting	1 day	Evaluation team	Evaluators offices
			UNODC offices
7. Draft report	10 days	ZAFT 54 project team & IEU	
8. Preliminary Review of Draft *quality assurance check prior to circulation to CLPs	1 day	CLPs & IEU	
	2 days	Evaluation team	Evaluators offices
9. Circulation of Draft to CLPs/IEU for review		Evaluation team	Evaluators offices
10. Revision of Draft			
11. Report finalization			

11. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent national expert with at least 7 years of professional experience in conducting evaluations of international projects (in particular UNODC or other UN projects), and in developing methodologies, including both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques. The expert should further have demonstrated knowledge and expertise in trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. The expert should hold an advanced university degree in law, criminal justice, criminology, migration management or a related field. He/she should not have been involved in the design and implementation of the project.

The evaluator will be appointed by ROSAF, in consultation with the Integrated Programme and Oversight Branch (IPB), Division for Operations, the Implementation and Support Section of the Organised Crime Branch - as well as the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), Office of the Executive Director.

The Project Manager will provide all required documentation and assistance to the Evaluator as required, including travel arrangements. Whilst receiving comments from the Project Manager and/or any other parties involved in the implementation of the project, the evaluator will not act as representative of any party. The evaluation will be conducted in conformity with these terms of reference.

12. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS

Prior to undertaking the evaluation, the evaluator will visit ROSAF for a briefing on the project management and the status of its execution. While in Pretoria, the Evaluator may at his/her discretion, seek the opinions of the relevant donor partners in Pretoria.

The Project Manager and support staff at ROSAF will ensure that adequate logistical arrangements and support is provided in the places to be visited. The evaluator will establish contacts, as deemed necessary, for the smooth progress of the evaluation. The evaluator will not have the authority to make any commitment, monetary and/or otherwise, on behalf of UNODC and/or any of the project parties i.e. the recipient country and donor partners.

During the debriefing meeting, which will be held at ROSAF February 6, 2013, the Evaluator will present a summary of the mission's findings and recommendations. Any observations and comments received from UNODC and the national counterparts during the mission will be taken into account by the evaluator and reflected in the final report as appropriate.

The evaluator will maintain his/her impartiality and independence in finalising the report as well as in making his/her final conclusions and recommendations. Within one week after the end of the mission February 8, 2013, the evaluator will produce a draft report in English not exceeding 30 pages, excluding annexes. This will be circulated for comments to the Programme Manager, the Integrated Programme and Oversight Branch (IPB), Division for Operations and the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), Office of the Executive Director and the representatives in the Project Steering Committee.

The evaluator will then incorporate these comments in the final proof read evaluation report. As far as possible, the report should follow the UNODC Standard Format and Guidelines for Evaluation Reports, which are included in Annex 3. The evaluator will be required to complete the summary assessment questionnaire for the evaluation, a copy of which will be provided during the introductory briefing held at ROSAF prior to the commencement of the mission.

At the Tripartite Review Meeting scheduled for February 27, 2013 ROSAF will make a presentation on the findings and recommendations of the evaluation.

13. PAYMENT MODALITIES

The evaluator will be paid in accordance with UN rules and procedures. He/she will receive a lump sum in three (3) instalments as follows:

- The first payment will be made upon submission and clearance of the Inception Report, which includes a detailed work plan, methodology and evaluation tools for this assignment (travel expenses plus 75 % of the daily subsistence allowance);
- The second payment (50 % of the consultancy fee and 25 % of the daily subsistence allowance) will be made upon the receipt of the draft report by the relevant units and sections at headquarters or field offices and by the Independent Evaluation Unit;
- The third and final payment (50 % of the consultancy fee, i.e. the remainder of the fee) will be made after receipt of the final evaluation report and its clearance by the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU).

ACTIVITY	AMOUNT IN US\$
Briefing of evaluator by the Project Manager and Programme Associate x 1 day (Pretoria)	\$408.00
Project documentation evaluation x 7 days	\$2,856.00
Presentation of inception report including detailed work plan, methodology and evaluation tool x 1 day (Pretoria)	\$408.00
Meetings and interviews x 5 days (Pretoria)	\$2,040.00
Site visits & site interviews x 5 days (Cape Town, Durban and O.R Tambo)	\$2,040.00
Debrief meeting x 1 day (Pretoria)	\$408.00
Drafting report x 5 days	\$2,040.00
Revision and finalization of the evaluation report x 3 days	\$1,224.00
Daily Subsistence Allowance Pretoria x 8 days	\$2,400.00

Daily Subsistence Allowance site visits x 5 day	\$1,500.00
Traveling costs + terminals <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Flights▪ Car rental	\$5,000.00
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS	\$20,324.00
TOTAL BUDGETED COSTS	\$40,000.00

ANNEX II. DESK REVIEW LIST

1. Financial Report, 2009
2. Financial Report, 2010
3. Financial Report 2011
4. PSC Meetings Minutes: October 2012, July 2012, May 2012, March 2012, February 2012, January 2012, June 2011, November 2011, October 2011, August 2011, November 2010, September 2010, March 2010, February 2010, January 2010.
5. Project Annual Report 2009
6. Annual Progress Report, January 2012
7. Annual Progress report 2010
8. Semi-annual Report 2010
9. Logical Framework
10. Project Document
11. Project Agreement (EU and UNODC)
12. MOU: BCOCC and UNODC

ANNEX III. EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

Evaluability of project

- * Has a project monitoring system been set up, including a baseline survey, to allow a proper monitoring throughout the project?
- * If so, please provide copy/ies of baseline studies and documentation on monitoring system
- * Are targets well specified in the Project Document, including clear and concise performance indicators? Please provide copies
- * Is there a clear and logical consistency between the objectives, inputs, activities, outputs in terms of quality, quantity, time frame and cost-efficiency?
- * Are the partners and beneficiaries well identified in the project document? Who are they?
- * Are prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks) well specified and met? Please provide documentation.
- * Is the managerial and institutional framework for implementation well defined? Please elaborate and provide documentation to this effect.
- * Is the work plan practical, logical and cohesive?
- * Is the planned project duration realistic? Motivate answer and provide practical examples of any delays and causes of delays if relevant.
- * How consultative was the process of reviewing the original Logical Framework
- * How effective was the changes made in activities in addressing overall objectives and South African priorities
- * Did the changes contribute towards an improved project or did it have negative influence on overall objectives. Explain with examples
- * Are all external institutional relationships correctly identified? Please motivate

Relevance

- * To what extent is ZAFT54 aligned with the relevant national plans and strategies of South Africa concerning for example Trafficking in Persons, smuggling of migrants and enhanced integrated border management. Please provide examples.

- * Is the project aligned with the priority needs of the beneficiaries/counterparts within the areas of integrated border management as well as the prevention of Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants?
- * Is the main objective of the project still relevant to the current situation in South Africa regarding Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants? Is the objective still relevant to the current situation in South Africa regarding capacity building of law enforcement and integrated border management?
- * Which are the differences? Why?
- * Is the project the appropriate solution to the problems it aims to address? Please motivate your response
- * Was the project designed in a participatory manner? Please explain.
- * Taking evolution of the context over time, to what extent did the project adapt to these changes? Please provide examples.
- * Is the main objective of the project still relevant to the current situation in South Africa regarding Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants? Please motivate
- * Are there any other actors providing a similar type of technical assistance in the country, targeting the same stakeholders? Please provide detail and examples.
- * Was the project's approach the appropriate solution to achieve the objectives? Please motivate. If not, please motivate and provide suggestions.
- * What is the particular added value of the project in comparison to ongoing projects being implemented in the country and/or the region by other actors? Please motivate response.
- * What is the particular added value of the project in comparison to other ongoing projects with the UNODC such as XASS69 or IOM's SACTAP-project? Please motivate and provide examples.
- * Did the project address the root causes? Please motivate response.
- * Would it be valuable to replicate best practices and lessons learned from the project, to future or ongoing projects with the UNODC or other actors, with or without modifications, and if so how?

Efficiency

- * Were sufficient funds available compared with planned activities?
- * Has the project funding been properly and timely allocated as well as spent as planned? Please motivate response.
- * Has the project staff been selected and recruited in a suitable and timely manner? Please provide detail
- * To what extent have project counterparts in South Africa fulfilled the obligations/responsibilities agreed upon in providing support towards the implementation of the project? Please provide examples
- * Which challenges have project counterparts experienced, that prevented them from fulfilling their obligations/responsibilities to provide support to the project? Please explain and provide examples

- * Which measures have been taken during the planning and implementation of the project to ensure that resources are used efficiently?
- * Is there a well-functioning and accountable project management and monitoring system in place? Please explain and provide detail.
- * What is the quality and timeliness of the monitoring, administrative and financial support provided by ROSAF and UNODC Headquarters? Please provide examples of procedures and timeframes.
- * What organizational and managerial arrangements were put in place and how well did they perform? Please describe and provide examples.
- * Which procedures for procurement were followed? To what extent did the procedure allow for efficiency? Please explain.
- * Compared with alternative approaches that would accomplish the same development objectives, has the project's progress been made at an acceptable cost? Could more progress have been achieved with the same input? Could the same have been achieved with less input? Would alternative approaches accomplish the same results at a lower cost without sacrificing on quality?
- * What measures have been taken during project planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used? How effective were those measures? Please explain.

Effectiveness

- * What was the institutional set up and contractual agreements? Please provide copies.
- * Which coordination bodies were involved and what were their roles? Please provide documentation
- * Where there exchanges between the different components (Results) of the project? If so, please provide detail.
- * Has the project achieved its foreseen objective and results (i.e. outputs, outcomes and impact)? If not, which progress had been made towards these achievements? Please provide detail.
- * What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of the project objective? Please motivate and provide examples.
- * To what extent could the management and implementing agencies overcome the challenges of the project? How?
- * Can any improvements be observed in the investigation, prosecution and adjudication of cases pertaining to trafficking of persons and smuggling of migrants in South Africa, following the implementation of the project? Please provide statistics and proof of comments/observations.
- * Has there been an improved effectiveness in inter-agency and inter-departmental cooperation between South African Counterparts since the implementation of the project began? Please motivate and provide supporting evidence.
- * Has the project been implemented with sufficient cooperation and dialogue with other UNODC projects, in particular XASS69, so as to effectively complement these efforts? Please motivate

- * What are the major challenges, opportunities and obstacles encountered by the project as a whole? Please provide detail. How was it dealt with?
- * Has the project achieved its foreseen objectives and results (outputs, outcomes, and impact)? If not, has some progress been made towards their achievement? Please provide detail.
- * What are the success factors for the achievement or reasons for non-achievement of the project objectives?
- * To what extent is the progress made so far the result of the project's intervention rather than of external factors or other actors?
- * Did the project take into consideration and/or implement the recommendations from the Mid Term evaluation?

Sustainability

- * To which extent have issues of sustainability been considered and incorporated into the project outline and activities? Please provide detail and comment on the effectiveness of these actions.
- * To which extent will the benefits generated through the project be sustained after the end of the project?
- * Have the beneficiaries taken ownership of the project objectives, and have they shown intentions of continuing, scaling up, and replicating and/or institutionalising project activities after the funding ceases? Please provide detail and supporting evidence
- * Are the relevant Government institutions affiliated to the Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee (BCOCC) developing the capacity to efficiently administer the initiative? Is there a motivation with the government institutions to continue administering the initiative? Please provide supporting evidence.
- * Extend of handover of project deliverables, and more importantly actual transfer of knowledge and ownership (specific institutions to be mentioned). Please motivate response and provide supporting evidence.
- * What measures were put in place to ensure sustainability? Please provide supporting evidence.

Impact

- * The extent to which the benefits received by the target beneficiaries had a wider overall effect on larger numbers of people in the region. Please provide supporting evidence.
- * What is the general quality of the project outputs to date? Please motivate response.
- * What difference has the project's intervention made to the operations of the relevant Government agencies and departments affiliated to the Border Control Operations Coordinating Committee (BCOCC), according to the departments? Please provide supporting evidence.
- * Based on the views of stakeholders and actors involved, to what extent has the project had intended and/or unintended impact, whether negatively or positively? Please provide examples.

- * To what extent have external factors beyond the control of the project affected its implementation, whether negatively or positively?
- * What was the adequacy and timeliness of the project's response to these external factors?
- * Has the project pursued the possibility of assessing impact? Which provisions were made, or could have been made, at the planning and implementation stage to assess impact?

Partnership and Cooperation

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

ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED DURING THE EVALUATION

Patrick Engstroem	UNODC Project Manager
Kagiso Malatse	UNODC Project Assistant
Calvin Mulaudzi	BCOCC and PSC Member
Machiel van den Berg	State Security and PSC Member
William Mpye	BCOCC Chair and PSC Member
Barbara van Dyk	King Shaka International Airport: Port Coordinator
Liza Labuschagne	Oliver Tambo Airport: Port Coordinator
Hubert Jack	Cape Town International Airport: Port Coordinator
Tebogo Phokanoka	Department of Home Affairs
Brigadier Mahlangu	South African Police Service
Stefano Varriale	EU Delegation, Pretoria

ANNEX V. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Original Objective	Revised Objective	Comments
<p>National Integrated Border Management Strategy 2008-2010 response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking in and through South Africa, by providing technical assistance to promote integrated border management by enhancing cooperation between all national border management agencies with the aim of achieving cooperation, coordination, mutual support, and information sharing, and joint operations between these agencies. Investigative and prosecutorial capacities will be enhanced and prevention, through information campaigns targeting officials and general public at border control areas, will be fostered.</p>	<p>The main objective of the project is to support the implementation of the revised National Integrated Border Management Strategy response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking in and through South Africa, by providing technical assistance to enhance the detection of and initial investigative actions to such crimes at the borders and ports of entry, promoting integrated border management by stressing cooperation between all national border management agencies, particularly in the areas of training, joint operations and mutual support. Through support to information campaigns at the border control areas, prevention of crimes as well as awareness among officials and the general public will be enhanced.</p>	<p>The focus has shifted from higher level integrated approach and enhancing cooperation between agencies towards a more operational level with a focus on building operational capacity to detect and initiate investigative actions and stressing cooperation between agencies</p>
Original Outcomes	Revised Outcomes	Comments
<p>Outcome(s): Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities of border control agencies to implement the national Border Management Strategy 2008-2010, with coherent institutionalized national frameworks established to coordinate and prioritize action as well as analyse information and share intelligence</p>	<p>Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities of border control agencies to implement the revised National Integrated Border Management Strategy response to smuggling of migrants and human trafficking with coherent, institutionalized national frameworks established to coordinate and prioritize action as well as analyse information and share intelligence</p>	<p>Outcome enhanced, but remained the same</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Improved knowledge and skills in the detection of fraudulent and fraudulently obtained travel</p>	<p>Outcome 2: Improved knowledge, skills and technical capacity in the detection of fraudulent and</p>	<p>Remained the same</p>

documents.	fraudulently obtained travel documents	
Outcome 3: Improved evidence based knowledge on the smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons.	Outcome 3: Relevant authorities take receipt of report on organised crime and the smuggling of migrants in order to use enhanced awareness and improved evidence-based knowledge in operational measures	Outcome enhanced but remained the same
Outcome 4 : Improved International and Interregional Cooperation on smuggling of migrants and Human trafficking.	Outcome 4: Improved International and Interregional Cooperation on smuggling of migrants and human trafficking	Remained the same
Outcome5: Increased awareness on Smuggling of Migrants and Human Trafficking.	Outcome 5: Increased awareness on smuggling of migrants and human trafficking	Remained the same
Original Activities	Revised Activities	Achievements/Comments
<p>Output 1.1</p> <p>a) Prepare TOR and recruit consultant to review relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of existing procedures and policies to respond to smuggling of migrants and trafficking in person and assist the BCOCC in the development of strengthened procedures and policies to enhance interagency cooperation, coordination, information sharing and the establishment of interagency teams;</p> <p>b) Arrange a mission for 4 members of BCOCC members to the Netherlands to study on-site border control operations, integrated border management and expertise center on document fraud.</p> <p>c) Arrange for training/seminar on integrated border management/establishment of interagency units.</p>	<p>Related to Output 1.1</p> <p>1.1.1 Prepare ToRs and recruit consultant to review relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of existing procedures and policies to respond to smuggling of migrants and trafficking in person and to provide input to the BCOCC in the development of strengthened procedures and policies to enhance interagency cooperation, coordination and information sharing;</p> <p>1.1.2 Arrange a mission for four members of BCOCC members to the Netherlands to study on-site border control operations, integrated border management and expertise center on document fraud</p>	<p>A review of existing procedures and policies to respond to smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons has been finalised. Results of the study were work shopped with key stakeholders. This review is available to South African agencies, but was not used in the development of further policies and procedures yet. The review has also identified awareness needs within the border control departments</p> <p>A mission for 4 members of the BCOCC, representing the Department of Home Affairs (DHA); the South African Police Service (SAPS); the Ministry for State Security and the South African Revenue Service (SARS) has been carried out to the Netherlands with the purpose of studying on-site border control operations, integrated border</p>

		management and the expertise centre on document fraud
<p>Output 1.2</p> <p>a) Prepare TOR and recruit consultant to assess training needs;</p> <p>b) Review outcome of assessment to serve as a basis for the preparation of tailored training syllabus</p>	<p>Related to Output 1.2</p> <p>1.2.1 Prepare ToRs and recruit consultant to assess training need; and</p> <p>1.2.2 Review outcome of assessment to serve as a basis for the preparation of tailored training syllabus</p>	<p>A training needs assessment for law enforcement officials, border police, customs, immigration, military staff, prosecution and judiciary, SoM and TiP has been finalised</p> <p>Results of assessment were shared at a workshop with key stake holders</p>
<p>Output 1.3</p> <p>a) Prepare TOR to develop training material and syllabus as per needs assessment above (Output 1.2) including adaptation of training manuals for law enforcement and the judiciary already prepared or under preparation by UNODC;</p> <p>b) agree on training schedule, participants;</p> <p>c) organize and implement training;</p> <p>d) monitor training delivery</p>	<p>Related to Output 1.3</p> <p>13.1 Prepare ToRs to develop training material and syllabus as per the afore-mentioned needs assessment (Output 1.2) including adaptation of training manuals for law enforcement and the judiciary already prepared or under preparation by UNODC;</p> <p>1.3.2 Develop a train-the-trainer course; on the basis of experience gained in the training needs assessment and based on previous capacity building projects;</p> <p>1.3.3 Select pool of candidates for train-the-trainer course;</p> <p>1.3.4 Deliver train-the-trainer course;</p> <p>1.3.5 Agree on training schedule, participants;</p> <p>1.3.6 Organize and implement broad-based training;</p> <p>1.3.7 Monitor training delivery</p>	<p>The project has contributed to the development of a global SoM-training manual, developed by UNODC headquarters and make use of standardized training material developed by UNODC and IOM. Two levels of training; one for front line staff focusing on the identification of cases on SoM or TiP and initial actions to be taken and second training course target experienced criminal investigators and focus on the investigation of SoM and TiP cases.</p>
<p>Output 1.4</p> <p>a) on the basis of experience gained in the delivery of training (Output 1.3) develop a train-the-trainer course;</p> <p>b) from participants above (output 1.2) select pool of candidates for train-the-</p>		

<p>trainer course; c) deliver train-the-trainer course; d) incorporate syllabus into the curricula of training institutions.</p>		
<p>Output 2.1 a) assess training and equipment needs of border agencies for the detection of fraud travel documents. b) procure equipment (package for 3 main intl. airports as proposed by the Netherlands and equipment for land border posts) c) provide training in the effective use of the equipment.</p>	<p><u>Related to Outcome 2</u> Related to Output 2.1 2.1.1 Assess training and equipment needs for border agencies, to enable the detection of fraud travel documents; 2.1.2 Procure equipment package for three main international airports 2.1.3 Procure equipment for main land ports of entry; and 2.1.4 Provide advanced document examination training.</p>	<p>An assessment has been conducted at O.R. Tambo, Durban and Cape Town International airports the skills and equipment available to border management agencies to detect fraudulent, false or stolen travel documents.</p> <p>Advanced document examination equipment has been procured and installed at airports in Cape Town, Durban and Johannesburg with limited training provided in conjunction with the installation.</p> <p>Document examination equipment was procured during this reporting period for 15 entry / exit points in South Africa</p> <p>45 officials from SARS, SAPS and DHA , 15 from each department, were trained in level 1 document verification in Pretoria and Cape Town</p> <p>15 members were trained in the Netherlands on document examination</p>
<p>Output 3.1 a) design research on the smuggling of migrants and human trafficking with a particular focus on the involvement of organized criminal groups and their modus operandi. b) prepare TOR and contract research team; c) implement and review outcome of research; d) print and disseminate</p>	<p><u>Related to Outcome 3</u> Related to Output 3.1 3.1.1 Design research on the smuggling of migrants and human trafficking with a particular focus on the involvement of organized criminal groups and their modus operandi.</p>	<p>A study on SoM and TiP with a particular focus on the involvement of organised criminal groups and their modus operandi has also been finalised during the reporting period, based on a literature review, a policy and legislation review and a number of fact-finding workshops. These</p>

research findings.	<p>3.1.2 Prepare ToRs and contract research team;</p> <p>3.1.3 Implement and review outcome of research; and</p> <p>3.1.4 Print and disseminate research findings.</p>	workshops were conducted in the border communities and in Pretoria for border control personnel and other relevant actors.
<p>Output 4.1</p> <p>a) Design training on mutual legal assistance and extradition procedures to prosecutors and judges.</p> <p>c) organize and implement training;</p> <p>d) monitor training delivery.</p>	<p><u>Related to Outcome 4</u></p> <p>Related to Output 4.1</p> <p>4.1.1 Prepare ToRs and recruit consultant to facilitate joint control and detection operations in the form of pilot projects between selected target countries and EU countries</p>	<p>Through the PSC and in coordination with the South African border control departments, the Project Manager has continued to supply information from a number of foreign border management agencies to the South African counterpart in order to sensitise them to the availability of information and the need to share. In addition contact has been established between border control departments at Cape Town and Durban international airports with the foreign liaison officers in Pretoria for continued information and intelligence support. Due to re-deployment of immigration staff at the Johannesburg International Airport, cooperation between DHA/Immigration and the foreign liaison officers has deteriorated during the reporting period. UNODC and the project have managed to restore working relationships.</p>
<p>Output 4.2</p> <p>a) Design training for investigators (police; immigration; prosecution) in regional / cross border investigations.</p> <p>b) organize and implement training;</p> <p>c) monitor training delivery.</p>		

<p>Output 5.1 a) design survey and related research tools. b) Prepare TOR and recruit service providers to implement survey. c) review the findings with media and NGO's with a view to design targeted awareness raising campaigns; c) provide support to the implementation of campaigns; d) produce awareness raising material for border posts.</p>	<p><u>Related to Outcome 5</u> Related to Output 5.1 5.1.1 Provide support to the implementation of campaigns; and 5.1.2 Produce awareness raising material for border posts.</p>	<p>No specific activities were implemented. Awareness raised was secondary result achieved through to other project activities</p>