

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

Independent Project Evaluation of

“Strengthening the capacity of the Central Asian Republics to protect and assist victims of human trafficking and migrant smuggling, especially women and children, in partnership with NGO and civil society actors”

XAC/X44

Central Asia

April 2014



UNITED NATIONS
NEW YORK, 2014

This evaluation report was prepared by Glynn Rankin, Director, Rankin Associates Ltd. The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) provides normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process of projects. Please find the respective tools on the IEU web site: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>

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, June 2014 Year. All rights reserved.

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

This publication has not been formally edited.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Executive summary	v
Summary matrix of findings, evidence and recommendations	viii
I. Introduction.....	01
Background and context	01
Evaluation methodology.....	03
II. Evaluation findings.....	06
Design.....	06
Relevance	07
Effectiveness	07
Efficiency.....	10
Sustainability	11
Impact.....	12
Partnerships and cooperation	13
Best practice.....	14
III. Conclusions.....	15
IV. Recommendations	16
V. Lessons learned	17
<i>Annexes</i>	
I. Terms of reference of the evaluation.....	18
II. Evaluation tools: questionnaires.....	26
III. Desk review list.....	35
IV. Stakeholders interviewed	37

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CA	Central Asia
EU	European Union
HQ	Headquarters
IEU	Internal Evaluation Unit
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INL	International Law Enforcement and Narcotics Affairs
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
LEA	Law Enforcement Agency
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OSCE	Office for Security and Cooperation in Europe
ROCA	Regional Office for Central Asia
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
TIP	Trafficking in Persons
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UN	United Nations
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Childs Emergency Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNTOC	United Nations Convention against Transnational Crime
USA	United States of America

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall objective of Project XACX44: “Strengthening the capacity of the Central Asian Republics to protect and assist victims of human trafficking and migrant smuggling, especially women and children, in partnership with NGO and civil society actors” was to strengthen capacity by providing legal drafting support focusing on protection of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants’ rights, developing operational standards for law enforcement personnel on victim identification and conducting training on best practices, and introducing a ‘Partnership Plan’ for effective cooperation among Government agencies, NGOs and civil society actors.

The Project outcomes designed to achieve the objective were: Outcome 1: Criminal justice personnel identify victims of human trafficking, smuggled migrants and witnesses and provide assistance and protection to them in accordance with international aid instruments: Outcome 2: Law enforcement agencies, NGOs and other actors actively cooperate to address the needs of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants, and the protection of their rights: Outcome 3: Shelters and victim support services improve availability and quality of services to victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants especially women and children.

This two year project commenced on 1 November 2011, the States¹ having endorsed the project during September-November 2011 and it was due to end on 31 October 2013. Due to the fact that Kyrgyzstan did not endorse the project there were unused funds and with the agreement of the donors, the project was extended for an additional six months at no additional cost. This project extension was granted in relation to outcomes 2 and 3 and the project finished on 30 April 2014. The total project budget was \$1,206,340 which comprised of \$959,616 EU funding and \$246,724 USA funding.

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the Project and to identify lessons learned that will help UNODC increase the effectiveness and impact in the area of assistance to and protection of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants. The assessment of the project has been limited by two factors, firstly, the evaluation took place before the completion of the project and, secondly, the outcomes of the project may not be evident in the short term, especially, within certain States within Central Asia (CA), namely, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. However, despite this limitation the major findings of the evaluation are as follows: There is still a need to build capacity in CA to identify, assist and protect victims and to enable this there needs to be dialogue between all actors including State and civil society. The consultative meetings brought all actors together and Turkmenistan this mechanism for dialogue hadn’t previously existed.

The project was ambitious in that it was the first project that incorporated a regional approach, with regional and national meetings and training and involved two distinct UN Agencies, UNODC and UNFPA, working together on an EU funded project. However, despite limited comments that it could have delivered more for the size of its budget, it managed to achieve its overall objective. The project aimed to provide practical assistance through training and consultative workshops, as per the project proposal, and it succeeded in this by holding National and Regional Consultative Meetings that facilitated informed dialogue and provided recommendations. The training and training materials delivered was built upon international and national expertise. Country assessments were undertaken by international experts who provided gap analysis and recommendations that informed the consultative meetings, training workshops and the content of the training materials. The project

established there was still an on-going need to strengthen capacity and identify, assist and protect victims within Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Tajikistan.

¹ Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan.

The main objective of the project was its focus on a more effective provision of assistance, identification and protection of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants. However, all CA States indicated that either the smuggling of migrants was not a problem or their protection was not a priority. This was reflected in the limited data obtained from all stakeholders and from the interviews and roundtables undertaken with all actors.

The project was managed from the UNODC regional office, with support from UNODC HQ, Vienna, but with no identified support within its country offices. The project relied on the National Committees being set up under the project for cooperation and coordination within each State. A management structure that provided capacity and a focal point within each UNODC country office would have been more effective, according to key stakeholders. UNFPA relied upon staff within its country offices for administrative and logistical support, however, there was no budget for these staff. However, despite concerns expressed by stakeholders, the management of each phase of the project was completed on time and under budget.

A needs assessment and a context analysis should have been undertaken prior to the implementation of the project to determine if the Project was needed and to ascertain what other projects had been undertaken or were in progress within the CA region and what would be the added value and impact of another project. The indicator(s)/targets within the project proposal and the outputs relating to outcomes should have been related to relevant and agreed baseline data so that it would be possible to measure if there had been any change, either positively or negatively, that could be attributed to the objective and outcomes of the project.

Based on the above information the main recommendations of the evaluation are:

When planning project proposals, either with or without defined partners, the UNODC should consider adopting an agreed timeframe for writing the proposal that allows sufficient time to complete all the requirements of the proposal including a needs assessment and context analysis to inform the content of any potential proposals. The proposal for Project XACX44 was written within a short time frame and subject to submission time constraints and also the necessity to find suitable funding partners who were both eligible and willing to support the proposal.

The UNODC should define the indicator(s)/targets at the outset of the project, in consultation with partners, and based on data and information that is measurable and that can be attributed directly to the outcomes and outputs of the project. The UNODC should also review the management structure and the budget for staffing when designing projects, especially, regional projects. Any management structure should contemplate having a funded focal point within country offices to provide administrative and logistical support and liaise and communicate with State stakeholders.

The fact that Project XACX44 was distinctive in that two different UN Agencies, the UNODC and UNFPA, worked together on a joint project that was funded by the EU should be acknowledged. The learning experience and best practices derived from the project should be used, by the UNODC, to inform future projects. This includes how the signed formal agreements were negotiated, the management structures and working arrangements agreed and what solutions were developed to overcome problems.

There are a number of lessons that can be learnt from the evaluation of Project XACX44 that are applicable to other projects and have the potential to improve future actions.

An initial needs and context analysis should have been undertaken, as previously stated, prior to the project commencing, to avoid potential duplicity, the alienation of potential stakeholders and to determine what would be the added value and impact of another project. The management structure should have included in-country focal/liason points to provide administration, logistical support, communication and awareness of activities being undertaken within each respective State.

The Project objective should have referred to victims of human trafficking only as there was, either, insufficient evidence that victims of migrant smuggling were a problem or they were not identified as a problem. All CA States indicated that the smuggling of migrants was not a problem and their protection was not a priority.

The project was delivered as planned, achieving its targets, with all meetings taking place on time, and with an under-spend on the budget. It provided a platform for constructive dialogue, on both a regional and national level, it provided constructive training and training materials and delivered practical assistance through training and consultative workshops, as per the project brief. It succeeded by providing consultative meetings with informed dialogue and training and training materials built upon international and national expertise. The project established there was still a need to strengthen capacity and identify, assist and protect victims in CA and that this was an on-going need.

To sustain the outcomes and outputs from Project XACX44 a clear structure and mechanism is required, with an agreed timetable, for the continued dialogue between State actors and Civil Society actors, especially, NGOs. This should be provided by State actors or by a follow-up Project sponsored by the UNODC and identified partner agencies should be encouraged. There was strong representation amongst all stakeholders for a follow-up project to build upon the positive aspects of the project and to ensure that all the preceding work of the project is not wasted.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings¹	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations²
Key recommendations		
There was strong representation amongst all stakeholders for a follow-up project. The rationale for this was twofold; that if there wasn't a follow on programme all the preceding work would be wasted and a programme is needed so the positive aspects of the project can be built upon.	Interviews, roundtables, documents.	UNODC to consider a follow-on project by identifying potential partners and funding streams.
Important recommendations		
The project was responsible for improving the structure and increasing the dialogue between State actors and civil society actors.	Interviews, roundtables, documents.	UNODC and donors to work with State actors to identify how mechanisms for dialogue can be maintained and improved.
Constructive use of in-country expertise to support international experts, set agendas and provide content and identify stakeholders and speakers for meetings and training.	Interviews, roundtables, questionnaires.	UNODC to use in-country expertise to assist in the provision of content, speakers and additional experts in future projects. They should also work with international experts by providing in-country knowledge and experience.
The project relied upon a "one size fits all" methodology when providing both regional and national training. No allowance	Interviews, roundtables, desk review.	UNODC and State and/or civil society actors should undertake a training needs analysis prior to the design.

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.

was made for differences in national expertise, ability and capacity.		Training should be designed to meet the capacity, ability and expertise of each State and build upon what already exists.
A needs assessment, context analysis and mapping report had not been undertaken prior to the completion of the project proposal. The project proposal was drafted by the UNODC after initial consultation with UNFPA.	Interviews, roundtables, documents.	UNODC should undertake a full mapping report and situation analysis to inform the project, objective, outcomes and outputs before undertaking any project proposals.
The management structure of the project should have incorporated national country office focal/liaison points.	Interviews, roundtables, questionnaires.	UNODC and UNFPA should review the management structure and funding for staff positions prior to the inception of future projects, especially, those that incorporate a regional element.
The baseline indicator(s)/targets were not defined or agreed amongst partners, including UNFPA, at beginning of project. Therefore, any potential measure of achievement was difficult to define, especially, outcome 3.	Interviews, roundtables, questionnaires and data sets.	UNODC to consult with partners using baseline data to define the indicator(s)/targets at the outset of a project. This will ensure that they are measurable and can be attributed directly to the outcomes and outputs of the project.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and context

Research undertaken by the UNODC has shown that human trafficking and migrant smuggling are serious and growing problems in CA and irregular migration poses very real dilemmas for all Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, as well as exposing migrants themselves to insecurity and vulnerability³. The problem of irregular migration has been exacerbated by the ‘Financial Crisis’ which has created large pools of unemployed labourer many of whom are recently returned labour migrants. Finding no employment in their home country, these individuals are increasingly desperate to secure employment again and may be willing to take risks which could lead them to become trafficking victims.

The CA States are source, transit and destination countries for human trafficking and migrant smuggling. The long established destination for migrants from the region has been Western Europe, in particular Germany, Italy and Greece, Central and South-East Europe, in particular Bosnia and Herzegovina, Poland, Albania and Bulgaria. In addition, Turkey is a major destination for victims of sexual exploitation. The Russian Federation and Kazakhstan are often destination countries for victims of forced labour.

Many victims of trafficking from CA pass through Kyrgyzstan and the Russian Federation en route to other destinations in Europe. More recently, Asia and the Middle East have become growing destinations for trafficking victims including China, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, South Korea, Thailand and the UAE⁴. Within CA, trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation, forced labour and forced begging occurs between each of the countries. The growing scale of migrant smuggling into Kazakhstan is due to its relative economic success is of increasing concern.

The UNODC, as part of the Global Report on Trafficking in Persons⁵, carried out an analysis of State responses to human trafficking in CA. Shortcomings were identified that prevented a more effective response by these States to human trafficking and smuggling of migrants. The shortcomings included inadequate legislation and weak criminal justice responses, lack of or insufficient cooperation between government agencies and civil society actors, and uneven and insufficient services to victims.

The project was designed to identify the specific needs in the target region from the very outset through conducting comprehensive country assessments in three activity groups, criminal justice, partnerships and services. The country assessments were to assist in determining which State actors and civil society organizations were the key stakeholders in counter human trafficking and migrants smuggling activities, to establish what types of formalized cooperative mechanisms would be the most effective in each target State, identify gaps in existing cooperation mechanisms and address the issues that require the most attention.

Project XACX44 built upon the work that the UNODC Senior Legal Adviser had undertaken when implementing GLO/900 “Legal Advisory Programme”, by utilising the experts and expertise of the

³ http://www.unodc.org/documents/human-trafficking/Global_Report_on_TIP.pdf

⁴ *ibid.* p1

⁵ *ibid.* p1

anti-human trafficking programme in Uzbekistan⁶, the sub-regional UNDA funded project⁷ and the Global project ‘GLOT 55’⁸.

The project aimed to create effective partnerships with national ownership by engaging government actors and relevant civil society actors, in particular NGOs. The UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia (ROCA), based in Tashkent, and the UNFPA Sub-regional Office for Central Asia, based in Almaty, had effective overall supervision of the project implementation. A focal point (Crime Prevention Expert) from the Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling Section of the Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking Branch of Division of Treaty affairs based in UNODC, Vienna, ensured the backstopping and provision of technical expertise by the relevant UNODC Sections. UNODC partnered with the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) for the project having signed a partnership statement, this partnership with UNFPA gave an additional value added due to the focus on women and children.

The project activities were carried out under the themes of (1) Rule of Law and (3) Prevention, treatment and reintegration, and alternative development of the UNODC Midterm strategy. In the Rule of Law area the project mainly contributed to Result area 1.1 – Ratification and implementation of conventions and protocols and Result area 1.3 – Criminal justice systems: more accessible, accountable and effective. In the Prevention area the project mainly contributed to result area 3.8 – Assistance to victim.

The purpose and scope of the evaluation

The evaluation provided insights to help UNODC increase the effectiveness and impact of its technical and assistance to project States in the area of assistance to and protection of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants. It focussed mainly on the project’s concept, design, implementation, results, efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, impact, partnerships, outputs and outcomes.

(a) It assessed the extent of:

- (i) The relevance of projects in the context of governments’ priorities and needs.
- (ii) The alignment of projects with UNODC’s strategic instruments e.g. strategic programme framework, UNTOC.
- (iii) The appropriateness of projects strategies and activities as the most effective UNODC measure for effective identification, protection and assistance to victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants.
- (iv) The effectiveness of projects, i.e. to what extent have the objectives of the projects been achieved.

(b) The evaluation ascertained whether the project has achieved its intended objective, and reflected on:

⁶ Strengthening the criminal justice response to trafficking in persons in Uzbekistan (UZB/S20)

⁷ Strengthening the criminal justice capacity to disrupt key human trafficking routes in Egypt, Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan.

⁸ Promoting the implementation of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children and the Protocol against smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air.

- (i) Whether the project met its outcomes?
- (ii) Whether the project met its outputs?
- (iii) Were there any constraints that affected the implementation of the project?
- (iv) Recommendations to increase effectiveness and impact.

The final evaluation of the project was carried out by an independent International Evaluation Expert.

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation of the project was completed after visits to Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan to meet with project stakeholders from all sectors as well as the following:

- (a) The desk review of relevant strategic and project documents including; project proposals, mission reports, progress reports, reports produced by outside experts, statistics on identified victims and crimes related to TIP (see Annex III). The aim of this desk review was to understand the contexts, roles, objectives and capacities of key stakeholders and to monitor activities and changes to activities carried out during the project. Also, to review the project documents to measure intentions and plans against results and outcomes where possible.
- (b) 15 interviews in person and 2 interviews via Skype, 7 roundtable meetings with stakeholders from national counterparts including government, shelter staff, NGOs, civil society, international partners, UNODC project team and other relevant personnel and donors in Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan (see Annex IV). The interviews provided additional information that wasn't apparent during the document review. It provided stakeholder responses about their experiences and their knowledge and opinions regarding the project components including what made an impact as well what were the challenges in the project implementation. It also confirmed or refuted any assertions within the project documentation.
- (c) Questionnaires were sent, to members of civil society, especially NGOs, of which 8 were returned ,completed, (see Annex III). The objective of the questionnaires was to collect information and opinion from those stakeholders who couldn't be interviewed.

The analysis of the documents reviewed, the information and analysis of interviews and roundtables with stakeholders and the analysis of the questionnaires, and observation of stakeholders during these interviews and roundtables, was triangulated to provide answers to the evaluation research questions (see Annex II) in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, partnerships and cooperation and best practice. The triangulation of the analysis from these diverse stakeholders reduced the likelihood of any inherent bias in the evaluation. It also enabled any outstanding questions from the desk review stage to be answered by either confirming or refuting the assertions and provided quantitative and qualitative data for the evaluation process.

Semi-structured interviews

The evaluation questions were used as a guide in each interview, either in person or by Skype, to ensure a standardised approach to the rationale for the questions, enable questions to be created during the interview and provide the flexibility to allow the stakeholders to react to the questions and provide their own experience and judgement of the project.

Roundtables

When either the group of stakeholders was too large to question by interview, or were the independent evaluator was of the opinion that a roundtable was the preferable option to obtain the best outcome, a roundtable was undertaken. The independent evaluator facilitated the group of stakeholders so they could hear and react to each-others responses and provide their informed opinions on the project.

Questionnaires

A structured questionnaire with standardised questions was used to obtain the experience and judgement of civil society stakeholders, mainly NGOs, who were not available to be questioned by interview or at a roundtable (see Annex II).

Quantitative data collection

Identified quantitative data was obtained from all stakeholders who had a responsibility for collecting relevant data during the period of the project. This data was analysed by a domain expert, the independent evaluator, to determine if there had been any identifiable changes that could be attributed to the Project. The data was also verified in stakeholder interviews and questionnaires to determine if any identifiable changes could be attributed to the Project.

This data included:

- The number of law enforcement investigations.
- The number of victim shelters.
- The number of victims identified.
- The numbers of victims who have received assistance.
- The amount of outreach materials produced (e.g. aide memoires and advocacy material).
- The numbers of persons trained.

Documents

A desk review of all the relevant documents was completed (see Annex III) which enabled an analysis of the background to the project, an assessment of the project against the evaluation criteria, and an identification of the issues to be addressed and an assessment of the outcomes and outputs of the project. The purpose of this analysis was to evaluate the questions of relevance to the project and the efficiency and effectiveness of the project, review the documents to measure intentions and plans against outcomes and outputs, and where possible, assess it against the Terms of Reference of the evaluation.

Sampling Strategy

The following techniques were used to ensure the integrity of the evaluation:

All interviews and roundtables were facilitated by the independent evaluator, who is a domain expert in human trafficking and smuggling of migrants, and is fully conversant with the subject matter of the project. This ensured: (i) that the stakeholders provided their opinions, judgement and experiences on

the project; (ii) that the observations by the facilitator ensured that the views expressed by the stakeholders excluded any subjectivity or self-interest; (iii) that the records of the interviews and roundtables were factually correct and reflected the views on the project of the stakeholders, excluding any replies that were outside the scope of the project.

The questionnaires returned included no extreme replies and any questions not answered were outside the scope of the knowledge of the organisation providing the answers. Therefore, there was no necessity to exclude any questionnaire using extreme sampling.

A balance of stakeholders were involved in the evaluation (see Annex IV) to avoid the potential for the sample to reflect the views of either one group of stakeholders or the views of a minority of stakeholders. The arrangements for stakeholder interviews and roundtables was facilitated by the regional office of UNODC ROCA who were also responsible for distributing the questionnaires to identified stakeholders.

Limitations to the evaluation

The evaluation was in compliance with the UNODC IEU evaluation policy handbook, templates and guidelines, however, there were limitations to the evaluation. These included the timeframe for the evaluation which was challenging due to the short time that the evaluator was in each State. This limited the time available to speak with stakeholders and also restricted the ability of the evaluator to either speak with or interview stakeholders from the regions of each State.

A further limitation was the late planning and /or confirmation of the evaluation schedule which reduced the ability to gain access to a representative sample of stakeholders, in both States and sectors, especially, within those States that the evaluator visited at the beginning of the evaluation.

These limitations were mitigated by the provision of questionnaires to those stakeholders that could not be interviewed and by contacting stakeholders, following an interview or roundtable, by Skype, telephone or e-mail to adduce further information or to clarify specific points. In Tajikistan the Inter Agency Committee on THB had met prior to the scheduled evaluation meeting to provide a representative reply to the evaluation.

Two factors limited the assessment of the project objective, outcomes and outputs. Firstly, the evaluation was undertaken prior to the completion of the project and in certain States, namely Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, this was too early to assess the impact and sustainability of the project. Key stakeholders, during interview and roundtable discussions, stated that any impact or sustainability could not be assessed in the short term and any potential outcomes may only be realised in the long term. Secondly, the indicator(s)/targets were difficult to quantify due to the lack of consistent and meaningful data. There were no consistent data sources within each of the CA States and in Turkmenistan there was legislation prohibiting the disclosure of statistics

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Design

The design of the project was well structured and its objective, outcomes and outputs reflected the important improvements that are needed in the CA Republics and was based upon UNODC research⁹ and experience from within the region. This was verified by stakeholders, both in interview and roundtable meetings, who were unanimous in stating the needs of the respective States and how the project addressed those requirements. However, the design of any project must consider a number of important factors to determine the necessity for the project, how will it be implemented, what are the risk factors and how it will be monitored and evaluated.

Prior to the implementation of the project it should have been preceded by a needs assessment and a context analysis to determine if the objectives of the project were relevant, what other projects are currently or had been undertaken in the CA States and what was the intended impact of the project. There is no documentary or interview record to show that a needs assessment or context analysis was undertaken, therefore, it was not possible to assess the initial necessity for the project and whether it was duplicitous. A needs analysis would have informed the outcomes and outputs of the project, potentially, enabled an improved working relationship with key stakeholders, including other International Agencies, and identified each individual State requirements as well as the regional dimension.

The Project relied on the UNODC network, within the region, to identify national experts who could contribute by providing the content for the consultative meetings and training and identify the stakeholders from within their respective States who would participate. Also, they had to identify the international consultants who, supported by the national experts, would undertake the key assessments that provided the content for the outputs of the project. Whilst the use of experts can be a positive solution within projects it can also make the Project reliant on the quality of the consultants engaged. However, this use of national consultants overcame some of the limitations and risks associated with the UNODC not having its own in-country expertise.

The Project proposal outlined the key political, economic and social risks and mitigation strategies related to each risk. It set out the main preconditions and assumptions both during implementation and after implementation. One of these risks was identified in that Kyrgyzstan did not sign up to the project and the mitigation strategy was effective in that representatives of that State attended on the training workshops and consultative meetings.

The overall Project objective remains in accordance with the UNODC project management principles and is impact-oriented, specific, practical, time limited and measurable. The present evaluation concludes that the project was designed and extended in accordance with the UN results based management principles. The project's structure is clear and represents a positive response to the objective of strengthening the capacity of the Central Asian Republics by targeting the countries more effectively identify, protect and assist victims of human trafficking and migrant smuggling.

The project's implementation will be examined in the following sections of the report.

⁹ Ibid. p1

Relevance

Project XACX44 has been relevant as proven and based on research that has shown that human trafficking and migrant smuggling are serious and growing problems in CA States. This research was undertaken by the UNODC¹⁰.

It identified shortcomings that prevented a more effective response to human trafficking and smuggling of migrants. These included inadequate legislation and weak criminal justice responses, lack of or insufficient cooperation between government agencies and civil society actors, and uneven and insufficient services to victims.

The project is relevant to the needs of the stakeholders in that human trafficking, was nearly unknown in CA during the Soviet period, is now a major problem facing the region. All states in CA have signed the United Nations Convention against Transnational Crime (UNTOC) and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially women and children¹¹.

The Project is in line with the UNODC mandate in CA where it has well established expertise in strengthening criminal justice capacities and promoting international best practices and standards and has been active in CA since 1993. UNODC has worked to provide legislative development and facilitate international cooperation and coordination.

The partnership with UNFPA is relevant and added value as UNFPA focussed on the rights of the child and female who were victims and ensured that all training undertaken and services provided took into consideration the unique needs of these groups. They also took responsibility for outcome 3 and outputs 3.1 and 3.2.

The Project was designed to identify the specific needs in the target region and build upon the work UNODC Senior Legal Adviser had undertaken implementing a Global Laws Assistance Programme (GLO/900), by utilising the experts and expertise of the anti-human trafficking programme in Uzbekistan¹², the sub-regional UNDA funded project¹³ and the Global project 'GLOT 55'¹⁴. The project also aimed to create effective partnerships with national ownership by engaging government actors and relevant civil society actors, in particular NGOs.

The project is relevant to the needs of the recipient's by proposing that the CA States have the necessary legislation in place and relevant actors trained to implement this legislation and to utilise the tools and mechanisms to effectively identify and protect witnesses and victims.

The Project activities were carried out under the UNODC themes of (1) Rule of Law and (3) Prevention, treatment and reintegration, and alternative development of the UNODC Midterm Strategy. In the Rule of Law area, the project mainly contributed to: Result area 1.1 – ratification and implementation of conventions and protocols and Result area 1.3 – criminal justice systems: more accessible, accountable and effective. In the Prevention area the project mainly contributed to: Result area 3.8 – assistance to victim.

¹⁰ Ibid. p1

¹¹ The Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (2000)

¹² Ibid. p1

¹³ Ibid. p1

¹⁴ Ibid. p2

Effectiveness

The expected outcomes and outputs of Project XACX44 were provided within the project documentation. One of the aims of the evaluation was to indicate the extent to which the objective and planned outcomes have been achieved. The Project aimed at strengthening the capacity of CA Republics to identify, protect and assist victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants, especially women and children in partnership with NGO and civil society actors.

The main achievements within outcome 1 were that, in relation to output 1.1, the project succeeded in analysing the legislation in each of the CA States and made recommendations for change following documented assessment missions and gap analysis. The Project document states that the content of these assessments were presented and discussed at the train the trainer courses for judges and prosecutors and were presented and discussed at the National Consultative Meetings that took place in all four CA States. However, there was limited legislative change in any of these States as a result of the Project. Whilst there is currently proposed legislative change in Kazakhstan, the only legislative change that can be attributed to the project, according to interviews with stakeholders, is in Uzbekistan, where legislation was amended to allow the use of psychologists in the victim shelter.

There were constraints in determining the effectiveness of output 1.1 in that it was difficult to attribute any proposed change in legislation to the effectiveness of the Project as it could be the result of a number of external factors including government policy. Also, the project output was evaluated in the short term and the potential effectiveness of the output will only be reflected in the long term.

In relation to outputs 1.2 and 1.4 trainers were trained and courses delivered for judges and prosecutors and Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA), which, according to the interviews, roundtable discussions, analysis of the questionnaires and the training evaluation, were well received by all participants. Those trained gained new knowledge and were equipped with a training manual and the tools of the UNODC. The response, especially from the NGO actors, was that there is a continuing demand for these training courses. Unfortunately, the second training for LEA, scheduled for March 2014, in Uzbekistan was cancelled due to circumstances outside the control of the project.

Output 1.3 related to the development of training materials, which included the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and pocket sized aide memoires, which were devised by both the national and international experts. The draft SOP manual was presented and discussed at the regional train-the-trainers course. The training materials were well received by all stakeholders with the only adverse comment being that the aide memoire was too detailed and a simpler format may be more useful. These training materials have been disseminated to all participants, at the consultative meetings and training workshops, both nationally and regionally, on a USB stick. They have also been delivered in hard copy form to all stakeholders.

Figure I. Number of stakeholders who attended training.

Country	Train the trainers for judges and prosecutors (2 training workshops):	Train the trainers for law enforcement agencies (1 training workshop):
Kazakhstan	8	5
Kyrgyzstan	10	5
Tajikistan	10	5
Uzbekistan	10	5
Turkmenistan	11	4
Total	49	24

The outputs under outcome 1 were directly relevant to the project objective and UNODC theme 3.8.2. However, whilst it is possible to quantify the numbers trained and the number of training materials produced and disseminated it was not possible, during the evaluation, to quantify the effectiveness of the outputs in the short or medium term or the impact on UNODC thematic strategies. This is because those trained and the training materials produced have not been sufficiently utilised within the four CA States to evaluate any outcomes.

The main achievement of outcome 2 was the success of National Consultative Meetings, output 2.3, which brought together actors from all sectors and created a dialogue between the State actors and civil society at both the regional and national level. This achievement was emphasised by all stakeholders during the interviews, roundtable discussions and upon the analysis of the questionnaires. In Turkmenistan this mechanism hadn't previously existed and the project instigated the first dialogue between the different actors with concrete examples of how this dialogue had improved the needs of victims.

The Consultative Meetings incorporated existing State mechanisms for multi-agency dialogue and the outcomes of the meetings resulted in the provision of better assistance and protection services to victims through agreements to sign MOUs or Joint Plans of Action. In Uzbekistan it was decided to include specific activities into the new National Action Plan 2013-14 to strengthen cooperation between NGOs and LEAs. These meetings also succeeded at a regional level by enhancing dialogue and building networks that related directly to addressing the outcome. All stakeholders stated it is a necessity for the continuation of this process to ensure that constructive dialogue continues.

The remaining outputs relating to outcome 2 were achieved and were relevant, however, any impact will take time to evaluate and may act as the starting point for additional work and/or projects in the future. In relation to output 2.1, gaps in services to victims, an assessment mission was undertaken and recommendations developed. In relation to output 2.2, the introduction of partnership plans, the UNODC facilitated this process in all States.

All outputs under outcome 2 were directly relevant to the project objective and UNODC theme 3.8.2. Output 2.3 was effective and contributed to improved victim assistance through dialogue, therefore, contributing to the UNODC thematic framework. However, it was not possible, during the evaluation, to quantify the effectiveness of outputs 2.1 and 2.2, in the short or medium term, or the impact on UNODC thematic strategies. This is because they have not yet been fully incorporated in any CA State and any evaluation of their effectiveness or impact will need to be in the long term.

Outcome 3, shelters/services to protect and support victims, was the responsibility of UNFPA and in interview they stated they were not involved in setting the indicators in the Logical Framework in the project proposal and also that the indicators proposed could not be measured. Therefore, it is difficult to analyse the achievement of this outcome in the absence of any measurable indicators or targets, and, assuming that measurable targets had been devised it would may not have been possible to attribute any achievements directly to the outcomes of the project.

The UNFPA, under Outcome 3.1 undertook an assessment mission in all four CA States and produced assessment reports with findings and recommendations. They held a national workshop at which 57 participants attended and a regional conference, in October 2013, on best practices and advocacy, which was facilitated by two international consultants, at which 45 participants attended. The training provided within the project was valued and was based on the State assessments undertaken by international experts, together with in-country experts, who contributed to the agenda, content and selection of presenters at each of the training workshops.

The stakeholders who participated in the training included NGOs who, both in interview and upon analysis of the questionnaires, stated that there was a disparity between the regional training and the national training. Some of the national training was duplicitous with participants having attended similar training and had already heard the presentations. There was also a disparity in ability of the participants with a combination of very experienced and less experienced participants. However, UNFPA achieved its role within the project with the majority of stakeholders commenting on the value and expertise they brought both to the project and to the area of human trafficking.

In interview, the UNFPA representatives stated that they exceeded the output targets set in the Project and in relation to output 3.1, this was not only achieved but an additional best practice workshop was held. In respect of output 3.2, increased awareness amongst shelter staff, additional training material was produced and more target groups were covered than indicated in the project proposal.

Whilst outcome 3 was consistent with the project objective it was not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the training or the assessment mission and whether they had any impact on the capacity to support victims and increased awareness of shelter staff as per the project proposal or contributed to the UNODC thematic strategy.

Efficiency

The planned outcomes and outputs of Project XACX44 were provided within the project documentation and one of the aims of the evaluation was to indicate the extent to which the outputs have been delivered and how they contributed to the attainment of the objective. The project is innovative in two respects, the first that it involved two UN Agencies working together which could affect the efficiency of the project in a number of differing ways including, conflicting management procedures, methods of working and reporting systems as well as their ability and capacity to deliver the project outcomes and outputs. Secondly, it was a regional and not a national project and this could have impacted on the efficiency of the project because both the management structure and those with TIP experience were based within the regional offices and not within the country offices.

The majority of the stakeholders, following interviews and roundtable discussions, were of the opinion that the project had been well managed and that the management was very professional and well organised, which was supported by the project documentation. Prudent budget management permitted a 6 month extension of the Project which delivered additional outputs to support the project objective and was delivered within the original project budget.

The project documentation contained the minutes of meetings and workshops, results achieved, budget expenditure, recommendations and actions which were set out in a concise and constructive manner. There was a project management plan in place that was adhered to and the project was delivered, achieving its targets, and with all meetings taking place on time and with an under-spend on the budget.

Figure II. Project budget allocation and spent.

Budget	EU funds	USA funds	Project total
Allocated	\$959,616	\$246,724	\$1,206,340
Spent	\$937,666	\$97,483	\$1,035,149
Remaining	\$21,950	\$149,241	\$171,191

The implementation of the Project, following the project proposal, was based on a regional management structure with support from UNODC HQ in Vienna. The regional office and the UNODC HQ had expertise in human trafficking and the smuggling of migrants. However, as per the project proposal, no additional staff were deployed within the UNODC country offices and there was no national focal point for information or communication. The project team relied on other agencies for expertise, information and cooperation in-country. This structure was subject to criticism, from stakeholders in interview, who stated that the project had “passed them by” and they were only aware of it when a meeting or training event took place in the State in which they were based. The project plan envisaged that the National Consultative Groups would undertake some of the responsibilities but this was not realistic and the project should have considered country office focal/liason points.

The Project design and management was based on the differing and complimentary expertise of two UN Agencies working together. The management structure meant that the UNFPA had to report to UNODC which entailed differing reporting structures and procedures which were resolved by signing an MOU. There was also a clear assignment of responsibilities for the outcomes of the project, with UNODC having responsibility for outcomes 1 and 2, and UNFPA for outcome 3, which brought clarification to the project.

The UNFPA had expertise within their country offices and used these staff as focal points to assist in administration and logistical support with no additional resource within the project budget to fund these staff. The planning, management and coordination of this aspect was at a regional level and created an extra burden for those involved in the country offices, who looked at the project as a positive challenge, and ensured all extra duties were completed on time.

Throughout the Project the two UN Agencies worked together, there was an acceptance of risks to the Project, created by the short time period in which the project proposal was developed and that there had been no situation analysis. Despite these limitations the risks to the project on a political, social and legal basis were identified and accepted at the outset and a risk management plan adopted.

The regional focus of the project assisted with the delivery of the objectives in that it replicated at a national level what was provided at a regional level. This enabled dialogue, practical training tools and assessments to be undertaken in each State and this may not have been possible in a national only project. Whilst this regional approach can be described as ambitious and contained numerous risks it contributed in meeting the objectives and outcomes of the project.

The procedures for evaluation were applied under the framework of UNODC results-based management ensuring that the project was subject to regular monitoring and a final independent evaluation. Whilst the final evaluation proceeded as per the project plan the regular monitoring was subject to the formation of an Action Progress Review Committees which met annually. More constructively the project allowed for a review of the project by the UNODC, at any stage, and these evaluations have been undertaken and documented. The project has also been subject to an audit by the EU and the independent procedures of the UNFPA. This has provided a transparent and audited evaluation and monitoring process. There were no changes in the reporting and monitoring arrangements during the project.

Sustainability

The evaluation of the project was undertaken as the project neared completion, therefore, it was not possible to assess all aspects of sustainability, especially, those in the long term. The focus is on the planning of the project for sustainability, the extent to which the outputs of the project are capable of being sustained and the plans of the stakeholders to continue to use the outputs of the project. The

project document envisages sustainability at an institutional and policy level but with no financial support.

The outcomes of the project included the provision of sustainable training materials, the training of sufficient trainers, who would then continue the training programme after the completion of the project, assessments of legislation and victim services that would provide recommendations for sustainable action. Independent consultants and in-country experts were involved in the assessments, preparation of the training materials and delivery of the training to ensure relevance.

The majority of the stakeholders who participated in the Project stated that the training material provided, namely the SOPs and aide memoire, were well designed, practical and would continue to be used. The practical materials are currently used in classes at the Training Academy, in Kazakhstan, and they have also provided case studies based on the material and this material provided will be actively used from 2014, including the SOPS and aide memoires. In Turkmenistan the Migration Service, where the border guards are being trained and are using the aide memoires are using the material and they will also be used at a high level conference, in June 2014. The training material was described, by stakeholders, as good enough, free and available to all and in different languages.

The main stakeholders who will probably use the training material are State Actors. There is concern amongst civil society, expressed during interview and roundtable discussions, that once the project finishes so will the funding, and if there are insufficient funds to open shelters they will be unable to fund training. They also question the relevance of training if they can't afford to assist victims. This concern about the funding and the fact that victim shelters in certain States have closed could limit the potential sustainability of outcome 3 unless it continues to be funded through a project.

The review of the legislation was a positive output of the project, however, it was not possible to show that the Project was a factor that influenced legislative change. Any change, if it occurs, may be as a result of several other contributory factors. In Kazakhstan they are implementing the non-punishment provision for victims of human trafficking in, which can't be directly attributed to the project. The amendment to the legislation in Uzbekistan, according to interviews with stakeholders, can be attributed to the Project.

The Project has been responsible for starting and improving dialogue between all sectors, however, it is apparent that in certain States meaningful dialogue will only continue under the auspices of a project. Informal channels of communication have been created as a result of the project and these may continue but can't be measured. There is no direct evidence to show that the national or regional consultative groups that were set up as a result of the Project will continue.

Impact

The project documentation states that the Action Progress Review Committee, which consists of representatives of the National Steering Committees, UNODC, UNFPA and EU would be established, and meet once a year, and that one of its responsibilities will be the assessment of the impact of the project. No record of this committee or its assessment of impact is apparent from the project documentation reviewed. However, the outcomes and outputs of the project were designed, after implementation, to build capacity and provide intentional positive primary and secondary long term effects.

The positive impacts include the fact that the training objectives have been achieved, especially, the summation of existing material, making the material acceptable, clear and understandable, and the development of practical training materials. It is the intention of both the governments of Kazakhstan

and Turkmenistan to use the training materials within their training centres and in Turkmenistan at a National Conference in 2014.

The training workshops trained more participants than planned and the training was well received and included operational expertise from other countries. Also, according to stakeholders in interview and roundtable discussions, the Project was the only way that the stakeholders could obtain experience from international experts. They stated that an additional benefit was that their managers and heads attended the training which was a catalyst for change as this precipitated implementation of the training when they returned to their respective workplaces.

The Project provided constructive meetings with government and civil society at both a national and regional level. The regional meetings within the Project strengthened the networks between NGOs and provided a regional NGO connection. There was improved dialogue between State and NGOs, and in certain States, it was the first time that the State actors had listened to problems and provided a platform for civil society to address problems to government. Stakeholders stated, in a positive manner, that holding a meeting in Turkmenistan was original and unique.

There is only one example of legislative change that could be attributed to the Project and that was in Uzbekistan, where stakeholders in interview stated, that the legislation was amended to allow the use of psychologists in the victim shelter, as a result of the project. However, all stakeholders of the Project, during interview, acknowledged that international projects can expedite change in legislation, especially, when the UNODC is involved.

UNFPA achieved successful outputs 3.1 and 3.2 and the project met its objectives as per the log-frame in the proposal. The participation of the UNFPA, who have not previously contributed to TIP projects, was a benefit to the project and was a learning curve for the UNFPA, however, their participation was a positive impact in itself.

The fact that the evaluation was undertaken at the end of the project meant that within all the CA States and, especially, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, it was too early to determine the impact of all the Project outcomes and outputs as not all can be evaluated in the short and medium term. This was verified by key stakeholders during interview and roundtable discussions who stated that any impact cannot be assessed in the short term and any change will be a long term process.

Partnerships and Cooperation

The project involved coordination and collaboration with a number of identified stakeholders, each, having a differing relationship and differing coordination and collaboration arrangements with the UNODC.

The two key donors of the Project were the EU and the US Embassies, through INL funding. The EU was the main funding partner and the project was managed by the EU Delegation Office in Astana. The donors had differing relationships with the UNODC Project Team one of the donors described the partnership as productive, with good coordination, and that the project was well run and managed. They were constantly informed about the project, attended the training sessions, consultative meetings, both nationally and regionally, and had an input into the project. However, the other donor, described their relationship, as remote, only being informed of project meetings at short notice and having no input into the project.

All key stakeholders, within each CA State, were identified with the assistance of in-country expertise and all attended and contributed to the project. This was enhanced by the setting up of National

Consultative Committees and working with existing Inter Agency Committees. The majority of stakeholders were satisfied with their involvement in the project and, as previously stated, the strength of the project was the continued involvement of all stakeholders. On a regional level, there were benefits of shared experiences that contributed to the achievement of the objectives.

The key partner in the project was the UNFPA, a fellow UN Agency, who have described the partnership in positive terms and as a learning curve in their knowledge of TIP. Whilst there were initial problems, with two different sets of management and procedures, these were resolved by signing a MOU. The continuing partnership was coordinated and constructive, at both a regional and local level, with both effectively discharging their responsibilities.

The criticisms of the project in relation to partnerships and collaboration, following stakeholder interviews, included limited contact with certain donors who were unaware of the progress of the project and received late invitations or invitations at very short notice to project events.

Best Practices

The project was both ambitious and wide ranging in the scope of its outcomes and outputs, however, the identification of best practice, as verified during interviews and roundtables discussions, was limited. It included the use of in-country experts to support international experts in identifying stakeholders, within each State, to participate in the project, influencing the agenda and providing content for the consultative meetings and training events, as well as presenting at these events.

The project facilitated dialogue between State actors civil society through the provision of consultative meetings, both regionally and nationally, and other mechanisms. The conference format of the project could have detracted from its relevance and the delivery of results. However, the majority of stakeholders stated that the project created active dialogue between all actors and this was enhanced by the conference format. The conference format also ensured that there were minutes recorded of each meeting and training workshop and the project documentation, supported by stakeholders in interview, confirmed that these actions were followed-up and acted upon.

The regional focus of the project assisted with the delivery of the objective in that it replicated at a national level what was provided at a regional level and this enabled the training, development of training tools, the country assessments and facilitation of dialogue to be undertaken within each State. This may not have been possible in a national only project. Whilst this regional approach could be described as ambitious and contained numerous risks it contributed to meeting the objective and outcomes of the project.

The simplification and delivery of all the training materials that were previously available within the CA States, including the UNODC training tools, and their provision in the different languages of the CA States for all stakeholders, was viewed by the stakeholders as best practice in itself. This enabled the training materials to be used and understood within all CA States.

III. CONCLUSIONS

This was a two year project with a budget of \$1,206,340 which was extended for an additional six months at no additional financial cost. It was ambitious, both, in its regional approach and that it involved two UN Agencies working together on an EU funded project and it achieved its objective and delivered the outcomes and outputs as per the project proposal.

The project was managed from the UNODC regional office, with support from UNODC HQ, Vienna, but with no identified support within its country offices. The project relied on the National Committees being set up under the project for cooperation and coordination within each State. A management structure that provided capacity and a focal point within each UNODC country office would have been more effective, according to key stakeholders. UNFPA relied upon staff within its country offices for administrative and logistical support, however, there was no budget for these staff. However, despite concerns expressed by stakeholders, the management of each phase of the project was completed on time and under budget.

A needs assessment and a context analysis should have been undertaken prior to the implementation of the project to determine if the Project was needed and to ascertain what other projects had been undertaken or were in progress within the CA region and what would be the added value and impact of another project. This would have informed the project proposal at the outset and would have enabled an assessment of any potential impact, whether it was duplicitous or what stakeholders should be included.

The indicator(s)/targets within the project proposal and the outputs relating to outcome 3 should have been related to relevant and agreed baseline data so that it would be possible to measure if there had been any change, either positively or negatively, that could be attributed to the objective and outcomes of the project. The UNFPA who were responsible for this outcome should have been consulted. It was not possible to ascertain if the project had achieved its targets based on the available data as this was limited and in Turkmenistan the provision of statistics is prohibited by legislation.

However, despite the apparent defects the project was delivered as planned, achieving its targets, with all meetings taking place on time, and with an under-spend on the budget. It provided a platform for constructive dialogue, on both a regional and national level, it provided constructive training and training materials and delivered practical assistance through training and consultative workshops, as per the project brief. It succeeded by providing consultative meetings with informed dialogue and training and training materials built upon international and national expertise. The project established there was still a need to strengthen capacity and identify, assist and protect victims in CA and that this was an on-going need.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The aim of the following recommendations is to inform and improve project design and delivery, enhancing the project performance and improving the sustainability of results. In relation to this project there is an objective to comment on the viability of a follow on project.

When planning project proposals, either with or without defined partners, the UNODC should consider adopting an agreed timeframe for writing the proposal that allows sufficient time for needs assessments and context analysis to take place to inform any potential proposals. The indicator(s)/targets should be defined at the outset of the project, in consultation with partners, and based on data and information that is measurable and that can be attributed directly to the outcomes and outputs of the project. The time frame on the evaluation of the Project should be reviewed, especially, when the impact and sustainability of the outcomes and outputs cannot be assessed in the short or medium term.

The UNODC should review the management structure and the budget for staffing when designing projects, especially, regional projects. The management structure should consider having a funded focal point within country offices to provide administrative and logistical support and liaise and communicate with State stakeholders. They should also acknowledge the different capacity, experience, abilities and expertise of the diverse stakeholders within the different CA States and factor this into future training development, especially, if there is to be any regional focus.

To sustain the outcomes and outputs from Project XACX44 there should a clear structure and mechanism, with an agreed timetable, for the continued dialogue between State actors and Civil Society actors, especially, NGOs. This should be provided by State actors or by a follow-up Project sponsored by the UNODC and identified partner agencies should be encouraged. There was strong representation amongst all stakeholders for a follow-up project to build upon the positive aspects of the project and to ensure that all the preceding work of the project is not wasted.

The experiences of two different UN Agencies, the UNODC and UNFPA, working on a joint project should be used as a template for future projects. The formal agreements that they signed, the management structures and working arrangements and the solutions they devised to overcome problems and the best practices identified will all inform future projects.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

There are a number of lessons that can be learnt from the evaluation of Project XACX44 that are applicable to other projects and have the potential to improve future actions. These include the provision of a realistic time frame to develop Project proposals, identify potential partners, assess its value and impact and enable support to be provided to those responsible for drafting the proposals. All project partners should contribute to the formulation of the indicator(s)/targets at the outset of the project which should be capable of being measured against an agreed and defined baseline so it can be determined if the project has achieved its intended outcomes and outputs.

All project partners should be involved in agreeing the Project objectives, at the outset, to ensure that they are relevant. The objective of Project XACX44 should have referred to victims of human trafficking only as there was insufficient evidence that the victims of migrant smuggling were either a problem or had been identified as a problem. All CA States indicated that the smuggling of migrants was not a problem and their protection was not a priority.

An initial needs and context analysis should be undertaken, prior to the project commencing, to avoid potential duplicity, the alienation of potential stakeholders and to determine what would be the added value and impact of an additional project. The management structures should have been reviewed, as it was a regional project, the structure should have included in-country focal/liaison points to provide administration, logistical support, communication and awareness of activities being undertaken within each respective State.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE Independent Project Evaluation (Final Evaluation) XACX44

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Overview of the Project and Its Evaluation

Project number:	XACX44
Project title:	Strengthening the capacity of the Central Asian Republics to protect and assist victims of human trafficking and migrant smuggling, especially women and children, in partnership with NGO and civil society actors
Duration:	01 November 2011 – 30 April 2014 (30 months)
Location:	Central Asia
Linkages to Country Programme:	n/a
Linkages to Regional Programme:	n/a
Linkages to Thematic Programme:	Countering Transnational Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking, including Drug Trafficking Themes: 1. Rule of Law and 3. Prevention Result areas: 1.1.- Ratification and implementation of conventions and protocols 1.3.- Criminal justice systems: more accessible, accountable and effective 3.8.- Assistance to victims
Executing Agency:	Central Asia (UNODC ROCA) United Nations Populations Fund (UNFPA) Sub-regional Office for Central Asia (implementing partner for Outcome 3)
Partner Organizations:	Ministries of Interior, National Security Services, General Prosecutor's Offices, Ministries of Justice, Ministries of Labor, Supreme Courts, Parliaments and Migration Services in each project country
Total Approved Budget:	USD 1,206,340
Donors:	European Union, United States
Project Manager/Coordinator:	Mr. Akmal Rustamov, National Project Officer, UNODC ROCA
Type of evaluation (mid-term or final):	Final evaluation
Time period covered by the evaluation:	01 November 2011 – 30 April 2014
Geographical coverage of the evaluation:	Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan
Core Learning Partners:	Supreme Court (SC KZ) in Kazakhstan Ministry of Interior (MOI TJ) in Tajikistan General Prosecutor's Office (GPO TM) in Turkmenistan General Prosecutor's Office (GPO UZ) in Uzbekistan

Project overview and historical context

The implementation of the two-year project began on 1 November 2011. The countries endorsed the project during September-November 2011. The project aimed at strengthening the capacity of the Central Asian Republics to identify, protect and assist victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants especially women and children, in partnership with NGO and other Civil Society actors, mainly by providing legal drafting support focusing on protection of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants' rights, developing operational standards for law enforcement personnel on victim identification and conducting training on best practices, and introducing a Partnership Plan for effective cooperation among Government agencies, NGOs and civil society.

UNODC research showed that human trafficking and migrant smuggling are serious and growing problems in Central Asia. Irregular migration poses very real dilemmas for the Central Asian states, as well as exposing migrants themselves to insecurity and vulnerability. The problem of irregular migration has been exacerbated by the Financial Crisis which has created large pools of unemployed labourer many of whom are recently returned labour migrants. Finding no employment in their home country, these individuals are increasingly desperate to secure employment again and may be willing to take risks which could lead them to become trafficking victims.

The Central Asian countries are source, transit and destination countries for human trafficking and migrant smuggling. The long established destination for migrants from the region has been Western Europe – in particular Germany, Italy and Greece – and Central and South-East Europe – in particular Bosnia and Herzegovina, Poland, Albania and Bulgaria. In addition, Turkey is a major destination for victims of sexual exploitation. The Russian Federation and Kazakhstan are often destination countries for victims of forced labour.

However, many victims of trafficking from Central Asia pass through Kyrgyzstan and the Russian Federation en route to other destinations in Europe. More recently, Asia and the Middle East have become growing destinations for trafficking victims including China, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, South Korea, Thailand and the UAE. Within Central Asia, trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation, forced labour and forced begging occurs between each of the countries. The growing scale of migrant smuggling into Kazakhstan due to its relative economic success is of increasing concern.

Justification of the project

The proposed Project has been designed to identify the specific needs in the target region from the very outset through conducting comprehensive country assessments in the three activity groups – criminal justice, partnerships and services. The country assessments were to assist in determining which state actors and civil society organizations were the key stakeholders in counter human trafficking and migrants smuggling activities, established what types of formalized cooperative mechanisms would be the most effective in each target country, identified gaps in existing cooperation mechanisms and addressed what issues require the most attention.

UNODC was uniquely qualified to undertake this Project, given its well-established expertise in strengthening criminal justice capacities and promoting international best practices and standards. UNODC has been active in Central Asia since 1993. With a regional office in Uzbekistan a regional senior legal advisor in-house and sub-offices in the other four Central Asian countries, UNODC has accumulated the required local expertise and coverage as well as extensive contacts within the law enforcement and legal communities and civil society in the region.

Moreover, the Regional Office was able to draw on the global anti-human trafficking experience of UNODC and tools such as Legislative Guidelines, a Model Legislation Against Trafficking in Persons, Toolkit to Combat Trafficking in Persons, Advanced Anti-Human Trafficking Manuals for Criminal Justice Practitioners as well as the Toolkit to Combat Smuggling of Migrants, the UNODC Model Law against Smuggling of Migrants and the Basic Training Manual on Investigating and Prosecuting Smuggling of Migrants. These tools are widely agreed to represent international best practices.

Through partnership with UNFPA, an additional value added was the focus on women and children who often

become victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants and to ensure that all trainings and services take into consideration the unique needs of these groups.

Project documents and revisions of the original document

As one of the main challenges it can be considered the fact that out of five countries in Central Asia, Kyrgyzstan has not endorsed the project. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) of the Kyrgyz Republic has not informed UNODC about either the approval or refusal of the project document that UNODC had sent to the MFA in August 2011. Since that time, UNODC has repeatedly – officially and unofficially - communicated with various national authorities of the Kyrgyz Republic on the need to take the required action. However, due to the repeated changes of the personnel of relevant ministerial departments, there were at least three cycles of reviews of the project document by the number of agencies, and the final decision has not yet been made. Due to this fact and in anticipation of the response from the Kyrgyz Government, the project had unused funds that were reallocated to other activities, which was agreed upon with the donor. Thus the project was extended for an additional six months at no cost and the project revision was initiated accordingly in September-October 2013.

2. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

Overall Budget (time period)	Total Approved Budget (time period)	Expenditure (time period)	Expenditure in % (time period)
2011-2014	2011-2014	2011-2013	2011-2013
1,206,340 \$ 2 years and 6 months	1,184,389 \$ 2 years and 6 months	690,562 \$	57%

3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation was foreseen in the project document as per evaluation guidelines provided by the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of UNODC. It is being undertaken to evaluate the XACX44 and seeks to provide accountability to donors by determining whether project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized, as well as to identify areas of improvement in a project, to get feedback, appraisal and recognition, and to attract resources toward future projects.

Procedures for evaluation will be applied under the framework of UNODC results-based management adopted to ensure effective delivery of technical assistance. In this regard, the Project will be subject to regular monitoring. An independent final evaluation will be carried out as well as a tri-partite review involving the donors, implementing agency and beneficiaries..

In compliance with the project document, the final Independent Project Evaluation is initiated by UNODC to provide insights that will help UNODC increase the effectiveness and impact of its technical and assistance to project countries in the area of assistance to and protection of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants. Keeping this in mind, the evaluation is expected to assess the extent of:

- the relevance of projects in the context of governments' priorities and needs,
- the alignment of projects with UNODC's strategic instruments e.g. strategic programme framework, UN TOC;
- the appropriateness of projects strategies and activities as the most effective UNODC measure for effective identification, protection and assistance to victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants;
- the effectiveness of projects, i.e. to what extent have the objectives of the projects been achieved

The evaluation report will be shared with relevant units of UNODC (including IEU), government counterparts and the donors.

The main stakeholders will be interviewed and briefed as part of the evaluation process and shall receive the key findings. Their comments, opinions and ideas shall be reflected in the report where appropriate. Please see attached the list of the Core Learning Partners in Annex

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The project will be evaluated during April 2014 and will focus mainly on the project's concept, design, implementation, results, efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, impact, partnerships, outputs and outcomes. The evaluation will cover the entire period of project implementation i.e 2 years and 6 months. The final evaluation will cover the activities of the projects implemented in Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. The project has not been evaluated before at any of its stages. Project Steering Committee meetings have been organized to review the progress made and identifies deficiencies which have been well considered and incorporated in the project revisions and extension.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Relevance:

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

Efficiency:

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

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

Effectiveness:

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

Impact:

- To what extent has the project met the needs that led to this project? Do these needs still exist?
- What are the effects of the project towards current organizational and individual performance (e.g. enhanced networking, partnership, investigation ability, etc)?
- Did the stakeholders experience any improvement in their skills, knowledge, and ability to operate the unit?
- Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environment changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the project?

Sustainability:

- To what extent do the benefits of this project continue after donor funding ceased?
- What are the major factors that influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?

- How do the counterparts plan to maintain the unit itself and the collaboration among PIU centers established during this phase? Otherwise, what support the project needs to provide in order to build such capacity?

Partnerships and Cooperation:

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

Lessons Learnt:

- What are the lessons learnt for future initiatives/projects?
- What are the best practices that could be applied in the future activities?

Recommendations may be made on issues relating to the implementation and management of the project as well as follow up projects dealing with the same issues. The evaluation shall assess in what ways the project design and / or delivery can be improved to enhance its effectiveness. The evaluation should also identify the key elements, assumptions and risks for the development of similar initiatives in this and other regions.

6. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation consultant should present an inception report that includes a detailed statement of Evaluation methods and the approach to be used to identify information sources and collect information during the evaluation and to analyze the data obtained. The evaluation of the project will be based on the following:

1. The study of relevant strategic and project documents (project proposals, project reports; progress reports, reports produced by outside experts, statistics on identified victims and crimes related to TIP, etc);
2. Where necessary, initial briefing by responsible UNODC staff in the Regional Office for Central Asia (ROCA) in Tashkent;
3. Interviews with the representatives of national counterparts (Government), shelters' staff, NGOs, international partners, UNODC project team and other relevant personnel, and, where it is necessary and required, donors;
4. Interviews with training and meeting participants;

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process, to be found on the IEU website:

<http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>.

A meeting plan with stakeholders will be prepared by the Project Manager jointly with the CLP and sent to the evaluator at least 1 week in advance of the field missions. This plan will include interview questions and a detailed description of the full evaluation methodology to be adopted. This methodology will be reviewed and approved by the project manager and by IEU prior to the evaluation.

The Evaluation Expert leading the evaluation will further elaborate on the evaluation methodology in an Inception Report, determining thereby the exact focus and approach for the exercise, including refining the evaluation questions, and developing the sampling strategy and identifying the sources and methods for data collection.

Upon completion of the fact-finding and analysis phase, a draft evaluation report will be prepared. The draft should be circulated to the parties (including Project Manager, stakeholders and IEU) for comments. The evaluator may choose to take the comments into account in producing the final report, for which he/she will be solely responsible.

While the Project Team is also part of the Core Learning Partners, their role is also to manage the process and logistics of the evaluation. The Independent Evaluation Unit at HQ provides comments and clearance of the final ToR; clears the final Inception Report and reviews and assesses the final evaluation report.

7. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluation will take place during the last months of the project in April 2014 within a contracted period of thirty one (21) days including weekends.

The Project Manager and the evaluator will develop and finalize 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 ROCA will revise the final agenda.

The evaluator will submit a draft report to the Evaluation Manager, the UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit, and to ROCA, as well as to all “Core Learning Partners”. The report will contain the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation team. The report should be no longer than 25 pages, excluding annexes and the executive summary. The report will be distributed by UNODC as required to the governmental authorities and respective donors, and will be discussed at a Tripartite Meeting by the parties to the project.

Timeframe for the evaluation process:

Duties	Preliminary deadlines	Location	Results
Desk study	April 1-2	Home base	List of evaluation questions Evaluation tools
Prepare Inception Report	April 2-3		Draft inception
Interviews with staff at UNODC ROCA	April 3	UNODC ROCA	Inception report
Evaluation mission: briefing, interviews and presentation of preliminary findings	April 4-12	Countries/Cities	Notes
Presentation of preliminary findings at UNODC ROCA	April 14	UNODC ROCA	UNODC HQ Notes
Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to stakeholders for comments; and finalization of report	April 14-21	Home base	Draft report Final Report

Expected Deliverables

The Lead Evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely Submission of all deliverables, as specified below:

- Inception Report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools;
- Draft Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation policy and guidelines
- Final Evaluation Report, including annex with management response (if needed);
- Presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations to CLP and other key stakeholders;

8. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The final evaluation of the project will be carried out by one independent International Evaluation Expert

identified by UNODC through a competitive selection process and supported by the National Project Officer. The Evaluation Expert should have expertise in reviewing criminal justice and/or law enforcement structures, and have experience in evaluating technical assistance projects. Costs associated with the evaluator will be borne by the project. The expert shall act independently, in line with UNEG Ethical Guidelines and in his individual capacity and not as a representative of any government or organization that may present a conflict of interest. S/he will have no previous experience of working with project XAC/X44 or of working in any capacity linked with it.

Evaluation Expert should have the following qualifications and experience:

- A minimum first-level university degree in law or law enforcement area
- Minimum of 10 years of relevant work experience in, or ii) in lieu of a first-level university degree, Minimum of 10 years of professional experience in, at least one of the following areas:
 - o Developing evaluation methodologies and carrying out evaluations, including the drafting and finalization of the evaluation reports.
 - o Law enforcement experience in the field of combating human trafficking and smuggling of migrants;
 - o Institutional capacity building / organizational management / training of law enforcement personnel
- In addition, the evaluator should have:
 - o Experience in conducting independent evaluations (if possible, within the UN system);
 - o Familiarity with human trafficking and migrant smuggling issuers in Central Asia;
 - o Knowledge of bilateral/multilateral technical cooperation, particularly in transnational organized crime.
- Excellent analytical, drafting and communication/writing skills in English. Knowledge of Russian is an asset.

The evaluator will be responsible for drafting the evaluation report, ensuring the report meets the necessary standards and for submitting the drafts as described in a timely manner. He will be supported by the IEU and National Project Officer based in Tashkent.

9. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS

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

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)

- Clears the final TOR
- Clears the final Inception Report
- Clears the final Evaluation Report
- Disseminates the cleared evaluation report through uploading it on the IEU-Website.
- Provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process, to be found on the IEU web site <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>

Project manager

- Drafting and finalizing the ToR
- Recruit evaluators
- Responsible for the provision of desk review materials to the evaluation team
- Review the evaluation methodology
- Select and liaise with the Core Learning Partners
- Reviewing the draft evaluation report
- Assessing the quality of the final report by using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports in the Independent Project Application in ProFi.
- Review the draft report and develop an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations
- In charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team
- For the field missions, the evaluation team liaises with the UNODC regional/field offices and mentors as appropriate.

Core Learning Partners

- Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are selected by the project manager
- Members are selected from the key stakeholder groups, including UNODC management, mentors, beneficiaries, partner organizations and donor member states

- Comment on key steps of the evaluation and act as facilitators with respect to the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action.

Independent Evaluator

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

Logistical support for the evaluator will be provided from UNODC ROCA and relevant field offices (including office space, an internet connection and use of a desktop computer where appropriate as well as assistance with interpretation). The evaluator will need to provide his/her own laptop, cameras or other equipment. ROCA will assist with transport within the region and support international travel arrangements and the issuance of visa (where necessary).

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES

Consultants will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. Payment needs to be correlated to deliverables – three installments: upon delivery of the Inception Report, of the Draft Evaluation Report and of the Final Evaluation Report and/or the final presentation.

80 percent of the daily subsistence allowance and terminals is paid in advance, before travelling. The balance is paid after the travel has taken place, upon presentation of boarding passes and the completed travel claim forms.

The consultant is paid in accordance with United Nations rules and procedures. Payment correlates to deliverables – three installments are foreseen (25%, 25% and 50% of total fees).

- The first payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon receipt of the Inception Report;
 - The second payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon receipt of the Draft Evaluation Report;
- The third and final payment (50 percent of the consultancy fee, i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report and its clearance by UNODC/IEU.

11. ANNEXES

- Annex 1. Desk review documents
- Annex 2. Job descriptions of evaluator
- Annex 3. List of CLP Members and Counterparts
- Annex 4. Evaluation Guidelines

ANNEX II. EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES

INTERVIEW PLAN

The interview plans differed for each interview, and the circumstances of that interview, depending on the stakeholder to ensure flexibility and to attain the maximum amount of information. The function of each stakeholder and their relationship to the project was established.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The independent evaluator outlined the evaluation criteria and the function of the evaluation and make reference to the potential evaluation questions which were used as a guide in each interview.

ROUNDTABLE

The independent evaluator facilitated groups of stakeholders so they could hear and react to each others responses and provide their informed opinions on the project. The planning for each roundtable differed for each roundtable, and the circumstances of that roundtable, depending on the stakeholder to ensure flexibility and to attain the maximum amount of information. The function of each stakeholder and their relationship to the project was established.

ROUNDTABLE QUESTIONS

The independent evaluator outlined the evaluation criteria and make reference to the potential evaluation questions which were used as a guide in each roundtable.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluations questions determined whether the project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized, as well as to identify areas of improvement in a project, to get feedback, appraisal and recognition, and to attract resources toward future projects.

In determining the evaluation of the project the following questions were considered:

RELEVANCE

- Were the overall objectives of the project met and to what extent are the objectives of the project still valid according to current situation and/or environment?
- To what extent were the project outcomes and outputs met, were they consistent with the overall project objective and did the activities and outputs achieve its overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- To what effect were the activities and outputs of the project consistent with its intended impacts?
- How relevant was the project to the identified 'target groups' and were the government's needs and priorities met?
- To what extent did the project design assist in the achievement of the project objective, outcomes and outputs?
- How did the project identify the right 'target groups', within each State \and were they the right groups and did they engage with the project?

EFFECTIVENESS

- To what extent, if at all, did the design of the project meet its objectives?
- Were the objectives in the project document achieved, or likely to be achieved, and what were the main contributory factors in either its achievement or non-achievement?
- To what extent were the stakeholders ('target groups') satisfied with their involvement in this project, could any of the planned activities have been modified to work better and did all the intended participants receive the planned training?
- Was there any value in, either or both, the training and training materials provided by the project and can you identify what they were?
- Was there anything in the project that could have been done differently to make the project more effective?
- If there was to be another project what objectives needs to be established and what outcomes should be considered. Would it need to be repeat of this project or would you need to conduct a similar project (e.g. to improve collaboration, fasten the implementation speed, satisfy the beneficiary counterparts, etc.)?

EFFICIENCY

- What were the influencing factors that were necessary to determine the situation and environment that informed:
 - (i) the extent to which the project provided the planned services and products within optimal cost and standards.
 - (ii) the method that the project was implemented and was it the most efficient way compared to alternatives.
 - (iii) the extent to which the activities were performed as planned and were they in a timely manner.
 - (iv) the extent to which the activities were adjusted in response to changes in situation and/or environment in order to maintain efficiency.
 - (v) how the activities met the expectations of implementing agencies (i.e. UNODC and its counterparts) to combat maritime migrant smuggling.
- To what extent was the situation analysis and justification for the project accurate and relevant?
- How were the project assumptions and risks, identified, both before and after implementation, and were there any further risks that should have been identified?

SUSTAINABILITY

- How did the project design support the sustainability of the project after completion and to what extent will the benefits of this project continue after donor funding ceases?
- What were the major factors that influenced, the achievement or non-achievement of, the sustainability of the project?
- How do the counterparts plan to maintain the unit itself and the collaboration among PIU centres established during this phase? Otherwise, what support did the project need to provide in order to build such capacity?
- Will there be any on-going requirement to address the following and, if so, why; stakeholder cooperation; services offered to victims; an increase the capacity of the services offered to victims; continue victim identification?

IMPACT

- To what extent did the project meet the needs that instigated the project and do those needs still exist and are they relevant?
- What were the effects of the project in relation to current organisational and individual performance (e.g. enhanced networking, partnership, investigation ability, etc.)?
- How did the stakeholders experience improvement, if any, in their skills, knowledge, and ability to operate the unit and what were the contributory factors?
- How did the project contribute to the long-term social, economic, technical, and environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions that were related to the project?

PARTNERSHIPS AND COOPERATION

- What were the factors that contributed to the extent to which partnerships and cooperation was sought and established (including UN agencies) and were any synergies created in the delivery of assistance?
- What was the involvement and roles of the stakeholders (e.g. counterparts, UN agencies, etc.) in the planning and implementation of the project?
- To what extent were the expected participating members actively engaged in the project activities including throughout the implementation period?
- To what extent did participating members understand their roles and responsibilities under the scope of the project?
- What were the main factors that influenced the participation and non-participation of the expected members?

BEST PRACTICES

- Were any best practices identified as a result of the project?

LESSONS LEARNED

- What were the lessons learnt within the project and will they inform and/or benefit future initiatives and/or projects?
- Can any of the best practices identified be applied to any future activities?

QUESTIONNAIRE

The attached structured questionnaire, with standardised questions, will be provided to absent stakeholders, who predominantly will be civil society;

As a participant of the UNODC project “Strengthening the capacity of the Central Asian Republics to protect and assist victims of human trafficking and migrant smuggling, especially women and children, in partnership with NGO and civil society actors” you can assist in the independent evaluation of the project by using your experience and judgement to answer the following questions.

You do not have to answer all the questions only those that you think are relevant to your experience of the project.

To answer the questions can you please circle the number on the scale that best represents your view on each question. Additional comments can be provided in the “Comment” box if you wish to elaborate your views.

Questions:-

1. Where you aware of the objectives of the project?

No								Yes
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Comment.								
2. Did you understand the objectives of the project?								
No								Yes
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Comment.								
3. Do you think the overall objectives of the project were correct?								
No								Yes
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Comment.								
4. Do you think the outputs and outcomes of the project were correct?								
No								Yes
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Comment.								
5. Do you think the correct stakeholders were identified?								
No								Yes
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Comment.								
6. Do you think that all stakeholders engaged in the project?								
No								Yes
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Comment.

7. Did the design of the project meet its objectives?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

8. Has the project increased the number of victims identified by criminal justice personnel?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

9. Has the project increased the active cooperation of stakeholders in addressing victim's rights and protection?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

10. Have the quality of victim support services been improved?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

11. Have the number of victims receiving assistance increased?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

12. Has multi-agency cooperation mechanisms improved?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

13. Has the number of prosecutions in which adequate victim provision and assistance was provided increased?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

14. Was the training provided of value?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

15. Was the training material provided of value?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

16. Will the training material be used now the project has finished?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

17. Were sufficient people trained?

No Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

18. Was the Aide Memoire of value?

No Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

19. Will the Aide Memoire be used now the project has finished?

No Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

20. Were the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) of value?

No Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

21. Will the SOPS be used now the project has finished?

No Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

Comment.

22. Do you think the project addressed it objectives?

No Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

23. Do you think the project addressed its outcomes?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

24. Did the project develop a regional capacity and/or identity?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

25. Has there been legislative change as a result of the project?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

26. Where the stakeholder meetings of value?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

27. Where increased shelter infrastructures delivered?

No

Yes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Comment.

28. Was there increased awareness amongst shelter staff?

No								Yes
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Comment.								
29. Have you any additional comments?								
Comment.								

ANNEX III. DESK REVIEW LIST

- Annual Progress Report for XACX44 (2011) (Document owner - Akmal Rustamov/UNODC-UZ/Vienna/UNO)
- Annual Progress Report for XACX44 (2012) (Document owner - Akmal Rustamov/UNODC-UZ/Vienna/UNO)
- Annual Progress Report for XACX44 (2013) (Document owner - Akmal Rustamov/UNODC-UZ/Vienna/UNO)
- Evaluations of the Train the Trainer courses.
- Gap analysis outcomes.
- Global Legal Assistance Programme (GLO/90).
- Independent consultant assessments.
- Interim Financial Report – 28.02.2013
- Mission Report - Dates: 23-28 September 2012 Purpose: (i) assist in the preparation and holding of a regional train-the-trainer course for law-enforcement practitioners on assistance to victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants (ii) deliver, during the train-the-trainer course, a presentation on training methodologies.
- Mission Report - 28 August 2013 Purpose: Organize and conduct the National Consultative Meeting including: (i) Roundtable meeting entitled “Improving the mechanisms of cooperation between government and civil society institutions to ensure protection of and assistance to victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants”; and (ii) Steering Committee Meeting of the Project.
- Mission Report - 7-9 October 2013 Purpose: Organize and conduct the National Consultative Meeting including: (i) Roundtable meeting entitled “Improving the mechanisms of cooperation between government and civil society institutions to ensure protection of and assistance to victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants”; and (ii) Steering Committee Meeting of the Project.
- Mission Report – Date 16 October 2013 Purpose: Organize and moderate the National Consultative Meeting, which were in two folds including: (i) Roundtable meeting entitled “Improving the mechanisms of cooperation between government and civil society institutions to ensure protection of and assistance to victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants”; and (ii) Steering Committee Meeting of the Project to review the progress of implementation and plans for the future.
- Mission Report - Date 11 March 2014 Purpose: Organize and conduct the 3rd National Consultative Meeting including: (i) Roundtable meeting entitled “Improving the mechanisms of cooperation between government and civil society institutions to ensure protection of and assistance to victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants”; and (ii) Steering Committee Meeting of the Project.
- Project Document- Project Number and Title XACX44: Strengthening the capacity of the Central Asian Republics to protect and assist victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants, especially women and children, in partnership with NGO and civil society actors.
- Project Revision – Date 7 November 2013.
- Report - Train-the-Trainers Course “Applying international standards to ensure protection and assistance measures towards the victims of trafficking in persons and smuggled migrants” 25-27 June 2012 Tashkent, Uzbekistan Tashkent Palace Hotel.

- Report – Regional Train-the-Trainers Course for Law Enforcement Officers “International best practices and Standard Operational Procedures in effective identification and protection of victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants” 25-27 Almaty.
- UNODC / UNFPA Joint Project: “Strengthening the capacity of the Central Asian republics to protect and assist victims of human trafficking and smuggled migrants, especially women and children, in partnership with NGO and civil society actors” - Component 3: Improving the availability of shelters and victim support services for victims of the trafficking in human beings and smuggled migrants, especially women and children - An assessment of the existing systems of assistance for victims of the trafficking in human beings and smuggled migrants in Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan. Final Overview Report December 2012.
- Uzbekistan “Strengthening the criminal justice response to trafficking in persons in Uzbekistan” (UZB/S20).
- X44 – Project Brochure Date 8 March 2013.
- II. The Action –Description - 1.1. Objectives to strengthen the capacity of the target countries to identify, protect and assist victims of trafficking in persons and smuggled migrants especially women and children, in partnership with NGOs and other civil society actors.

UNODC TRAINING MATERIALS (USB)

- Aide Memoire in Russian and Kazakhstan
- Education Films
- National Consultative Meeting in Astana
- SOP Manual in Russian, Kazakhstan and English
- Training Course for Judges and Prosecutors
- UNODC UNFPA Workshop

ANNEX IV. STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

Stakeholders interviewed

Astana

Governmental Organizations (round table meeting)

Core Learning Partners (interview)

Delegation of the European Union (interview)

NGO "Korgau-Astana" (interview)

Dushanbe

NGO "Femida" (interview)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (round table meeting)

United States Embassy (INL) (interview)

OSCE (round table meeting)

IOM (interview)

Almaty

UNFPA (interview and phone call)

NGO "Rodnik" (interview)

NGOs – Ashgabat (round table meeting)

Governmental Representatives (round table meeting)

Ashgabat

OSCE (interviews)

US Embassy (interview)

UNFPA (interview)

Delegation of the EU (interview)

UNFPA (interviews)

US Embassy (INL & USAID) (round table meeting)

Tashkent

Governmental Organisations (round table meetings)

NGO "Istikbolli Avlod" (interview)

UNFPA (Skype interview)

UNODC (Skype interview)