

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

Independent project evaluation of the
**“Expressive Youth”: citizenship,
access to justice and culture of peace**

Executive Summary and Summary Matrix of
Findings, Evidence and Recommendations

Project BRAX16

Brazil

June 2015



UNITED NATIONS
New York, Year

This evaluation report was prepared by Ms. Clarice Zilberman Knijnik, Consultant. 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.

© United Nations, Month Year. All rights reserved worldwide.

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.	Preliminary Findings of the Desk Review.....	1
II.	Methodology:	2
III.	Major Findings	3
IV.	Conclusions	9
V.	Recommendations	12
VI.	Lessons Learned:	13
	Summary Matrix of Findings, Evidence and Recommendations	14

Annexes

I.	Terms of Reference of the Evaluation.....	17
II.	Evaluation Tools: Questionnaires and Interview Guides.....	34
III.	Desk Review List	37
IV.	List of Persons Contacted during the Evaluation	38
V.	Evaluation Matrix	40

I. PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF THE DESK REVIEW

This is the final evaluation of the **BRAX16 – “Expressive Youth” Project: citizenship, access to justice and culture of peace**. This Project started in 01/01/2011. It was to be undertaken in 42 months with US\$ 1, 075,268 funding; it was completed in July 2015. The Project is in line with the UNODC guidelines for Strategic Area 03: prevention, treatment, reintegration, and alternative development. The project aimed at developing tools for working with youth in order to reduce violence, and prevent crime and drug abuse among vulnerable urban communities. Moreover, it would implement the "Expressive Youth" methodology and develop additional actions for 18-29 years old in the urban area surrounding the Federal District of Brazil. It was based on the "Expressive Youth Programme" prior experience, implemented by CAIXA SEGURADORA in 2007-2009, without UNODC participation. The current project was undertaken as a pilot in the towns of Sobradinho II (26 km from Brasilia) and Ceilândia (30 km from Brasilia), both within the Federal District. Data from the Mortality Data System (SIM – Sistema de Informação sobre Mortalidade), of the Ministry of Health, show that the largest number of victims of fatal assaults and homicides in Brazil are aged 15-24. The towns of Sobradinho II and Ceilândia II have high mortality rates for this age group, although rates for the Federal District areas known as Estrutural and Varjão were higher in 2008-2009. Statistical data indicate rates have been high in these districts over the last five years.

As the CAIXA SEGURADORA Programme had carried out previous actions in the area, the BRAX16 project already had a description of beneficiaries’ profiles; execution manuals; list of NGOs working in these two areas of the Federal District; and an existing network of young people who took part in CAIXA’s initiatives. Relevant partners for the implementation of the project include: **(i) CAIXA SEGURADORA**: privately company 100% devoted to protecting Brazilian families, with a strong presence on the four markets on which it operates: insurance, pension plans, consortia, and capitalization. It designed the previous "Expressive Youth Programme" and funded its technical cooperation. **(ii) NGOs active in these towns**: Central Única das Favelas do Distrito Federal - CUFA / DF; Azulim Cultural Group; Rede Urbana de Ações Socioculturais - RUAS; Movimento Integrado de Saúde Comunitária / DF MISMEC-DF; **(iii) international organizations: UNESCO and UNODC**. For UNODC-LPOBRA, this project was an important experience of partnership with the private sector, as in Brazil UNODC had mostly worked with public agencies and institutions.

II. METHODOLOGY

One of the purposes of this evaluation was to analyse relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and added-value of UNODC actions in cooperation with CAIXA SEGURADORA in 2011-2014. The project required an independent final evaluation due to the amount of funds invested in it and its execution time. The evaluation was conducted according to the UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) guidelines and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation manuals and guidelines. The final evaluation was conducted under the supervision of UNODC / Vienna, with the support of the Liaison and Partnership Office in Brazil 1 (LPOBRA), and with collaboration from CAIXA SEGURADORA. An independent consultant carried out the evaluation. At the onset of her work, the evaluator reviewed the documents, identified, together with project managers, the key partners and stakeholders to be interviewed and established strategy and tools for the interviews. Field visits to the project were undertaken at Sobradinho II and Ceilândia, where meetings and interviews with players and beneficiaries of the project took place. The evaluator interviewed about 30 participants in two districts of the Federal District, including actors, partners, consultants, and direct beneficiaries of the project. The evaluator tapped into different sources of information to make sure data triangulation would be relevant, reliable, and credible. The most significant constraints on the evaluation included: (i) no baseline proposal in the project document; (ii) staff turnover in UNODC office, execution partners -NGOs-, and consultants throughout the project; (iii) weakness in progress reports focusing activities conducted by NGOs; (iv) absence of monitoring and evaluation reports on courses, meetings, and cultural events due to the punctual nature of project initiatives; (v) decision not to carry out a project final impact evaluation, which was planned; and (vi) demobilization of NGOs, consultants, and expression agents, with the consequent reduction in the number of beneficiaries attending courses and events, due to expiration of project funding contracts as of mid-2014.

III. MAJOR FINDINGS

Design

The project was designed as an «umbrella» project, which allowed agreed activities to be conducted. BRAX16 presented its initial cooperation proposal: with clearly stated purposes and with defined goals based on a diagnosis of youth needs, previously identified by CAIXA SEGURADORA. The project design was appropriate for conducting workshops and training sessions with young people aimed at preventing violence, drug abuse and crime; in these, a number of places were reserved for young offenders going through socio-educational reintegration processes; moreover, it allowed support for entrepreneurship training.

The project design was consistent with strategic lines of action in the Expressive Youth Programme (Caixa 2007/2009): (i) **Expressão Jovem** (Young People Expression): set of cultural and educational activities aimed at promoting health and engagement of young people in order to overcome social exclusion. Technology operation is based on involvement of communities and integration of social protection networks, advocacy and access to justice services, security, health, education and culture; (ii) **Fala Jovem** (Group Psychotherapy for Youth): therapeutic technique allowing people to share life experiences and, together, try to find solutions to their problems. During the project was introduced a new initiative called “**Diálogos da Juventude**” (Youth Dialogues), which organized events dealing with topics within UNODC expertise for fighting and preventing crime, drug abuse, and violence among young people in communities involved in the project.

The expected completion time and financial resources were well dimensioned, although the proposed arrangement for fund management by UNODC and Gearbox experienced difficulties in implementation and in the proposed coordination structure. The original design defined direct beneficiaries considering 18-29 year olds, not establishing subgroups of beneficiaries based on profile or age. This entailed difficulties in mobilizing and communicating with young people in the two target towns.

Therefore, the project initial design should have been better planned to include characteristics of players’ behaviour in a more dynamic and flexible way so the project response to young people could have been more agile. At the same time, the original design should have included systematization actions and procedures, as well as mechanisms aimed at generating public policy proposals to reduce violence among young adults at the local level.

Relevance

The BRAX16 project is consistent with Brazilian policies for social inclusion through cultural and free-time activities, entrepreneurship, reduction of crime and violent death among young people, as well as for fighting drug use and reducing the number of young people with HIV and sexually transmitted diseases. At the same time, it is also consistent with the Federal District Government’s priorities in relation to youth.

From the perspective of initiatives involving multilateral agencies and the private sector, the project is part of CAIXA SEGURADORA initiative in the framework of Global Compact actions aimed at

achieving MDGs in 2015, especially as to human rights issues, youth, and mortality reduction. In the broader context, BRAX16 is implemented within the second UN Development Cooperation Framework considering outcomes agreed with the Brazilian government: reduction of inequalities; human rights and citizen security; income and job creation. The BRAX16 cooperation is very relevant because it allows the UNODC to broaden its work with the group of young people on local and state levels.

There is a strong synergy between this project and other governmental actions within these communities, which increases the likelihood, in the medium term, of reducing violence among young people in the group through actions in which the project is able to intervene. Relevance is even wider when we take into account all that this cooperation has already achieved: knowledge, contact and support networks, meetings; young people participation in international forums; exchange of experiences among young people; improved NGO methodology and management processes; local mechanisms for mobilizing young people; and dissemination of information through meetings and social media.

Efficiency

The original project execution schedule was updated on a yearly basis, with the inclusion of new topics and new demands. Besides, small delays in implementation arose due to a number of factors, such as: (i) replacement of an NGO in Sobradinho II; (ii) inclusion of young people in order to mobilize youth in both communities; (iii) in 2013, delay in fund transfer to the project from CAIXA SEGURADORA; (iii) difficulties of communication and decision-making flow between players and partners; (iv) new partner included to deal with communication issues –UNESCO. The outputs and the actions implemented, set out in the action plans, were compatible with the execution and management capabilities of UNODC, CAIXA and NGOs, with the UNODC administrative, financial, and coordination support. The Office was highly capable of conducting initiatives, monitoring agreed activities, such as supporting decision-making on changes in activities; moreover, it was able to agree with other partners on actions aimed at carrying out the project. The project was directly implemented.

CAIXA SEGURADORA was the implementing agency, with an important role. UNODC was appointed as responsible for the implementation and management of the project in the Agreement with CAIXA SEGURADORA; the former was in charge of its administrative and financial management. The UNODC system allowed high quality information to be provided in a transparent and timely fashion about the acquisition and bidding processes, in support of project management decision-making.

The disbursement tracking system followed the UNODC rules that require training of NGOs accounting areas; one NGO was replaced, as it did not prove capable of managing expenditures and mobilization capacity. This replacement was carried out together with young people so they could streamline actions –Expression Agents- in one of the localities; despite keeping the same team, the NGO in the other locality underwent a change of corporate name. Communication, systematization, and dissemination of project activities and outcomes elicited difficulties; thus, it was necessary to hire additional workers to meet these challenges.

Another issue that impaired cooperation efficiency was the set of changes in community therapy, with the inclusion of a new NGO specializing in this area. The adaptation to the project of the "Programme" approach, taking into account local specificities, led a group of respondents to point out that the project helped improve strategies used to work with young people; another group found that the inclusion of agents (youth facilitators) could still be improved.

During BRAX16, the previous Programme –undertaken by CAIXA SEGURADORA in 2007-2009 through direct fund transfers onto NGOs- proved difficult to replicate on a larger scale. The use of Expression Agents (facilitators in each community) aimed at trying a new way to extend the reach of the project to the target audience by means of more flexible mechanisms.

The project disbursed in 04 years: in 2011 - US\$302,302; in 2012, a similar amount - US\$ 310,178; in 2013, disbursement was reduced to US\$ 240,740; the last year of implementation, US\$ 221,989 was foreseen, which totals US\$ 1,075,208. A comparison between planned project disbursements and what was effectively disbursed points to a good performance in 2011 and 2012.

Regarding the pace of activity implementation, there were minor delays relative to the original plan; the pace of disbursements remained very close to what was originally planned. A 12-month extension after 2013 was requested, and a new 06-month extension for project completion was authorized in December 2014. It is worth noting that UNODC proved able to identify and propose, in a timely and relevant fashion, corrective actions required to enhance efficiency in management, human resources, and tools for outcome management. Therefore, taking into account the experimental nature of the project implementation, it is possible to say that the level of project efficiency was medium in terms of cost, time, and opportunity for achieving outcomes.

Partnerships and Cooperation

The partner in this project was CAIXA SEGURADORA, private company that was its sole donor, thus allowing the cooperation to exist. This initiative is in line with the company's mission to make social investment in young citizens. For UNODC, this partnership is a first experience with CAIXA SEGURADORA, which approached the Office wishing to take advantage of the UNODC expertise in its areas of institutional competence.

The project engaged in dialogue and cooperation with representatives of the Federal District Government, through the Youth Coordination, although no formal agreement was reached to ensure the inclusion of this project and its methodology into the set of policies and public programmes in the Federal District. Collaborative actions were promoted with the National Secretariat of Youth through "Youth Dialogues", as well as through the participation of professionals in project events and of young people in meetings held by the Secretariat.

In terms of cooperation with other multilateral organizations, the project, through an agreement between CAIXA SEGURADORA and UNICEF, could take advantage of this latter's expertise in communication. At the same time, the project fostered initial partner networking with local governments, community and local private sector through activities that included workshops, events and meetings. "Fala Jovem" and Youth Dialogues were carried out in collaboration with TJDF, serving SERUQ beneficiaries, Civil and Uniformed Police of the Federal District; and Public Security Council and Office of the Attorney General. In each of the project areas, partnerships were established with about 15 NGOs and community leaders. Thus, the project fostered a number of successful partnerships and cooperation with other players, beneficiaries, public officials, community leaders and national or Federal District government agencies.

Effectiveness

This project's immediate goal was to adapt and implement the "Youth of Expression" methodology -previously developed by CAIXA SEGURADORA- in Federal District communities. In relation to Outcome 1.1: "Surveys in local communities to be assisted by the project undertaken to stimulate the creation and strengthening of comprehensive and integral care networks for young people" based on surveys, existing youth networks were strengthened so they could take part in project

actions and events; furthermore, young people demands were identified through workshops. The project convened seminars on public security and reproductive health, as well as an international meeting on the challenges of governance and public security, with support from the University of Brasilia; two meetings were also held to address HIV / AIDS with young people in both project localities.

In relation to Outcome 1.2: Implementing collaborates at the local level (NGO's) identified and trained in the "Expressive Youth" methodology; expected outcomes were achieved in both localities, although the number of training sessions was smaller than initially planned. NGOs were selected, young people mobilization and participation networks were created for events organized by the project, and local partnerships were established. Through interviews and visits to project sites it was possible to verify high levels of young people participation in and satisfaction with activities cooperation partners conducted. Through meetings and workshops, around 800 young people were directly and 13,000 indirectly served, as they took part in events promoted in cooperation, such as Youth Dialogues; "Sabadões Culturais" ("Cultural Saturdays") and Dance Contest (SESC). In 2012, 27 meetings of "Fala Jovem" were held that dealt with free topics, so providing an open forum for young people in the project to express their difficulties and joys, frustrations and achievements under professional supervision.

In relation to the development of Outcome 1.3: "Youth of Expression" Methodology implemented and adapted in thematic aspects related to UNODC mandate; it is possible to consider that the achievement of this outcome involved a process aimed at reviewing the Youth of Expression Programme methodology (previous project elaborated by CAIXA SEGURADORA without UNODC participation), considering the strengths and weaknesses found in different areas of action with young people. It was difficult to make progress in this topic towards a joint solution; it required at least 15 strategic planning meetings in 2013 to agree on methodological improvements, based on project-produced inputs.

In this context, we can say that some of the activities aimed at achieving this outcome were not entirely carried out, although this is explained by the lack of a final decision on changes to be introduced in the Expressive Youth model. The project was lately informed that CAIXA SEGURADORA will fund its second stage, during which changes will be introduced in the Programme operational model and the work will mainly focus on generating input for public policies.

Impact

Through interviews, it was possible to verify that there is consensus among respondents about BRAX16 activities having contributed changes in young participants' KAP - Capabilities, Attitude, and Practice (CAP – Comportamento, Atitude e Prática) in different project components. This information was collected from Ceilândia youth group before the onset of the project and was once again confirmed during evaluation interviews in both communities. Therefore, the project contributed to achieving the development goal that aimed at fostering citizenship, access to justice, and culture of peace.

Interviews with NGOs, trainers, beneficiaries, and professionals engaged with the project indicate that young project participants experienced some degree of improvement in social integration, acquired better knowledge and information on issues such as health, violence and drugs, health and culture of peace, and developed new practices aimed at enhancing future employability. Young direct project beneficiaries' are now more likely to get a job due to qualification offered through workshops on topics of cultural or artistic interest, or other forms of young people expression. At the same time, it was pointed out that, based on what they had learned from workshops, a few young

people had started small businesses and / or taken advantage of these qualification opportunities to design projects for new career paths. Caixa Seguradora invested to generate knowledge about sexual and reproductive health by publishing three studies in 2012-2014.

Most short-term positive effects achieved by the project are in a strategic and synergistic relationship with other initiatives, public programmes and policies of the Brazilian government and the local government for this young age group. This means that, for the most part, effects are achieved, not solely due to the action of project initiatives, but also because these efforts are synergistic with actions in different areas of government policy.

We could highlight the following among the set of effects the project achieved throughout its implementation:

- a) Dissemination of studies on new project topics through Youth Dialogues, providing the basis for the reflections of young people, managers, and community;
- b) Improvement of young people consultation processes and mechanisms, which outcome helps understand their demands and opportunities for actions; this improves ngos and Expression Agents planning capacity, leading to the inclusion of new content; this also makes it easier to propose actions, events and training scenarios;
- c) Cooperation with public and non-governmental partners to extend collaboration in planning, monitoring, and implementation of actions;
- d) Dissemination of events, meetings, training sessions, debates, “Fala Jovem” sessions, Expressive Youth activities to different players and local partners through social media and general media, fostering new arrangements and enhancing local consensus on the initiatives;
- e) Awareness-raising and information activities for managers, professionals, relevant partners, youth, and community on project issues,
- f) Interaction with other local initiatives focusing on issues of interest to young people;
- g) Dissemination, exchange, and international and national visibility of project initiatives;
- h) Proposition of a new operating and strategic model for Expressive Youth for the coming years;
- i) Expansion of research and advocacy activities to draw attention to causes advocated by UNODC and CAIXA SEGURADORA on youth issues.

Sustainability

After the completion of cooperation activities, the effects of the project are not strongly maintained; NGOs who worked with the project show varying degrees of sustainability in their activities in project areas, in both cities, due to their previous experience and support network with other local funders, both national and international. There were no proposed exit strategies for when the cooperation programme is completed; and the need to transform this project into a public policy input generator caused sustainability likelihood to be reduced.

The likelihood of project outcomes and effects being relatively sustainable in coming years is medium to low, considering:

- a) Staff turnover in the Federal District government;
- b) Lack of definition of the profile of the new Institute to be set up within CAIXA SEGURADORA; CAIXA SEGURADORA Institute undefined priorities for continuing support to this project at the locality level;
- c) Lack of actions aimed at institutionalizing and advocating the project with public authorities and other strategic partners;

- d) Weakness in formal coordination with other national and local programmes and projects for youth;
- e) And demobilization of Expression Agents and trainers who worked in previous years.

Uncertainty as to decisions on the introduction of changes in the Expressive Youth Programme method also had a negative impact on project sustainability in both localities and on the likelihood of it being replicated in other cities.

Cross-cutting themes: Human rights and Gender

By its very nature, the project conducted actions aimed at promoting citizenship and human rights based on two axes –Expressive Youth, activities and events; and “Fala Jovem”, community therapy on topics chosen by young people- as well as on several meetings held to address issues such as: drugs; violence; crime; rights of young people; local full support network for young citizens.

Human rights issues were addressed together with professionals of the judiciary and the executive powers, with UNODC participation. Interviews pointed out that the inclusion of these topics strengthened the strategy according to which the project should enjoy systematic collaboration with other agencies and institutions in order to look at this issue in a crosscutting way. In these "Youth Dialogues", the following groups were also provided with information: young people, public officials, businesspersons, representatives of young people communities and families. Regarding the gender issue, the project had not designed a specific strategy for gender equality. Nevertheless, “Fala Jovem” meetings led to the creation of specific interest groups of young women; these address, for example, the issue of adolescent mothers in younger age groups. Women's collectives - created to discuss topics of interest and to consolidate support networks among women in the project, and working together with other areas in the cities (Sol Nascente is a district of Ceilândia) - were integrated into the Expressive Youth component, promoting better training for young mothers and for those in the process of recovery and reintegration, which may include activities and hours devoted to social or community work.

IV. Conclusions

The initial proposal considered a 36 month (2011/2013) implementation time for this project, funded with US\$ 1.075 million, covering 03 outcomes. The project supported activities identified as being necessary to promote citizenship, access to justice and culture of peace among 18-29-year-olds in two localities in Federal District: Sobradinho II and Ceilândia. The project was granted an 18-month extension time, with the support of CAIXA SEGURADORA funds, direct execution of UNODC (DEX) and two NGOs hired to implement actions in both cities.

The project is highly relevant, as it is in line with national policies and priorities for youth since the establishment of the National Secretariat for Youth / PR in 2006. The Expressive Youth Programme is consistent with the guidelines set out in the National Youth Charter, adopted in 2013. This initiative is consistent with the cooperation guidelines adopted by the Brazilian Government and the United Nations System agencies, concerning issues of Public Security, Justice, Human Rights, and Citizenship. Special attention should be paid to the fact it complies with the Global Compact initiative, to which CAIXA SEGURADORA is a signatory. The project is also consistent with the MDGs, which it contributes to achieving, in the areas of Human Rights, youth, and mortality reduction.

The project design was relevant to achieve an initial proposal for activities, outcomes, and management arrangements aimed at implementing and monitoring cooperation. However, the management model proposed faced obstacles, as in the midst of the implementation process, the project started to try a new pilot arrangement of responsibilities among relevant partners, with the introduction of a new player into the process. The inclusion of Expression Agents to replace and to support NGOs substantially modified previous (2007-2009) institutional arrangements that were still standing.

The project implementation schedule was a little delayed, as was disbursement, relative to original plans, but annual expected disbursement was unchanged. The project disbursed in 04 years: in 2011 - US\$302,302; in 2012, a similar amount - US\$ 310,178; in 2013, disbursement was reduced to US\$ 240,740; the last year of implementation, US\$ 221,989 was foreseen, which totals US\$ 1,075,208. Of the total project funds, approximately 27% were allocated to personnel expenditure (including individual consultants); 40% were allocated to subcontract support or grants to NGOs; and about 10% for training (including participation in international meetings). The direct UNODC (DEX) administrative costs are consistent with the rules agreed with the Brazilian Government. Costs of individual consultants, contracts with Expression Agents, events and NGO service provision are consistent with average amounts paid in Brazil for these; these were quality services aimed at obtaining the expected output.

The project efficiency can be said to be medium due to the nature of outcomes expected from BRAX16, which involved making adjustments and validating changes in the methodology CAIXA SEGURADORA used in 2007-2009. The set of factors that impaired to a certain degree the project efficiency was not under direct control of project management: donor institutional change; contract discontinuation due difficulties experienced by a Sobradinho II NGO in mobilizing young people with an appropriate profile for the project; and delays in carrying out the communication component through a direct agreement between CAIXA SEGURADORA and UNESCO.

Therefore, the Project implementation efficiency is average, although most difficulties it faced in managing cooperation in terms of deadlines and decision-making can be attributed to external factors. The project implementation allowed the continuity of mobilization and support networks for more than 800 young people who are direct beneficiaries of project components: (i) Expressive Youth (events, workshops, and training sessions); (ii) Fala Jovem (community therapy meetings); and (iii) incorporation of "Youth Dialogues" (theme introduced by UNODC -drugs, violence, crime, weapons and others within its competence). Moreover, 13,000 young people were mobilized in events organized by the project and benefitted indirectly from it.

At least 06 "Youth Dialogues" meetings were held, with the participation of representatives of public security, D.A. office and district offices to discuss information and dissemination on topics that included drugs, youth health, STD / HIV, and violence and youth rights. Moreover, 03 monthly training sessions were held on average preparing for youth entrepreneurship; activities involving hip-hop, all dances, basketball; events were promoted events in both localities with wide participation of young people who attended project workshops or who were active in the photography, digital communication, event promotion, and Expression TV collectives.

Conducting monthly community therapy meetings between young people and professional or adults to deal with topics of interest of youth was important to consolidate channels of dialogue and support for youth who took part in project actions. In interviews, young people and instructors explained what their life trajectories would be like were it not for NGOs physical spaces as reference points for them: loss of parents in accidents; many groups associated with drugs and violence; failure in accessing higher education; young mothers; and change of professional plans in the case of workshop topics -photography and events.

As seen above, dealing with youth issues involves joint action of the three powers on local, state and national levels. Project initiatives involving these powers were reduced; coordination had been initiated with local and district authorities. Thus, the extent to which this output was produced was average-large, as a new project design was proposed that allows: greater capacity for replication and medium and long-term effects for 18-29 year olds; to serve their needs based on age subgroups and interests; and to incorporate topics of interest to young people such as entrepreneurship, drugs, and violence.

Most project short-term positive effects are in a strategic and synergistic relationship with other initiatives, public programmes and policies of the Brazilian government for this age group. This means that, for the most part, effects do not stem solely from project actions, but rather from synergy with actions in different areas of government policy. In this context, this evaluation can say that the project had immediate effects that require mechanisms and processes to maintain these effects over years to come, as long as CAIXA SEGURADORA continues to support this initiative.

The revision of the Expressive Youth model is expected to generate new effects and ensure greater synergy with other youth programmes and policies. In order to achieve the development goal, many other actions are certainly required over the next years, as well as an active participation of different public and private players and other levels of Government, not forgetting other current programmes. It is worth noting that the inclusion of a line of action devoted to advocacy of public policies for young beneficiaries may have greater future impact in addressing the youth issue at local, state, and national levels. The inclusion of this strategy would ensure increased visibility and impact to CAIXA SEGURADORA and UNODC actions with the replication of the project in other localities.

This cooperation proved to achieve very little sustainability. The project should have included an exit strategy for CAIXA SEGURADORA and UNODC, preparing actors and local partners to own the project. This exit strategy would require actions to be developed from the beginning with NGOs, beneficiaries, authorities and Expression Agents to give continuity to project initiatives, thus

ensuring effects would persist in the coming years. Another weakness in sustainability is to be found in the significant reduction in the target of training young people so they replicate Expressive Youth methodology; this was due to the stalemate in deciding which modalities should be used to implement Expressive Youth. Only 07 Expression Agents were trained for the two cities, thus reducing the likelihood of replication in other districts of both towns or in surrounding localities.

Based on previous analysis, it is possible to say that the likelihood of project outcomes and effects being relatively sustainable over the coming years is medium-low. This is so because, by its very nature, the project conducted actions aimed at developing citizenship and guaranteeing human rights based on the axes Expressive Youth (activities and events) and Fala Jovem (community therapy on youth-chosen topics), as well as on several meetings it convened to address issues such as: drugs, violence, crime, rights of young people, network of integral care to young citizens. These human rights issues were addressed with the participation of professionals from the judiciary and the executive, as well as from UNODC. Interviewees pointed out that the inclusion of these topics had strengthened the strategy according to which the project should enjoy systematic collaboration with other agencies and institutions, to address these issues in a crosscutting way. In these "Youth Dialogues", the following groups were also provided with information: young people, public officials, businesspersons, representatives of young people communities and families.

Regarding the gender issue, the project had not designed a specific strategy for gender equality. Nevertheless, Fala Jovem meetings led to the creation of specific interest groups of young women; these address, for example, the issue of adolescent mothers in younger age groups. In view of its implementation, the project established partnerships and cooperation agreements with more than 20 NGOs and public institutions, thus ensuring better conditions for local ownership of the project, which developed support and mobilizing networks for 18-29 year olds in both cities where the project worked. Special cooperation was established between CAIXA SEGURADORA and UNODC from the proposal stage to the completion of the project.

Therefore, it can be said that the achieved outcomes were satisfactory when these external and internal project conditions are considered. A consensus emerged from the interviews about the satisfactory outcomes of cooperation activities for information, training and new perspectives on young people personal development in both localities. A broader group of partners must still validate the new revised methodology. The BRAX16 project was evaluated as very relevant, specifically: medium level of efficacy and a lower level of efficiency; medium level in terms of achieving medium term effects; and low probability of impacts and sustainability of the project results in case CAIXA SEGURADORA or a new partner would not ensure technical, administrative, and financial resources, as well as resources that would allow coordination with strategic partners for the promotion of human rights, citizenship and justice for 18-29 year olds, with the relevant use of new methodologies in the Expressive Youth Programme in both cities and elsewhere.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

To UNODC:

Recommendation 01: That joint actions should be promoted with CAIXA SEGURADORA and other partners in order to implement the new stage of deployment and methodology validation that would fit the Expressive Youth Programme. **Recommendation 02:** That new actions should be included taking into account the need to expand initiatives that would address issues such as drugs, violence, crime, employment and employability, and consolidate Youth Dialogues.

Recommendation 03: That project activities should be reviewed to meet the 03 youth profiles, thus designing proposals for action targeting each of the three subgroups of beneficiaries aged 18-29.

Recommendation 04: That a project exit strategy should be designed, considering all actions that would be required, from the beginning of the implementation, to ensure the sustainability of impacts.

Recommendation 05: That processes, mechanisms and tools should be institutionalized to ensure collaboration with new partners.

Recommendation 06: That strategic work with relevant partners, civil society, and political should be continued in order to enhance the likelihood of this Programme and project being incorporated into local, state, and national level public policies (advocacy).

To CAIXA SEGURADORA:

Recommendation 01: That a position should be agreed upon on the revision of the Expressive Youth Programme methodology, with the inclusion of new operating model and new themes.

Recommendation 02: That support should be granted to the new stage of the project, as long as it is considered a priority of CAIXA SEGURADORA and the Institute's action plan for the next 04 years.

Recommendation 03: That a meeting should be held with other potential partners from public and private sectors in order to present the project outcomes and expand partnerships.

Recommendation 04: That the Expressive Youth Programme manuals 2007/2009 should be reviewed in the light of the proposed methodological adjustments and those new manuals should be produced for new technical issues.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED

Lesson learned 01: The initial design defining project methodological review activities should include a mid-term review to enhance adjustment consistency.

Lesson learned 02: Projects involving different players and partners –from private sector, governmental and non-governmental organizations- should devote an initial period to establish coordination and consolidate roles, working arrangements and synergy with other initiatives.

Lesson learned 03: The original project design should have provided more time for CAIXA SEGURADORA and UNODC decision-making processes on the validation of new project operational and strategic proposals.

Lesson learned 04: The lack of exit strategy in the original project design increased the likelihood of project effects and impacts of the project fading out after its completion.

Lesson learned 05: Inclusion of an advocacy component in the project design could have favoured a permanent coordination with local and national public policies and programmes; the project might have been included in or associated with other government initiatives, thus enhancing its likelihood to influence youth policies.

Lesson learned 06: In the case of cooperation projects involving international organizations and the private sector, joint action strategies should be designed from the onset in order to generate synergies between social investment and different contributions to proposing public policies.

Lesson learned 07: New projects should include initiatives aimed at promoting forums for dialogue between public and private players, NGOs, civil society organizations, and projects that benefit from social investment in order to build collaborative arrangements and joint actions.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings ¹ : problems and issues identified	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ²
Key recommendations		
<p>1. There was a lack of updated baseline information and reliable updated statistics. It is thus difficult to measure impact and achievements.</p>	<p>During desk review and interviews for this evaluation reliable information and updated statistics on human trafficking facts and policy were not available.</p>	<p>It is recommended to UNODC and the CAIXA SEGUROS that future projects make provisions for baseline surveys at the beginning of the implementation phase to establish a source for measuring results and impact.</p>
<p>2. Since the second semester of 2012, UNODC and CAIXA SEGUROS agreed to make a substantive revision of the Project's Document to improve the management of the Project and to consolidate the incorporation of new areas of interest. The revision was not implemented, even with a strategic planning seminar in the end of 2013. As consequence of this situation, the project faced delays in its implementation.</p>	<p>During desk review and interviews for this evaluation, a substantial deceleration in the pace of implementation was noticed in 2012 and 2013, due to difficulties to take a decision regarding a revision of the Project's Document..</p> <p>Experience in other projects in periods of absence of taking a decision process indicate that this causes substantial delays for the full implementation of the cooperation.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the CAIXA SEGUROS and UNODC review the alternatives proposed in 2013 to take a decision considering the new methodology to implement Youth Expression Project in a planned second phase.</p>

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.

<p>3. NGOs had difficulties in youth mobilization and in using administrative and financial processes adopted by international organizations, such as UNODC. One NGO had to be replaced by community facilitators and a new Project mobilization coordinator. Another NGO changed its corporate name, but maintained the same team</p>	<p>During desk review and evaluation interviews it was possible to notice how difficult it was to mobilize young people and use international organizations' accounting procedures. At the same time, it was possible to relate increased young people participation in communities to the existence of new mobilizing agents and local coordination for mobilization</p>	<p>It is recommended that in future bidding processes NGOs should be required to have developed satisfactory previous work in at least two international technical cooperation projects with UN system agencies.</p>
<p>4. NGOs and expressive youth built networks for awareness-raising, mobilization, and dissemination of training sessions, events, and workshops that were welcome by young people in both communities the project served. Wide participation in project-organized workshops and events. It could have been wider had the initial communication strategy been adopted after reviewing the issue of communication and mobilization of young people in both communities.</p>	<p>During desk review and evaluation interviews, it was possible to notice how difficult it was to mobilize young people and disseminate workshops, opportunities, and events. It was possible to see that change in strategy, with the inclusion Expression Agents - agreed with the UNODC and CAIXA SEGURADORA, expanding the UNODC presence in the communities- resulted in improvements in communication and mobilization with communities.</p>	<p>It would be recommended that, in future technical cooperation projects, communication, mobilization, and dissemination of project actions should be a planning priority. Moreover, local coordinators and expression agents should be hired who were not included in the original plan, but who streamlined youth response.</p>
<p>Important recommendations</p>		
<p>1. Project Management – communication difficulties; document flow and delay in decision-making required very frequent meetings. These difficulties were due to previous work practices between Caixa and NGOs, and the UNODC management system in working with NGOs. Difficulties in implementing</p>	<p>During desk review and interviews, regarding the pace of implementation, it was possible to identify how fragile was the management process that was implemented.</p>	<p>It is recommended that UNODC should propose an administrative and financial system fit for working with NGOs to support the required pace of project execution.</p>

local activities.		
2. Bureaucracy – overly complicated procedures for bidding processes hinder project implementation.	Desk review and interviews identified that delays occurred in bidding processes due to bureaucratic procedures determined by UNODC procedures and the specialized requirements for the qualifications of consultants and NGOs to be engaged.	It is recommended that UNODC should review the procedures for bidding processes for hiring consultants under international technical assistance projects.
3. Sustainability – Lack of project-implemented proposals and actions that would ensure enhanced sustainability and continuity of medium-term effects.	Desk review and interviews pointed to the lack of actions aimed at ensuring continuity of project initiatives; nothing was done to include project outcomes in public programs and policies for young people in areas of high mortality, crime and social exclusion rates.	It is recommended that continuing collaboration between Caixa Seguradora and UNODC should allow the inclusion in the original design of actions aimed at proposing new youth public policies and programmes; and allow a larger number of partners from public, private and non-governmental sectors in the new cooperation.
4. Information – Actions related to UNODC thematic areas of expertise were further included in project actions. Although not originally planned, the creation of spaces for dialogue with youth allowed the incorporation of topics of interest to young people about security, reproductive health, citizenship, justice and others pertaining to UNODC expertise	Desk review and interviews pointed to how much young people in both communities appreciated the "Dialogues with Youth", in which UNODC took a leadership role, thus adding value to information, awareness-raising, and dissemination of topics within its expertise among young people.	It is recommended that, from the onset, future cooperation on this issue should include these meetings with youth as a way to broaden the dialogue with young people, families, community leaders, public officials and local administrators.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Project number:	BRA/X16
Project title:	“Expressive Youth”: citizenship, access to justice and culture of peace
Duration:	August 2010 – June 2014
Location:	Brazil
Linkages to Country Programme:	
Linkages to Regional Programme:	
Linkages to Thematic Programme:	<p>Strategic Area: 3. Prevention, treatment and reintegration, and alternative development</p> <p>Result area: 3.1. Community-centred prevention</p> <p>3.1.3. Creating tools to address youth and violent crime, especially in marginalized urban communities</p> <p>3.1.7. Expanding the capacity of Member States to foster community-centred drug abuse and crime prevention programmes and, in that context, increased cooperation between UNODC and relevant entities of civil society that are active in such programmes in accordance with relevant international conventions and within the mandates of UNODC</p>
Executing Agency:	UNODC

Partner Organizations:	John Snow Brazil Consultancy, Movimento Integrado de Saúde Comunitária do Distrito Federal (MISMEC-DF), Grupo Cultural Azulim, United Nations Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (ILANUD).
Total Approved Budget:	US\$1,227,180.00
Donors:	CAIXA SEGUROS Group
Project Manager/Coordinator:	Nivio Nascimento
Type of evaluation (mid-term or final):	Final Independent Project Evaluation
Time period covered by the evaluation:	August 2010 – June 2014
Geographical coverage of the evaluation:	Brasil (Federal District)
Core Learning Partners ³ (entities):	UNODC, CAIXA SEGUROS Group, Educação em Foco, UNESCO, Agentes de Expressão

Project overview and historical context in which the project is implemented

This project aims at implementing the methodology called “Expressive Youth” and the incorporation of additional activities to prevent violence and promote access to justice among young people of 18-29 years of age, as well as stimulating the creation and/or strengthening of networks of integral care to young people in the Federal District. The Expressive Youth Programme is the result of a pilot experience of CAIXA SEGUROS Group in the cities of Sobradinho II and Ceilândia, Federal District, in the years of 2007 to 2009, and aims at disseminating the concept of health promotion among young people, with a focus on reducing mortality by external causes.

³ The Core Learning Partnership (CLP are the key stakeholders of the subject evaluated (project, programme, policy etc.) who have an interest in the evaluation. The CLP works closely with the Evaluation Manager to guide the evaluation process.

Justification of the project and main experiences / challenges during implementation

The project is justified by the synergy between the goals of the methodology developed in the scope of the Pilot Programme “Expressive Youth” and the mandate and the Strategic Programme Framework of UNODC for Brazil. The tackling of urban crime and violence prevention, considering the high concentration of population in urban areas and recognizing the vulnerability of young people, is defined as a priority of UNODC in the country.

Data from the Mortality Information System (SIM) of the Ministry of Health show that the age group between 20 to 29 years concentrates the highest number of fatal victims of assaults and homicides in Brazil. In this country, homicides jumped from 32,603 occurrences in 1994 to 49,844 in 2011. When separated by age groups, SIM data reveal that the lethal violence in Brazil predominately affects young people. In the range from 20 to 29 years of age, for example, 18,798 homicides were recorded in 2011, representing 39.7 % of the total of homicides occurred this year.

The Map of Violence: Homicide and Youth in Brazil (2013), research authored by Julio Jacobo Waiselfisz and promoted by the General Secretariat of the Presidency, National Youth Secretariat, and the Secretariat for Policies to Promote Racial Equality shows that the vulnerable situation of young people against violence is reflected in the victimization index pointed by the study. The index, which indicates the ratio between the homicide rate among young people and not young people in 2011, was 249.6 %.

The actions planned one can point out are: creating tools to address youth and violent crime, especially in marginalized urban communities, and expanding the capacity of Member States to foster community-centred drug abuse and crime prevention programmes.

The partnership in question will also contribute to the achievement of Outcome 3 – Reduced violence, promoting peace, conciliation and justice – of UNDAF (United Nations Development Assistance Framework) for Brazil for the period 2007-2011, as well as for the achievement of Millennium Development Goals, in the sense that developing countries should be based on fundamental values, among them the freedom from fear of violence. Finally, the Bangkok Declaration recognizes the importance of participation of individuals and civil society groups in crime prevention and effective prevention measures can significantly reduce crime and the victimization of citizens.

The main goal, the results and indicators of this project, established in accordance with UNODC and CAIXA SEGUROS Group were as follows:

Immediate goal	Indicators
-----------------------	-------------------

<p>Adapt and implement the “Expressive Youth” methodology in communities of the Federal District.</p>	<p>Changes in the KAP (Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice) of young people assisted by the project.</p> <p>Reduction in the number of homicides in each area or community involved in the project.</p> <p>Increased number of alternative measures to imprisonment applied to the target population.</p>
<p>Results</p>	<p>Indicators</p>
<p>Result 1.1:</p> <p>Surveys in local communities to be assisted by the project undertaken to stimulate the creation and strengthening of comprehensive and integral care networks for young people.</p>	<p>Two focal groups carried out.</p> <p>Two surveys carried out.</p> <p>Partnerships with government, civil society organizations and private enterprises established.</p> <p>90 local agents selected and trained.</p> <p>Integral care networks for young people created and strengthened.</p>
<p>Result 1.2:</p> <p>Implementing partners at the local level (NGO’s) identified and trained in the “Expressive Youth” methodology.</p>	<p>Two NGOs selected and partnerships formally established.</p> <p>20 local agents trained in the “Expressive Youth” methodology and in project management and monitoring.</p> <p>Additional partnerships established by NGO’s with other actors.</p>
<p>Result 1.3:</p> <p>“Expressive Youth” methodology implemented and adapted in the thematic areas related to UNODC mandate.</p>	<p>Two focal groups carried out.</p> <p>Manuals of “Expressive Youth” methodology adapted.</p> <p>180 local agents trained.</p> <p>450 young people assisted by the project.</p> <p>Partnerships with government and civil society organizations.</p>

During the project implementation, UNODC encountered problems in the execution of a grant by Azulim. From late 2011, the partner institutions noticed the implementation of activities was suffering from organizational issues such as low mobilization and little ability to engage in sustainability actions. Thereafter, UNODC and Caixa Seguros decided to terminate this agreement and initiated a new model of implementation in Sobradinho II.

The main difficulties encountered throughout 2013 were related to the definition of roles and internal flows between the different partners of the program. Aiming at solving this question, UNODC hired a consultant specializing in Strategic Planning that conducted meetings with partners throughout the year. The final document, containing the analysis of these meetings was delivered in the end of 2013 and will be used as a basis for guiding the planning of the programme's segment.

It is noteworthy to point that both the implementation of the program and the strategic planning process were impacted by the institutional transition of the donor, which is in a formalization process to become an Institute. The uncertainties of this process affected the progress of the program and consequently the development of its actions.

At the end of 2013, the project document was reviewed with the purpose of extending the implementation period in order to finalize the administrative procedures and conduct the final evaluation in the second semester of 2014.

Project documents and revisions of the original project document

The project document is part of the desk review documents, found on Annex II. No revisions have been submitted, requested or approved at this stage of project implementation.

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

The project is linked to the UNODC's Crime Prevention strategy with a human rights approach based on the rules of law.

The proposal is in line with the global "Strategy for the period 2008-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime", (E/CN.7/2007/14) and intends to implement the results listed below:

THEME	AREA OF RESULT	RESULT	PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT
3. Prevention, treatment and reintegration, and alternative development	3.1. Community-centred prevention	3.1.3. Creating tools to address youth and violent crime, especially in marginalized urban communities 3.1.7. Expanding the capacity of Member States to foster community-centred drug abuse and crime prevention programmes and, in that context, increased cooperation between UNODC and relevant entities of civil society that are active in such programmes in accordance with relevant international conventions and within the mandates of UNODC	Promote citizenship, access to justice and culture of peace.

I. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

	Overall Budget	Total Approved Budget	Expenditure	Expenditure in % (time period)
2011	1.075.268	1.075.268	300.926	28,0%
2012	1.075.268	1.075.268	309.153	28,8%
2013	1.075.268	1.075.268	340.500	31,7%

II. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

Reasons behind the evaluation taking place

The evaluation of this project was planned for in the document revision to be carried out throughout the extension period – first semester of 2014, according to the rules of the UNODC evaluation policy and handbook. It will be conducted under the general supervision of (1) UNODC/LPO - Liaison Office and Partnership in Brazil, (2) UNODC/HQ (Independent Evaluation Unit) and (3) CAIXA SEGUROS Group.

This process aims at providing accountability to donors by determining whether project objectives were met and resources were wisely utilized; identifying areas of improvement in a project; clarifying and tackling problems; getting feedback, appraisal and recognition, as well as learning lessons for a possible continuation of the project.

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: design, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, as well as partnerships and cooperation, gender and human rights and lesson learned.

Assumed accomplishment of the evaluation

One of the expected accomplishments of this evaluation is to provide valuable information on the lessons that can be learned from current implementation, as well as to analyse the project's impacts in the communities, providing further gain for future projects. It will also seek to determine whether the activities and design of the project document were in line with the project document.

The main evaluation users

It is hoped that the findings of the evaluation process benefit the organizations that took part in the project, in particular CAIXA SEGUROS Group, UNODC and the NGOs involved in the implementation.

III. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The unit of analysis to be covered by the evaluation

This evaluation will focus on one project as a whole, including implementation of actions by the government (National Secretariat of Justice), external parties (7 NGOs and ICMPD), as well as the involvement of UNODC (LPOBRA) in its execution, thematic and operational support.

The time period to be covered by the evaluation

The final Independent Project Evaluation of the project will cover the concept, design, implementation and accomplishments of the project throughout the period from June 2010, when the original document BRAX16 project was formally approved, to the end of the Evaluation Field Mission (tentatively November 2014). The evaluation should take into consideration the extension review for its completion.

The geographical coverage of the evaluation

It should cover the territory of Federal District, in Brazil, where the project was implemented.

IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, as well as partnerships and cooperation, gender and human rights and lesson learned, and, will respond to the following below questions (2-4 recommended), however, provided as indicative only, and required to be further refined by the Evaluation Team.

<i>Relevance</i>
1. To what extent is the project aligned with mandates, decisions and strategies of UNODC and Caixa Seguros?
2. How relevant is the project to target groups' needs and priorities?
3. Does the project provide an appropriate support in disseminating the concept of health promotion among young people, with a focus on reducing mortality by external cause?
<i>Efficiency</i>
1. Were activities effectively planned, managed and monitored on an ongoing basis?
2. Were sound financial management systems and practices used, which provided timely, accurate and transparent information on project expenditures and procurement?
3. Was the pace of activity implementation satisfactory (or were there any significant delays)?
4. Are stakeholders generally happy with the quality of project management?
5. Has the project adequately documented, reported and disseminated information on what it is doing/has achieved?
6. Were the resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
7. To what extent was UNODC HQ based management, coordination and monitoring efficient and appropriate for Field Offices?
<i>Effectiveness</i>
1. Has the project achieved its objectives and results, as provided by the project document and its revision?
2. Was the quality of project results satisfactory, and was this appropriately monitored by the project?
3. How effective is the project on the dissemination of the concept of health promotion among young people? How could it be improved?

4. Have project results directly contributed to the achievement of desired/planned objectives, and what is the evidence?
5. Were unforeseen challenges to the implementation of the project handled creatively and effectively?
6. What are the results achieved beyond the logframe?
7. To what extent was the progress made due to the result of the project activities' rather than to external factors? How did external factors impact on the effectiveness of its activities?
<i>Impact</i>
1. Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the project?
2. What are the intended or unintended (positive and negative) long-term effects of the project?
3. What difference has the project made to the target group and key stakeholders, on regards to initiatives towards fighting mortality among young people?
4. Could the project be more innovative in terms of products and initiatives?
5. To what extent will the benefits generated through the project be sustained after the end of project's duration?
6. Does the project receive sufficient financial and human resources to adequately meet its objectives and mid and long-term objectives and priorities?
<i>Sustainability</i>
1. To what extend are the project results (impact if any, and outcomes) likely to continue after the project?
2. Is stakeholders' engagement likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated or institutionalized after external funding ceases?
3. Have the beneficiaries taken ownership of the objectives to be achieved by the project? Which beneficiaries in particular? Are they committed to continue working towards these objectives once the project has ended?
<i>Partnerships and cooperation</i>
1. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established (including UN agencies) and synergies been created in the delivery of assistance?
2. Were project stakeholders appropriately involved in project implementation? If not, how could this interaction have been enhanced?

<i>Cross cutting issues/Human rights and gender</i>
1. To what extent have the project achieved results on human rights and gender equality?
2. To what extent have young groups been empowered and influenced outside of the intervention's targeted group?
3. To what extent a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention?
<i>Lessons learned</i>
1. What lessons can be learned from the project implementation in order to improve performance?
2. What best practices emerged from the project implementation?
3. What recommendations can be made to improve the project in order to increase relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability?
4. What lessons can be drawn from the partnerships established in the scope of the project?
5. To what extent were Human Rights and Gender mainstreamed in the project design and implementation?

V. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methods used to collect and analyse data

When conducting the evaluation, the evaluator needs to take into account relevant international standards, including the UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) Evaluation Policy, Handbook, Templates and Guidelines to be found on the IEU web site⁴ and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards.

Given the specificity of the project, a qualitative model is recommended in order to cover all important aspects of the project and shall be included in a detailed evaluation plan to be provided in a proposal (Inception Report) and discussed with UNODC. Analysis of the collected information will be used for a determination of the project's effectiveness by applying the principles of the qualitative models. All evaluation findings need to be triangulated through various sources and methods in order to ensure their credibility and reliability.

⁴ IEU Policy, Handbook, Guidelines and Templates to be used in the evaluation-process can be found on the IEU-Website: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>

The sources of data

Primary sources of data include, among others:

Qualitative methods: Structured and semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, key informants or representatives of different interested entities (face-to-face, by telephone or by webcam).

Secondary sources for the desk review will include, among others: The project document and revision

Annual and Semi-Annual Progress Reports (2011 to 2014) Publications issued under the project

Other relevant documents

It is anticipated that the following methods will be used by the evaluation consultant:

Preliminary desk review of all relevant project documentation, administrative and financial records, as provided by UNODC and independently accessed by the evaluator (e.g. from the web or through other professional contacts/sources)⁵. The desk review must be summarized and submitted as an inception report, through the application on Independent Project Evaluation in ProFi, which further specifies the evaluation methodology, determines its exact focuses, scope and draft data collection instruments, provides preliminary findings after the desk review and further refines the evaluation questions. (see Annex II for a list of documents). The inception report should include a detailed statement of proposed evaluation methods and design matrix, as well as the questionnaires that will be answered with information provided by all key informants and key players, implementing partners, academic institutions (if any), and clients of the services (if any), the questionnaires should address both qualitative and quantitative aspects. Besides, the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection must be specified at the Inception Report. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards. Evaluator must present the detailed design matrix and evaluation instruments to UNODC prior the field visits;

On-going email and phone communication with stakeholders as required, including with respect to confirming all field work arrangements, meetings etc.;

Field visit face to face interviews using structured or semi-structured questionnaires with key informants/service providers and key project stakeholders, both individually and (as appropriate) in small groups. If necessary, conduct focus group discussions with regional beneficiaries. This would include an initial meeting with staff of UNODC Liaison and Partnership Office in Brazil;

Interviews with key informants and key players (face-to face or by telephone): Donor, UNODC HQ , implementing partners, and senior officials from the Administrations/Governments and clients of the services;

Presentation of preliminary evaluation findings at a debriefing at the UNODC Liaison and Partnership Office in Brazil;

⁵ IEU Policy, Handbook, Guidelines and Templates to be used in the evaluation-process can be found on the IEU-Website: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>

Final reflection on and analysis of all available information, preparation of the draft evaluation report (based on the UNODC IEU Evaluation Report Guidelines and Format)⁶ and submission through the application on Independent Project Evaluation in ProFi to UNODC/IEU and appropriate stakeholders including the CLP (Core Learning Partners/Partnerships);

Preparation of the final evaluation report, following feedback from UNODC and stakeholders on the final draft report, incorporating all requested amendments; clearance by IEU.

Presentation of the final findings after the assessment of IEU.

Following acceptance of the final evaluation report, the Project Manager will then be responsible for disseminating the results of the evaluation to key stakeholders and IEU will publish the final evaluation report on its website.

VI. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

Time frame for the evaluation

The evaluation will be undertaken over, roughly a twelve-week period, starting on 8th September, until the production and submission of the final evaluation report no later than 27 November 2014

The evaluation consultant will provide up in a period, broken down roughly as follows (**the tentative dates may vary according to the recruitment process conclusion**):

From	To	Deliverables and milestones
8/09/2014	22/09/2014	Desk review, methodology formulation and design of questionnaires. Production of inception report. Consultations with stakeholders and CLP on Inception Report contents.
01/10/2014	08/10/2014	Field visit to Brasilia, Brazil. Interviews with CLP and other relevant stakeholders. Meetings in LPOBRA.
09/10/2014	24/10/2014	Analysis of field visit findings. Clearance of doubts with relevant stakeholders and CLP on outstanding issues, if necessary. Drafting of evaluation report.
25/10/2014	07/11/2014	Delivery of Draft Evaluation Report. Final report must be delivered in English and Portuguese. Comments received from CLP, including CAIXA SEGUROS Group, UNODC LPOBRA and IEU/HQ. No work required from consultant while document is being analysed by the CLP.
08/11/2014	13/11/2014	Work on alterations to be made to the Draft Evaluation Report.

⁶ IEU Policy, Handbook, Guidelines and Templates to be used in the evaluation-process can be found on the IEU-Website: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>

27/11/2014	Delivery of Final Evaluation Report; clearance by IEU – Independent Evaluation Unit
-------------------	--

VII. Time frame for the field mission

The field mission will occur according to the following agenda:

Duties	Time frame	Location	Results
Interviews with project's stakeholders	01/10/2014 - 08/10/2014	Brasilia-DF / Phone	Inception report
Evaluation mission: briefing, interviews and presentation of preliminary findings	01/10/2014 - 08/10/2014	Brasilia-DF	Notes
Presentation of findings to stakeholders	08/11/2014 - 27/11/2014	Brasilia-DF	Notes

Expected deliverables and time frame

The 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, preliminary findings of the desk review, if needed refined evaluation questions and draft evaluation tools (questionnaires; etc.) in line with the UNODC IEU templates and guidelines; cleared by IEU before the field mission starts.

Draft Evaluation Report in line with UNODC/IEU evaluation policy, guidelines and templates. Final Evaluation Report, including annex with management response (if needed), in line with

UNODC/ IEU evaluation policy, handbook, guidelines and templates; cleared by IEU; Presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations to CLP and other key stakeholders.

<i>Duties)</i>	<i>Time frame</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Deliverables</i>
----------------	-------------------	-----------------	---------------------

<p>Desk review, methodology formulation and design of questionnaires.</p> <p>Production of inception report.</p> <p>Consultations with stakeholders and CLP on Inception Report contents.</p>	8/09/2014 - 30/09/2014	Home base	Questionnaires; Evaluation tools; Inception report
<p>Field visit to Brasilia, Brazil;</p> <p>Interviews with CLP and other relevant stakeholders.; Meetings in LPOBRA</p> <p>Analysis of field visit findings Clearance of doubts with relevant stakeholders and CLP on outstanding issues, if necessary</p>	01/10/2014 -07/11/2014	UNODC/LPOBRA; Brasilia, Brasil	Draft of evaluation report
<p>Work on alterations to be made to the Draft Evaluation Report.</p>	08/11/2014 - 27/11/2014	Home base	<p>Delivery of Final Evaluation Report; clearance by IEU</p> <p>–Independent Evaluation Unit</p>

VIII. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

Number of evaluators needed

The evaluation process will include only an independent external evaluator with expertise in evaluation and in the subject area of the project to be evaluated, as well as experience in translation/interpretation (Portuguese - English/English - Portuguese) and written and spoken fluency in English and Portuguese.

The role of the lead evaluator

Carry out the desk review; develop the inception report, including sample size and sampling technique; draft and finalize the inception report and evaluation methodology, incorporating relevant comments, in line with the guidelines and template on the IEU website <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation-step-by-step.html>; 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; draft an evaluation report in line with UNODC evaluation policy and the guidelines and template on the IEU website⁷ finalize the evaluation report on the basis of comments received; include a management response in the final report; present the final evaluation findings and recommendations to stakeholders.

More details will be provided in the respective job descriptions in Annex I.

The role of the other evaluator(s)

Not applicable for this Term of Reference.

Conflict of interest

The evaluator will not act as representatives of any party. He/She must remain independent and impartial and must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the project under evaluation. . The evaluator has no authority to make any commitment on behalf of the parties of the project, ie, UNODC, donor or other partners.

According to UNODC rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation.

Reference to job description detailing qualifications and responsibilities

The Evaluator's Role And Responsibilities Are: Carry Out The Desk Review;

Develop The Inception Report, Including Sample Size And Sampling Technique;

Draft And Finalize The Inception Report And Evaluation Methodology, Incorporating Relevant Comments;

Lead And Coordinate The Evaluation Process And The Oversee The Tasks Of The Evaluators; Implement Quantitative Tools And Analyse Data;

Triangulate Data And Test Rival Explanations;

⁷ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation-step-by-step.html>;

Ensure that all aspects of the terms of reference are fulfilled;

Draft an evaluation report in line with UNODC/IEU evaluation policy, guidelines and templates; finalize the evaluation report on the basis of comments received;

Include a management response in the final report (if needed)

Present the findings and recommendations of the evaluation at the donor briefing at the time of its annual mentors' meeting

For the respective roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager, the evaluator(s), the stakeholders and the Independent Evaluation Unit in the evaluation process on Independent Project Evaluations, please see <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/independent-project-evaluations-step-by-step>

IX. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS

Roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager

The independent project evaluation will be carried out following UNODC/IEU's evaluation policy, handbook, guidelines and templates⁸ and UNEG Norms and Standards.

The Project Manager is responsible for selecting Core Learning Partners and informing them of their role, providing desk review materials to the evaluation team, initiating the evaluation- process in the Independent Project Evaluation Application in ProFi, reviewing the inception report as well as the evaluation methodology, liaising with the Core Learning Partners, reviewing the draft report, assessing the quality of the final report by using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, as well as developing an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations to finalise the evaluation process in ProFi.

The Project Manager will also be in charge of providing logistical support to the evaluator including arranging the field missions.

For the respective roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager, the evaluator(s), the stakeholders and the Independent Evaluation Unit in the evaluation process on Independent Project Evaluations, please see <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/independent-project-evaluations-step-by-step.html>

Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are selected by the project managers. Members of the CLP are selected from the key stakeholder groups, including UNODC management, mentors, beneficiaries, partner organizations and donor Member States.

8

IEU Policy, Handbook, Guidelines and Templates to be used in the evaluation-process can be found on the IEU-Website: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>

The CLPs are asked to 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.

Roles and responsibilities of the Independent Evaluation Unit

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process. Please find the respective tools on the IEU web site <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>.

Logistical support responsibilities

The Project Manager will be 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.

X. PAYMENT MODALITIES

The Consultant will be issued an IC contract * and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. The contract is a legally binding document in which the consultant agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines.

For the field mission, the evaluator will be provided with air tickets and DSA (according to Brazilian legislation and the amounts therein stipulated) in addition to the fees here described. 75 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 form.

Payment is correlated to deliverables: upon delivery and clearance of the Inception Report, of the Draft Evaluation Report and of the Final Evaluation Report, including the final presentation. The payment of services will be made upon certification of satisfactory performance at each phase, according to the table below:

Percentage	Deliverable
25%	Upon delivery and clearance, by IEU, of the Inception Report.
25%	Upon delivery and clearance, by IEU, of the Draft Evaluation report.
50%	Upon delivery and clearance, by IEU, of the Final Evaluation Report, after clearance and inclusion of comments made by stakeholders and after presentation of the evaluation findings.

The financial support from the present evaluation should not be used for payment of taxes or fees. Eventual fees or taxes should be paid by the contracted party with its own resources and will be considered as counterpart.

ANNEX II. EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

Project Name: BRAX16 - “Expressive Youth”: citizenship, access to justice and culture of peace

Themes: Strategic Area: 3. Prevention, treatment and reintegration, and alternative development

UNODC Thematic Programme Outcome to which this project directly contributes: Result area: 3.1. Community-centred prevention; and 3.1.3. Creating tools to address youth and violent crime, especially in marginalized urban communities

Interviewed name:

Position:

Institution:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Interview date and venue:

For more information on the performance of this project, lessons learned, and recommendations for future projects in this field, interviews are being conducted with people and organizations involved in the execution of the Technical Cooperation or whose partners are involved in the project. We thank your participation in this assessment process and for your support in this interview that contains a series of questions that must be answered in no more than 50 minutes. Thanks for your cooperation.

Question 1: What was your involvement in the technical cooperation project for the strengthening of the citizenship of young people – Expressive Youth in Ceilândia e Sobradinho II? Caixa Seguros Grupo e UNODC?

Question 2: How would you assess the results and challenges, needs, and priorities of this cooperation? Could you give examples?

Question 3: What results, in your opinion, have been achieved until 2014? To what extent:

() Very satisfactory; () Satisfactory; () Not too satisfactory; () Unsatisfactory; () No opinion

Could you indicate which of the results achieved or to be achieved until 2015 had the greatest impact on you/your institution? And on young people?

Question 4: In the near future, with the continuation of these actions by your institution, do you think that it would be possible to achieve greater impact on? What future actions would be necessary to achieve more sustainability and local impact on this theme after the end of the Project's implementation?

Question 5: How did this Project contribute to strengthen strategies on ?

human rights; citizenship and democracy; labor and gender policy; participation of various actors and orgs; strengthening cultural and public young people policy; information and capacity-building on the theme.

Question 6: How did this Project contribute to the promotion of partnerships or support to more interaction among public institutions, NGOs, and individuals? Could you give an example? Do you consider the project's contribution for partnership with civil society?

Very satisfactory; Satisfactory; Not too satisfactory; Unsatisfactory; No opinion.

Question 7: How do you evaluate the project's coordination and integration of efforts with other actions/strategies and policies of other national institutions and local sponsors? Could you give an example?

Question 8: What were the main lessons learned until the end of the Project from the execution of this technical cooperation? Could you give an example?

Question 9: What improvements do you/your institution think should be introduced in the design of new projects to achieve more effectiveness and efficiency?

Question 10: What were the main factors that make it difficult to accomplish this technical cooperation? How were they overcome? Could it have been conducted any other way?

Legal framework and regulations Counterpart's commitment; Insufficient counterpart resources; Counterpart's implementation capacity; Opposition from the community; Consultants' performance; No Coordination among institutions; Project design; Public cultural issues; Changes in national or local policy; Changes in counterpart's policy; Faulty monitoring and assessment; Others (please name).

Question 11: What were the main factors that facilitated the implementation of this technical cooperation? How were they overcome? Could it have been done any other way?

Legal framework and regulations Counterpart's commitment; Sufficient counterpart resources; Counterpart's implementation capacity; Support from the community; Consultants' performance; Coordination among institutions; Project design; Public cultural issues; No changes in national policy; No changes in counterpart's policy; Satisfactory monitoring and assessment; Others (please name).

Question 12: Do you believe that the benefits of this project will be sustainable after the end of this cooperation? Could you give examples? And what about the short-, medium- and long-term impacts? Could you give examples? Could it need to promote after 2014 other initiatives to be more sustainable?

Question 13: What were the outcomes and outputs accomplished or not accomplished regarding the development of cultural and entertainment policy to young people from 18-29 years old according to the themes of the project? And regarding Caixa's knowledge about /dissemination of the themes of the project? For society? For other ongs and sponsors? And for you?

Question 14: What results already produced effects/changes in your institution/you? Could you give examples?

Question 15: Do you consider that the human, technical, and financial resources proposed in the design of this cooperation were adequate for implementing project until 2014? Would you change these conditions to new projects' execution?

Question 16: The cooperation with UNODC responded adequately and in time to the necessary execution of the project? Could you give examples of tools and mechanisms adopted for the implementation of the project?

Question 17: How were the partners and direct beneficiaries involved in the participation, planning, and implementation process of this cooperation?

Question 18: Was it possible during the project to implement a process to share information about the project with other partners, institutions, regional management and society?

Question 19: Was the choice of concentrating on specific themes suitable for the project's implementation strategy? Why? Would you have chosen other areas of action? Why?

Question 20: Have the project follow-up tools and meetings proven to be efficient and effective for the management of the project? And how were the project monitored by UNODC; CAIXA and ONGs? Was there a structured Coordination Network? Could you suggest new improvements in the monitoring process used by the CAIXA and UNODC regarding the Project implementation?

Question 21: Do you think that the experience acquired until 2014 could be taken to other levels: state and other municipalities? And could it be transferred to other countries? And could it be used as a tool? Could you name improvements for this transfer to be successful?

Question 22: What areas of cooperation have shown better potential for a future cooperation with UNODC and Caixa on the same theme?

Question 23: What changes to the current cooperation strategies and cooperation practices with UNODC would you suggest concerning the Expressive Youth? Difficulties faced?

Additional comments and suggestions:

Thank you

ANNEX III. DESK REVIEW LIST

- Cover Letter Signed Project BRAX16
- Signed Document of the Project BRAX16
- Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation
- Annual Work Plan 2010/2014
- Report of Tripartite Meeting UNODC/ABC/CAIXA SEGUROS
- Reports of UNODC and CAIXA Meetings - Project's Budget Sheets
- Annual Project Progress Report 2010, 2011,2012,2013 (APPR)
- Semesters Project Progress Report 2011-2014 (APPR)
- Financial Reports 2012, 2013
- Reports of Consultancies executed 2011/2014
- Reports of the CAIXA SEGUROS events and technical meetings
- Reports of Strategic Planning Workshop
- Reports elaborated by ONGs and Consultants of BRAX16 (2011/2014)
- CAIXA S EGUROS GROUP publications of "Jovens de Expressão"
- Reports of focal groups Ceilandia e Sobradinho II (2012)
- Evaluation Report of John Snow Brasil: Ceilândia e Sobradinho II (2008/2009)

ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

The Core Learning Partners are composed of the following members:

CAIXA SEGUROS Group

Mrs. Alice Scartezini. Social Marketing Coordination

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime – LPOBRA

Mr. Nivio Nascimento, Project Officer

Mrs. Vivian Coelho, Project Assistant

Mrs. Marina Marques, Project Assistant

Mr. Gilberto Coelho, Program Assistant

United Nation Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization – UNESCO

Mr. Aduino Soares, Project Officer

John Snow Brasil

Mr. Rodrigo Loro. Management Coordinator

Educação em Foco (RUAS)

Mr. Max Maciel, General Coordinator

Mr. Antônio de Padua, Communication Coordinator

AZULIM

Mr. Iranildo Moreira, Coordinator

Mr. Paulo Henrique de Jesus Cantilo – Financial Assistant

“AGENTES DE EXPRESSÃO”

Mr. Carlos Alexandre Ferreira

Mr. Davidson Pereira

Mr. Doriel Francisco

Ms. Thabata Lorena

Mr. Vinicius Lapixa

Mr. Wesley Guimarães

BENEFICIARIES

Beneficiaries from Sobradinho II and from Ceilândia)

Mr. José Augusto Souza

Mr. Jardel Costa

Mr. Antonio de Paiva

Ms. Rayane Soares

Ms. Dayana Correia

Ms. Thais Moreira

Mr. Luis Henrique Ferreira

Mr. Lucas Rodrigues

Ms. Flavia Lima

Mrs Luiz Felipe Fiuza

CONSULTANCY

Mr. Alexandre Mac Dowell

Mrs. Andrea Catta Preta

Mr. Vinicius Dias

Mrs Doralice Dias (MISMEC)

Mr. José Iranildo

BRAZILIAN AGENCY FOR COOPERATION (ABC)

Mr. Pedro Henrique Meireles – Manager for UNODC

ANNEX V. EVALUATION MATRIX

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Relevance	1. a. Is the project in line with the national policies priorities to reduced violence, promoting peace, conciliation and justice in the Federal District Government? And National Level?	Is the project established in 2011 still in line with the policies of the administration?	Comparison of priorities established by FD Government, UNODC, Caixa (analysis of allocated resources and products obtained)	Confirmation of priorities in the national, local and institutional policy documents of the government and Caixa for the main area of the Project BRAX16.	FD Budget and Caixa Seguros: - Annual Action Plans - Reports and bulletins.	- Desk Review; - Interview with NSJ/MJ authorities and ABC.

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Relevance	1. b. Is the project in line and consistent with the Technical Cooperation Agreement of Brazil and the UNODC (TC Country Program)?	Does the project meet national cooperation needs? And local main areas to cooperation?	Review of Country Program and UNDAF Multilateral and Bilateral Program in the interested area	Confirmation of priority and suitability	- Documents and annual reports - Brazil and UNODC Technical Cooperation Policy	- Desk Review. - Interview with actors of UNODC, Caixa Seguros and NGOs
	1. c. Does the project meet the needs of direct and indirect beneficiaries?	Has a preliminary diagnosis of the beneficiaries needs been done by Caixa Seguros? Was the selection of the final beneficiaries appropriate – size, volume, and gender?	Check on the existence of a baseline before the Project was implemented.	- Results of baseline studies (?) and Caixa Seguros studies or other local sector diagnosis - Perception of the different actors of the Project	-PRODOC and Tripartite meetings ; - Staff of Caixa Seguros; experts of UNODC, and NGOs	- Desk Review; - Interview with different actors of the Project.

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Relevance	1. d. Does the UNODC cooperation have methodological/technological advantages in the cooperation area over other agencies and countries?	Does the UNODC cooperation present more comparative advantages in the areas of reducing violence; promoting peace, conciliation and justice; Technical and management models?	Suitability and pertinence compared to other multilateral sources.	- Results obtained in technical projects with a different funding source (national or bilateral) or previous projects implemented with UNODC.	- PRODOC, bulletins and reports of project with a different funding source.	- Desk Review; - Interview with UNODC; Caixa Seguros, Agents of Expressive Youth, NGOs and Brazilian experts.
	1. e. In what extend is the project aligned with mandates, decisions and strategies of UNODC and CAIXA SEGUROS?	Were the selected areas of technical cooperation the most appropriate? Was there enough synergy to generate effects with other multilateral and national sources? And other bilateral or regional cooperation? It is promoted during the implementation?	Knowledge of the stage and priority of other themes at the time of project proposal and in 2013. Comparison of the main project area in the technical cooperation policy and national sector policy, inter ministries policy	Results of similar projects and difficulties found in the implementation process – Brazil, Region, or other Countries	- Progress reports and bulletins	- Desk Review; - Interview with authorities and experts.

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Relevance	1.f Does the project provide an appropriate support in disseminating the concept of health promotion among young people, with a focus on reducing mortality by external cause?	Relevance increased by other sources and agencies working in the areas of the Project. How relevant is the project to target groups needs and priorities?	Comparison of information and components from other sources and agencies in the theme.	Information obtained from results achieved from the first j action implemented by Caixa Seguros and ONGS with the same group of beneficiaries – Ceilandia e Sobradinho II.	- PRODOC, reports, researches and bulletins –	- Desk Review; -Interview - Group meetings
Effectiveness	2.a. Have the results (products, results and short and effects) been achieved by the project? If not, what has been the level of progress achieved at the end of the project?	a – Original project estimated 03 Results - b – Were the results obtained enough to achieve the purpose?	Document of Project and proposed indicators; Base line existent 2010 and changes identified to 2014	Reasons for changing or not of the outputs to be obtained? Results obtained at the end of the Project	Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings	- Desk Review -Meetings with Coordination - Interviews.

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Effectiveness	2.b. Has the specific objective (purpose) been worked to be achieved at the end of the Project?	Has the results and outputs allowed keeping the achievement of the purpose?	Evaluation of the achievement level of project effects with the reduction of results or activities during the implementation	Refer to the actions implemented to obtain the initial project design in the end of 2014. Factors that contributed or not to obtaining the achievements expected until 2014?	Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings	- Desk Review. - Interviews with Caixa, ONGS, UNODC, and consultancies.

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Effectiveness		Which assumption factors contributed in a positive way or made the effectiveness of the Project more difficult?	<p>Identification of obstacles and advantages in the implementation of the project (external and internal)</p> <p>Comparison with the design of other projects in the area and the effects obtained in the same period.</p> <p>Assess level of dependence of decisions on external factors to the project. The same with internal factors</p>	<p>Refer to the Project implementation proposal and strategy, identifying the variables controlled directly or not by the Project.</p> <p>Means for verifying in the original project design possible demanded changes or not.</p>	<p>Original Project Document</p> <p>Project Progress Report</p> <p>Tripartite Meetings</p>	<p>- Desk Review</p> <p>- Interviews with coordination, execution actors of the project and beneficiaries</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Effectiveness		Have the assumptions allowed achieving the specific objective (purpose)?	Identification and/of achievement of assumptions with changes in the actors of the Project and its consequences	Initial institutional conditions of Caixa Seguros during the process of the project design Actual institutional conditions produced as a consequence of Project coordination and implementations internal and external changes	Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings	- Desk Review - Interviews with coordination, execution actors of the project and beneficiaries

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Effectiveness	2.c. Have the outputs been achieved as planned at the work plan from 2010 to 2014?	<p>Has the output achievement guaranteed the achievement of the Purposes?</p> <p>If not achieved, explain reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Has the Project Coordination been effective? 2.Has the Management of the Project incorporated changes needed in the execution of the Project? 3.Have the changes in the Project's knowledge and technical cooperation model worked? 	<p>Project Development</p> <p>{ Matrix Planned Achieved</p> <p>Quantitative indicators were not defined and goals have not been defined</p>	<p>- Project performance (baseline) and (indicators)</p> <p>Perception of partners, beneficiaries, actors...</p> <p>Formal and official information and reports</p>	<p>Original Project Document</p> <p>Project Progress Report</p> <p>Tripartite Meeting</p> <p>Project Coordination::Caixa, and UNODC</p> <p>Specific Coordination and Caixa/NGOs reports regarding workshops and meetings</p> <p>List of activities and participants.</p>	<p>- Desk Review</p> <p>- Guided Interviews</p> <p>- Specific meetings</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Effectiveness	2.d. What are the results achieved beyond the logframe?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the project purpose be orientated to support the reduction of human violence in the two territories in the FD region? - Had the local workshops taken into account the specific needs of Projects beneficiaries involved in the Were unforeseen challenges to the implementation of the project handled creatively and effectively?theme? 	Quantitative indicators are defined but not used and without base line and target values (annual or total)	<p>PDM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Name and number of activities executed; -Necessary information to generate the final situation of trainee and participants: national professionals - Ex-ante and during implementation data and information -Project complemented activities executed with Caixa resources - Progress of implementation of the original outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings Project Coordination: Caixa and UNODC Specific Project's Coordination reports regarding workshops and meetings List of activities and participants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk Review - Interview with Caixa, UNODC, UNESCO and ABC staff; and consultancy's professionals

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Effectiveness	2.e. Have the assumptions had a positive or negative contribution to the achieving outputs?	<p>Do the frequent changes in project assistants and NGO have negative effects on the performance of the project and on obtaining the outputs and products?</p> <p>- Have the changes or not in the sector and other authorities in the local administration influenced obtaining the products? 2010/2014</p>	<p>PDM</p> <p>Considering the facts of the political and administrative reality in Brazilian institutions public, private and ONGs</p>	<p>- Names of Directors, Managers and Interlocutor/Spokesperson</p> <p>- Management periods (time)</p> <p>- Sector policy and institutional policy</p>	<p>Administrative actions and appointments:</p> <p>Original Project Document, Revisions</p> <p>Project Progress Report</p> <p>Tripartite Meetings</p> <p>Project Coordination</p> <p>List of activities and participants.</p>	<p>- Desk Review</p> <p>- Interview with professionals, consultants and staff of Caixa, UNODC and UNESCO.</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Effectiveness	2.f. Was the quality of project results satisfactory, and was this appropriately monitored by the project?	Integration of monitoring systems of projects actors	Manuals and procedures elaborated to monitoring process of the the project	- Monitoring reports elaborated by different actors	Administrative actions and appointments: Public policy documents on Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings Project Coordination reports and meetings	- Desk Review - Interview with professionals, consultants and staff of Caixa, UNODC and UNESCO. - Interviews with beneficiaries

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Effectiveness	2.g. Which facts have contributed to obtaining products and achieving purposes? Positive or negative	Were unforeseen challenges to the implementation of the project handled creatively and effectively? Have project results directly contributed to the achievement of desired/planned objectives, and what is the evidence?	PDM Considering the facts of the political and administrative reality in local institutions and in the region FD Reports of activities and data regarding beneficiaries	- Opinion of parties involved in the implementation of the project	- Experts - Managerial levels - Progress Reports - Tripartite Meetings	- Desk Review - Interviews

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Efficiency (suitability, opportunity, costs)	3. a . Were the products obtained suitable to achieving the objective or purpose?	<p>Which output was in accordance with the original plan (time, opportunity and costs)</p> <p>What reasons/factors helped or made it more difficult to achieve outputs, activities and inputs?</p> <p>Were activities effectively planned, managed and monitored on an ongoing basis?</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Planned</p> <p>Indicators</p> <p>Baseline</p> <p>Corrective measures?</p> <p>Alternative measures?</p>	<p>- Compare % products and participation in achieving the purpose (spec. obj).</p> <p>- Schedule of product delivery and activity (cost, opportunity, suitability)</p> <p>- Opinion of parties involved</p>	<p>-Original Project Document</p> <p>- Documents revisions</p> <p>-Project Progress Report</p> <p>-Tripartite Meetings</p> <p>-Project Coordination</p> <p>-Specific UNODC reports regarding activities sand workshops</p> <p>-Staff and authorities</p>	<p>- Desk Review</p> <p>- Interviews</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Efficiency (suitability, opportunity, costs)	3. b. Were the original activities enough to guarantee the achievement of products of the Project?	<p>Were the original activities proposed enough for generating the products?</p> <p>Were activities been modified in relation to the original proposed document?</p> <p>Was the quality of products achieved during the implementation of the project?</p>	<p>Planned</p> <p>Achieved (baseline)</p> <p>(indicators)</p>	<p>- Schedule of implementation of activities (inputs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality ▪ Opportunity ▪ Cost <p>- Opinion of parties involved about Project outputs and outcomes.</p>	<p>-Original Project Document</p> <p>- Documents revisions</p> <p>-Project Progress Report</p> <p>-Tripartite Meetings</p> <p>-Project Coordination</p> <p>-Specific UNODC reports regarding activities sand workshops</p> <p>-Staff and consultants</p>	<p>- Desk Review</p> <p>- Interviews</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Efficiency (suitability, opportunity, costs)	3.c Were sound financial management systems and practices used, which provided timely, accurate and transparent information on project expenditures and procurement?	<p>Are stakeholders generally happy with the quality of project management?</p> <p>Has the project adequately documented, reported and disseminated information on what it is doing/has achieved?</p>	<p>References at the Project document;</p> <p>Interviews realized by ongs and agents</p>	<p>Reports regarding workshops and activities elaborated by consultants</p> <p>Participation of Caixa Seguros and UNODC professionals in the workshops and activities</p>	<p>Reports of consultants</p> <p>Project Progress Reports</p> <p>Tripartite Meetings</p> <p>Project Coordination Reports and Meetings</p>	<p>Desk Review</p> <p>Interviews</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Efficiency (suitability, opportunity, costs)	3.d Were the activities and inputs implemented in time, timely, and at reasonable costs for the production of outputs and outcomes until 2014?	<p>Were the costs of products appropriate and similar to the other objects of the area?</p> <p>If there are differences between estimated and executed, indicate reasons and factors.</p> <p>Were the resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?</p>	<p>Comparison with other projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same results with lower costs? ▪ Another methodology to achieve outcomes. 	- Comparison with other NSJ and Technical Cooperation Projects	<p>Original Project Document</p> <p>Project Progress Report</p> <p>Tripartite Meetings</p> <p>Project Coordination:</p> <p>Two other funding sources with similar products -</p>	<p>- Desk Review</p> <p>- Interviews</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Impact	4.a Is there a probability of achieving the overall objective of the Project?	<p>Can the short effects already be felt? Which ones? Description (quality/quantity)</p> <p>Can the long term effects (impacts) be achieved? (assessment ex-post)</p> <p>What are the present actions by UNODC and Caixa to measure medium and long term impacts?</p> <p>Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project document indicators - Project impacts expected to be achieved in the PRODOC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data information ex-ante with present - Same beneficiaries from phase I of the Caixa Seguros (2007/2009) and UNODC/Caixa (2010/2014) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress reports - Committee Meetings - Opinion of actors, consultants and beneficiaries - Project operational plans and activities reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk Review - Interview

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Impact	4. b What actions not planned in the Project could have generated bigger impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need to approve legislation? - need for more training and dissemination to implement monitoring process; more public institutions participating... <p>What are the intended or unintended (positive and negative) long-term effects of the project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Project document indicators - Other Sectors Projects implemented or ongoing on the theme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compare data information and evaluation process in other projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports of other projects - Brazilian experts missions and actions - Progress reports - Committee Meetings - Opinion of actors, consultants and beneficiaries - Project operational plans and activities reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interview - Desk Review

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Impact	4.c What difference has the project made to the target group and key stakeholders, on regards to initiatives towards fighting mortality and violence among young people?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would the impacts be restricted to the two areas or/ and local level? - Do the target beneficiaries of the project identify the improvement in the project's technical cooperation areas? Could the project be more innovative in terms of products and initiatives? 	<p>PDM</p> <p>Purpose achieved</p> <p>Ex-ante research of the situation in the project' areas?</p> <p>Post-execution research of changes promoted by the Project? Monitoring of impacts or effects during execution?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indicators regarding violence among young people - Characteristics of the main areas of the Project - Proposition of new actions or technical cooperation after 2014 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress reports - Coordination Meetings - Opinion of actors, consultants and beneficiaries - Project operational plans and activities reports - Reports regarding similar projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Desk Review - Interviews

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Impact	<p>4.d. What other projects and/or interventions could act as synergies to broaden the effects and impacts of this project in the end of the execution?</p> <p>What restrictive and positive reasons inhibited or broaden the achievement of the overall objective and the immediate objective?</p>	<p>Would it be possible to generate more effects in the next two years?</p> <p>Was it possible to monitor the indicators to evaluate the reduction and prevention of youth's violence?</p>	<p>Compare income data from similar projects or situation before and after the project</p> <p>Reports and documents concerning the obstacles for project implementation</p> <p>Opinion of different project actors</p>	<p>- Identification of restrictive or positive factors for the implementation of the project</p>	<p>-Progress reports</p> <p>- Coordination Meetings</p> <p>- Opinion of actors, consultants and beneficiaries</p> <p>- Project operational plans and activities reports</p> <p>- Reports regarding similar projects</p>	<p>- Desk review</p> <p>- Interviews</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Impact	4.e. To what extent will the benefits generated through the project be sustained after the end of project's duration?	Does the project receive sufficient financial and human resources to adequately meet its objectives? and long-term objectives and priorities?	-implementation of actions during the project to assure the continuity of the project and/or effects	- Identification of actions, legislation and resources to assure the continuity of impacts	-Progress reports - Coordination Meetings - Opinion of actors, consultants and beneficiaries - Project operational plans and activities reports - Reports regarding similar projects	- Desk review - Interviews
Sustainability	5.a Would it be necessary to start a new cooperation after the conclusion of the present cooperation?	What are the reasons/motives for continuing with the support of the international cooperation?	Progress achieved in this Project	- Comparison with other projects -ONGs institutional and financial capacity	- Opinion of actors, authorities and consultancy	Desk Review Interview

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Sustainability	5.b To what extent are the project results (impact if any, and outcomes) likely to continue after the project?	<p>What is the probability of continuity of projects implementation by ongs or public administration after the conclusion?</p> <p>Is stakeholders' engagement likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated or institutionalized after external funding ceases?</p>	<p>Present situation</p> <p>Future situation</p> <p>Assumptions</p>	- Comparison with other projects that ongs participated previously	<p>Original Project Document</p> <p>Project Progress Report</p> <p>Tripartite Meetings</p> <p>Project Coordination:</p> <p>Staff ,ONGs and authorities, consultancies</p>	<p>Desk Review</p> <p>Interview</p>

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Sustainability	5.c Is there an effort to disseminate the results of the Project in other levels? Civil Society? Networks of NGO? Public institutions of FD? Other states and municipalities?	What actions would be necessary to implement the experiences if the execution were considered difficult? What would be the estimated cost? Would external support be needed?	Present situation Future situation Assumptions	- Comparison with other projects; - Project web site	- Actors' opinions - Budgetary and human resources - UNODC, Caixa -Public administration - Web site	Desk Review Interview

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Sustainability (risks)	5.d. Would - administrative - financial - legal - human resources conditions are appropriate to give continuity to the project, allowing the achievement of intermediate effects and long term impacts?	Have budgetary resources been estimated for 2012 to 2014 and after 2015? Is the technical team of Caixa and ONGs guaranteed for the continuity of activities after conclusion of the Project? Is a raise in the budget of Caixa, ONGs predicted for the continuity of the project in the next 3 years?	Present situation Future situation Assumptions	- Secured amounts - Caixa Seguros budgets (2015/2018) - Action plans of Caixa Seguros and ONGs from 2015 until next 2 years	- Budgets - Planning activities - Project Progress Report - Project Coordination; Staff and authorities	- Desk Review - Financial management (multi annual budget) - Interview
	Project's ownership by Caixa and ONGs? Other partners?	How are the initiatives to disseminate this experience implemented? And the local mobilization?	Planned in the original project - local and FD level initiatives	- Budgets 2015; until 2018	Multi Year Action Plan of Caixa Seguros and ONGs	- Interview - Desk Review

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Partnerships and cooperation/ cross cutting issues human rights and gender	6.a To what extent have partnerships been sought and established (including UN agencies) and synergies been created in the delivery of assistance?		Project design Indicators Expectations at the end of the project	Opinion of actors, agents, ongs, institutions, beneficiaries and other partners Communities and groups of young people Examples	Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings Project Coordination: Staff ,ONGs and authorities, consultancies Beneficiaries	- Interview - Desk Review

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Partnerships and cooperation/ cross cutting issues human rights and gender	6.b Were project stakeholders appropriately involved in project implementation? If not, how could this interaction have been enhanced?		Project design Indicators Expectations at the end of the project	Opinion of actors, agents, ongs, institutions, beneficiaries and other partners Communities and groups of young people Examples	Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings Project Coordination: Staff ,ONGs and authorities, consultancies Beneficiaries	- Interview - Desk Review

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Partnerships and cooperation/ cross cutting issues human rights and gender	7.a To what extent have the project achieved results on human rights and gender equality?		Project design Indicators Expectations at the end of the project	Opinion of actors, agents, ongs, institutions, beneficiaries and other partners Cases and examples	Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings Project Coordination: Staff ,ONGs and authorities, consultancies Beneficiaries	- Interview - Desk Review

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Partnerships and cooperation/ cross cutting issues human rights and gender	7.b To what extent have young groups been empowered and influenced outside of the intervention's targeted group?		Project design Indicators Expectations at the end of the project	Opinion of actors, agents, ongs, institutions, beneficiaries and other partners Communities and groups of young people	Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings Project Coordination: Staff ,ONGs and authorities, consultancies Beneficiaries	- Interview - Desk Review

5 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Judgment Bases	Information Needed	Information Source	Information Gathering Method	5 Evaluation Criteria
	Main	Related				
Partnerships and cooperation	7.c To what extent a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention?		Project design Indicators Expectations at the end of the project	Opinion of actors, agents, ongs, institutions, beneficiaries and other partners Communities and groups of young people	Original Project Document Project Progress Report Tripartite Meetings Project Coordination: Staff ,ONGs and authorities, consultancies Beneficiaries	- Interview - Desk Review