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<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
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<td>SPSS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBA</td>
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<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
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<td>TIJ</td>
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<td>UNEG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDECOM</td>
<td>Independent Commission on Investigations</td>
<td>UNHABITAT</td>
<td>United Nations Human Settlements Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTI</td>
<td>Judicial Training Institute</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
<td>UNOHCHR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD-DAC</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee</td>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Public Defender's Office (Liberia)</td>
<td>UNWomen</td>
<td>UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>Penal Reform International</td>
<td>VAW</td>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Regular Budget</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has a broad mandate in supporting Member States in crime prevention and criminal justice (CPCJ) reform. The Global Programme (GP) ‘Support to Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform’ (GLOT63) has been one of UNODC’s instruments in this field, and one of several GPs managed by the Justice Section, Division for Operations (DO) at UNODC Headquarters (HQ) in Vienna. The GP started in 2008; its first three years were assessed by a mid-term Independent Project Evaluation completed in 2012. This was followed by a comprehensive project revision that reformulated the GP’s objective ‘Policy-makers and professionals, in countries in receipt of UNODC advice and assistance, design and implement evidence-based crime prevention and criminal justice reform policy and programmes’ as follows: ‘States improve CPCJ systems in line with UN standards and norms in CPCJ and other relevant instruments’. Eight original outcomes were further reduced to three: ‘States develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies based on UNODC assessments, advice and programme support’; ‘States and the international community develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies using UNODC tools and trainings’; ‘States develop or update standards and norms with UNODC support’. Key substantive areas were crime prevention, police reform, strengthening prosecution services, the judiciary/courts, restorative justice, access to legal aid and prison reform and alternatives to imprisonment, as well as women in the criminal justice system, justice for children and the protection of victims and witnesses. The GP has since 2012 been funded by 15 donors\(^1\) with a total budget of USD 7,417,249 and has been managed by a part-time project manager. GLOT63 will be completed in December 2018.

Purpose, scope and methodology of the evaluation

A final Independent Project Evaluation of the GP was conducted from May to September 2018. The evaluation was undertaken for accountability and learning purposes and followed the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. It also assessed UNODC-specific criteria on design, partnership and cooperation, human rights, gender equality and good practices and lessons learned. The evaluation’s specific aims were to assess outcomes, gender mainstreaming and the implementation of recommendations of the mid-term Independent Project Evaluation. The evaluation covered the period from 1 January 2012 until 22 June 2018 (the end of the field mission). The main stakeholders were UNODC, governments, partner organizations, civil society organizations, universities, donors and direct beneficiaries.

\(^1\) Canada, France, Germany, Israel, Japan, Norway, One UN Vietnam, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, USA
This final Independent Project Evaluation was undertaken with a participatory, gender-responsive evaluation methodology in line with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and UNODC Evaluation Norms and Standards, promoting the participation of stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. The evaluation methodology considered primary and secondary data sources ensuring triangulation of findings. The desk review covered 125 documents. During and following the field mission to Vienna from 13 to 22 June a total of 47 respondents (26 F; 21 M) were interviewed. Additionally, two online global surveys for Justice Section Staff and CPCJ focal points combined and participants of expert meetings/trainings were completed to support the global coverage of the evaluation. The response rates were respectively 35 percent (14 M/15 F and 4 not indicated) and 12 percent (24 M/20 F). Several limitations were encountered, including challenges related to the global nature and size of the GP.

The gender-balanced evaluation team comprised an independent, external international evaluation team leader and an independent, external international senior expert from the Netherlands and Finland with expertise in CPCJ reform evaluations and quantitative and qualitative methods.

Main findings

Relevance

The evaluation found that the GP was relevant as a flexible, administrative vehicle for the implementation of the Thematic Programme on CPCJ Reform 2012-2015. The GP continued in that role till date even though no new Thematic Programme was adopted after 2015. The GP was further aligned with the UNODC Strategy 2012-2015 and the UNODC Strategic Framework of 2016-2017 and 2018-2019. The GP’s focus on CPCJ norms and standards and related tools continued to be relevant, although its size and scope had become more limited since the launch of the ‘Global Programme on Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice’ (GLOZ43) in 2015, the ‘Global Prison Challenges’ (GLOZ85) in 2016 and the foreseen ‘Strengthening Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Responses to Violence against Women’ (GLOW65) in 2019. UNODC’s programming architecture with regional programmes (RPs) further diminished the relevance of GP-supported field-level technical support.

Design

The GP was designed by a small team at the Justice Section, UNODC, without a broader consultative process. As activities were often determined by earmarked grants, the GP’s scope was therefore neither global nor covering all focus areas to the same extent. In 2012, the number of outcomes was reduced from eight to three in order to mirror the planned results of the Thematic Programme 2012-2015. Data triangulation show that monitoring and reporting were far from informative. Organizational decisions on a CPCJ reform strategy and related programming structure ought to precede one on a new GP, taking into regard concerns about the emphasis given to prison reform and the limited attention to crime prevention.

Efficiency

The GP had to some extent been (cost-)efficiently executed, with expert meetings and training jointly implemented with partners, including the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.
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Rights (UNOHCHR) and the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UNWomen). This occasionally compromised visibility with UNODC being one of several agencies supporting a particular thematic area. The tight schedules accompanying earmarked funding supported efficiency, although some delays occurred due to external factors, such as the Ebola epidemic in West Africa in 2015 and internal challenges, including the new administrative system Umoja in 2015-2016. Project management had limited coordination and administrative responsibilities, which led to challenges in fundraising, monitoring and reporting. Communication between the Justice Section and the field showed good practices but also lessons learned.

Partnerships and cooperation

The evaluation found that partnerships had been fundamental to the GP’s achievements. Partners included UN agencies, international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), academia, and individual experts. Each focus area had different partners, such as UN Women in the field of VAW, Penal Reform International (PRI) and the UN Department for Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) in prison reform, and the UN Human Settlements Programme (UNHabitat) in urban crime prevention. Cooperation was overall highly appreciated with UNODC showcasing its ‘added value’ of expertise and ability to gather actors from different regions and legal domains, although its resource base could even have been more inclusive. Donors were satisfied although donor relations could occasionally have benefited from further coordination amongst UNODC staff.

Effectiveness

The GP was effective to a large extent considering set targets and available data. The GP supported three UNGA resolutions: ‘United Nations Model Strategies and Practical Measures on the Elimination of Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice’ (A/RES/68/189 adopted 18 December 2014); ‘United Nations Revised Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners’ known as the ‘Mandela Rules’ (A/RES/70/175 adopted 17 December 2015) and ‘Taking Action against Gender-Related Killing of Women’ (A/RES/70/176 adopted 17 December 2015). The GP also supported UNODC project proposals in Central Asia and Nigeria, as well as provided 17 tools to support States in the implementation of CPCJ norms and standards and provided training for criminal justice practitioners in different regions.

Impact

While indications about the impact of the GP were shared during this evaluation, the evaluation team had neither the needed capacity nor time and other resources to follow-up and verify these data, including in prison reform, human rights, crime prevention, justice for children and women’s human rights. The impact of the GP on the SDGs, especially goals 5, 11 and 16, could also not be measured as relevant indicators were not aligned.

Sustainability

Sustainability was to some extent considered in the GP. Ownership of CPCJ norms and standards was visible with the adoption of the UNGA resolutions, and by means of national requests for technical assistance. However, sustainability was more contumacious in practice, and dependent on political priorities, resources and cultural sensitivities, and UNODC’s ability to update, disseminate and facilitate access to tools and tailor these to the needs of target groups. Training
was often one-time, and rarely followed-up on.

Human Rights and Gender Equality

Human rights and gender equality were only to some extent mainstreamed in the GP. While international human rights and gender equality norms and standards were considered in CPCJ instruments, tools and training, these had not been given sufficient attention in the GPs logframe and related planning and monitoring mechanisms.

Main conclusions

The GP was relevant as an administrative vehicle for the implementation of the Thematic Programme on CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, and its design reflected this function. The GP continued to absorb funding after 2015, although it was no longer explicitly referred to in CCPCJ reporting. The project had been efficient and effective to some extent. Impact could not be measured during this evaluation because of lack of capacity and data. Human rights and gender equality were to some degree mainstreamed, sustainability had only been considered partially and the recommendations of the 2012 Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation were only in part implemented. Together with the crime and drugs conventions, CPCJ norms and standards continued to be viewed as being at the heart of UNODC’s mandate, which should inform the development of a new strategy on CPCJ reform and a related programming architecture.

Main recommendations

Recommendation 1. Relevance/design. The GP was the administrative vehicle of the Thematic Programme on CPCJ Reform 2012-2015. A new thematic programme was not adopted after 2015. Some stakeholders considered the current emphasis on prison reform, and the limited attention given to crime prevention, as limiting the execution of UNODC’s mandate. It is recommended to formalize, complete and adopt a UNODC-wide CPCJ strategy, including a programming structure that covers all focus areas (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in cooperation with sections at UNODC Headquarters and UNODC regional offices)

Recommendation 2. Relevance/efficiency Resource mobilization was coordinated to some extent within UNODC. The absence of a CPCJ resource mobilization strategy, and the focus on the ‘usual’ donors, contributed to available opportunities and some internal competition. It is recommended to finalize a CPCJ resource-mobilization strategy covering also ‘new’ donors (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in close cooperation with the Co-financing and Partnership Section, UNODC and UNODC regional offices)

Lessons learned and best practices

Good practices included the effective partnerships supported under the GP, including the joint efforts with international organizations to mobilize a wider constituency and build on, utilize and showcase UNODC’s expertise. Lessons learned were especially identified in design and efficiency, including in indicator design and monitoring and the assignment of project management responsibilities with only limited coordination, administrative responsibilities and legitimacy.
## SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The GP was the administrative vehicle of the Thematic Programme on CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, UNODC’s strategy with a programming structure for CPCJ reform. A new thematic programme was not adopted after 2015, while the CCPCJ still has a standing agenda item on CPCJ standards and norms. Some stakeholders considered the current emphasis on prison reform, and the limited attention given to crime prevention, as limiting the execution of UNODC’s mandate.</td>
<td>Desk review Semi-structured interviews Survey UNODC staff Survey participants trainings/expert meetings</td>
<td>1a. Formalize and complete a UNODC-wide CPCJ strategy, including a programming structure covering all focus areas of CPCJ reform (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in cooperation with sections at UNODC Headquarters and UNODC regional offices) 1b. Adopt a global CPCJ strategy (UNODC senior management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource mobilization was coordinated to some extent within UNODC. The absence of a CPCJ resource mobilization strategy, and the focus on the ‘usual’ donors, limited opportunities and led to some internal competition.</td>
<td>Desk review Semi-structured interviews Survey UNODC staff</td>
<td>2. Finalize a CPCJ resource-mobilization strategy covering also ‘new’ donors following the completion of GLOT63 (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in close cooperation with the Co-financing and Partnership Section, UNODC and UNODC regional offices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The GP had a project manager function with</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>3. a) Allocate fulltime administrative project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement. In certain cases, also conclusions may be included in this column instead of findings.

3 Recommendations are proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a project/programme; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions.
limited administrative and supervisory responsibilities shared between two RB-funded CPCJ officers at P3 (only until 2015) and P4 level. This led to limited coordination and after 2015 also administrative follow-up and the less optimal use of technical expertise of RB-funded staff.

| 4. Monitoring was done for reporting, but data collection, registration and sharing was fragmented and not conducive for results-based management and evidence-based reporting per focus area, partially as a result of the GP’s quantitative indicators. SDG, human rights and gender-sensitive indicators were largely missing. Gender equality was not mainstreamed in most focus areas (except, for instance, in VAW and prison reform). | Semi-structured interviews | Desk review | 4. a) Develop meaningful indicators in CPCJ projects to support results-based management, including SDG, human rights and gendered ones for all focus areas; b) Integrate comprehensive monitoring mechanisms for data collection, registration, analysis and reporting in CPCJ projects (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC) |
| | Survey UNODC staff | Semi-structured interviews | Survey UNODC staff |
| | Survey participants trainings/expert meetings | | Survey participants trainings/expert meetings |

| 5. Dissemination of tools was partially similarly organized across the GP, and key stakeholders were not always aware of available tools. The UNODC website, including the webpage, did not support easy access. Tools were mostly only in soft copy and not available in all UN languages, while modern technology and tools developed by other organizations were not capitalized on. | Desk review | 5. Adopt a comprehensive communication strategy following the completion of GLOT63 to support the translation and dissemination and use of CPCJ tools, such as by means of modern technology incl. the strengthening of online access (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC) |
| | Semi-structured interviews | Desk review |
| | Survey UNODC staff | Semi-structured interviews |
| | Survey participants trainings/meetings | Survey UNODC staff |

| 6. The GP’s administrative function continued to be | Desk review | 6. Decide on a short-term mechanism to guarantee a |
| | | | |
valued after 2015. No decision had been made yet to ensure a continuation of this function in light of the GP’s completion at the end of 2018, such as the development of a new GP or the use of existing GPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Semi-structured interviews</th>
<th>Survey UNODC staff</th>
<th>continuation of the administrative function of the GP after its completion (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. The development and updating of CPCJ norms and standards was highly relevant. Expert meetings were generally inclusive, although sometimes affected by funding, political taking precedence over technical interests and insufficient consideration of local perspectives. Modern technology was not used to replace meetings on location. No concrete opportunities were visible at the time of this evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>Semi-structured interviews</th>
<th>Survey UNODC staff</th>
<th>Survey participants trainings/expert meetings</th>
<th>7. Continue with monitoring the political environment for opportunities to develop/update particular CPCJ norms and standards by means of inclusive expert consultations following the completion of GLOT63 (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. CPCJ tools were greatly valued by stakeholders. The theoretical nature of some reduced their relevance for local application. Their testing and inclusion in training as part of the roll-out process was not a standard practice. Prison reform tools required updating with the Mandela Rules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>Semi-structured interviews</th>
<th>Survey UNODC staff</th>
<th>Survey participants trainings/expert meetings</th>
<th>8. a) Update prison tools with the Mandela Rules under GLOZ85 and/or (an)other relevant project(s); b) Integrate the development of new CPCJ tools into a comprehensive testing/training implementation plan in GLOZ43, GLOZ85 and other CPCJ projects (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in cooperation with UNODC regional offices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. UNODC field offices had hardly been involved in the GP’s design. Field communication was to some extent efficient; the last CPCJ focal point meeting in 2015 was a good practice. GP field activities, often one-time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>Semi-structured interviews</th>
<th>Survey UNODC staff</th>
<th>9. Enhance cooperation with regional offices by a) requesting their participation in the design of GPs; b) organizing regular CPCJ focal point meetings; c) examining options to pool resources for CPCJ reform in particular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Enhance cooperation with regional offices by a) requesting their participation in the design of GPs; b) organizing regular CPCJ focal point meetings; c) examining options to pool resources for CPCJ reform in particular
with limited sustainability, were shifted to RPs.

| 10. Human rights and gender equality were only to some extent mainstreamed in the GP. While such norms and standards were considered in CPCJ instruments, tools and training, these had not been given sufficient attention in project planning and monitoring. | Desk review | 10. Enhance human rights and gender mainstreaming in relevant projects, especially but not only in project planning and monitoring (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC) |
| 10. Enhance human rights and gender mainstreaming in relevant projects, especially but not only in project planning and monitoring (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC) | Semi-structured interviews | |
| | Survey UNODC staff | |
| | Survey participants trainings/meetings | |
I. INTRODUCTION

Background and context

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has a broad mandate in supporting Member States in crime prevention and criminal justice (CPCJ) reform.\(^4\) UN standards and norms in CPCJ ‘cover the following areas: (a) persons in custody, non-custodial sanctions, juvenile justice and restorative justice; (b) crime prevention and victim issues; and (c) good governance, the independence of the judiciary and the integrity of criminal justice personnel. The standards and norms are also central to the work of the United Nations in the areas of the rule of law and human rights, as they provide detailed guidance on various principles of human rights in crime prevention and the administration of justice’.\(^5\)

The UNODC Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015 ‘provides the global framework for UNODC’s programmes and projects on crime prevention and criminal justice reform for 2012-2015, setting out a consistent and comprehensive approach based on the UNODC Strategic Frameworks, the UNODC Strategy 2012-2015 and the relevant UN Conventions and standards and norms related to crime prevention and criminal justice reform.’\(^6\) The Thematic Programme had three pillars, namely normative work, operational work and data collection, research and analytical work, and focused on the development, promotion and application of CPCJ norms and standards captured in ‘soft law’. The Thematic Programme was managed by the Justice Section located in the Division for Operations (DO) at UNODC Headquarters in Vienna.\(^7\)

Launched in 2008, the Global Programme (GP) ‘Support to Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform’ (GLOT63) has been one of UNODC’s instruments to implement the thematic programme. The Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015 formulated the purpose of the GP (here referred to as ‘Global Project’) as follows:

‘Staffing and operational expenses for the HQ-led part of this TP [Thematic Programme] that are not covered by the regular budget are funded by extra-budgetary resources through the Global Project on support to crime prevention and criminal justice reform (project GLOT63).

---

\(^4\) See for instance UNGA resolution 44/72 ‘Crime prevention and criminal justice’, which identified the main objectives of the United Nations (UN) in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice as: promotion of a more effective administration of justice, the strengthening of international cooperation in the fight against transnational crime, the observance of human rights and the pursuance of the highest standards of fairness, efficiency, humanity and professional conduct.

\(^5\) ECOSOC (E/CN.15/2015/8*) ‘Use and application of United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice’.

\(^6\) UNODC Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015: 3

\(^7\) UNODC Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015: 17
This project aims to support UNODC programme development in the area of crime prevention and criminal justice reform.8

The GP comprised two of the three pillars given in the Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, namely normative and operational work. It was launched in 2008 and managed by the Justice Section. The GP’s completion date is planned for 31 December 2018.

A mid-term Independent Project Evaluation of the first three years of implementation was published in early 2012. A comprehensive project revision was undertaken in June that very year, including the introduction of a new objective and outcomes. The number of outcomes were reduced from eight to three, although the wide scope of the GP remained. Also, as of 2011, technical assistance activities from the Justice Section that were previously covered by four different GPs were consolidated into GLOT63 following the closure of three GPs ‘Assisting Member States in the implementation of the Guidelines on Justice in Matters Involving Child Victims and Witnesses of Crime’ (GLOS67), ‘Legal assistance for implementing UN Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice’ (GLOT62), and ‘Access to Legal Aid in Africa’ (XAFT40).9

Following the 2012 project revision, the GP’s earlier objective ‘Policy-makers and professionals, in countries in receipt of UNODC advice and assistance, design and implement evidence-based crime prevention and criminal justice reform policy and programmes’10 was replaced by the objective ‘States improve CPCJ systems in line with UN standards and norms in CPCJ and other relevant instruments’, and the following three outcomes, which were the same as the ones given in the Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015:

- States develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies based on UNODC assessments, advice and programme support;
- States and the international community develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies using UNODC tools and trainings;
- States develop or update standards and norms with UNODC support.

The GP project revision of June 2012 actually expanded the number of key substantive areas compared to those given in the project document11 and covered the same thematic areas and cross-cutting themes as the Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, namely crime prevention, police reform, strengthening prosecution services, the judiciary/courts, restorative justice, access to legal aid and prison reform and alternatives to imprisonment.12 Cross-cutting

---

8 UNODC Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, 2012: 30
9 UNODC Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015: 30-1
10 UNODC Project document, 2009: 7
11 The seven key substantive areas covered in the project document were crime prevention; access to legal aid and justice; integrity and accountability of criminal justice institutions; penal reform; justice of children; violence against women; and victims support and assistance.
12 UNODC Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015: 7-15
themes were human rights, women in the criminal justice system, justice for children and the protection of victims and witnesses.

In practice, the GP’s scope was only global to some extent. Many activities were global in scope, such as the tools developed under the second outcome, and the expert meetings to support the development and updating of norms and standards under the third outcome. However, not all sub-regions and countries were covered in terms of training, project development or other activities as this was dependent on needs identification, staff capacity and the availability of funding (see map 1). These activities were mostly implemented in South-East Asia, Central-Asia, the Middle-East and North Africa, East and West Africa and Latin America. The thematic areas were spread differently across the regions; for instance, prison reform/alternatives to imprisonment and justice for children activities were implemented in several regions while violence against women (VAW) mostly in South East Asia, legal aid in South East Asia and West Africa, police reform in the Middle East and North Africa, crime prevention in Central Asia, East Africa and Latin America and criminal justice reform in Central Asia.

Map I: Regions/countries in which GP activities were implemented (2012-2018) (source: GLOT63 progress reports)

Since 2012 the GP has decreased in scope and budget. There was a clear shift from assessments and program development to policy- and legal advice between 2012 to 2015, and after 2015 project development was only occasionally supported under the GP. Additionally, justice for children and prison reform/alternatives to imprisonment/legal aid received their own programmes with the launch of the ‘Global Programme on Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice’ (GLOZ43) and ‘Global Prison Challenges’ (GLOZ85) in respectively 2015 and 2016 (although some prison reform activities continued to be funded by the GP until 2017). The GP ‘Strengthening Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Responses to Violence against Women’(GLOW65) is estimated to start in 2019. The Justice Section also

---

13 E.g. the training of Libyan prison officials in Algeria was undertaken in 2017 with Japanese funding.
managed four other GPs on maritime crime and e-learning, and used funds of the RB (section 23) to implement activities on CPCJ reform.\textsuperscript{14}

A CPCJ Officer at the P4-level funded by the RB was the part-time project manager of the GP prior to and also following the 2012 mid-term Independent Project Evaluation. The project manager also worked on other projects and responsibilities. In June 2018, the project team further comprised a consultant and a Programme Assistant (G6). The GP had further provided for the salaries of UNODC staff in the Justice Section and the field, with the group composition altering each year as determined by activities implemented under the GP. Thus, a total of three staff occupying CPCJ Officer positions (P4) in 2012, 2016 and 2017, one CPCJ Officer position (P3) in 2014-2015, one Associate CPCJ Officer position (P2) in 2016-2017, and one Programme Assistant position (G6) from 2014 to up to 2018 were supported in the Justice Section, UNODC HQ during at least one year. Furthermore, the GP supported one CPCJ Officer position (P4) in 2013 and one national Programme Officer (P3) from 2013 to up to 2017 in UNODC’s Country Office in Vietnam, one Programme Officer position (P3) in UNODC’s Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa in Egypt in 2017 and one Administrative Assistant position (Service Contract) in UNODC’s Regional Office for West and Central Africa in Senegal in the period 2014-2017. A United Nations Volunteer (UNV) position was also supported under the GP in UNODC’s Country Office in Colombia in 2015.

Pie chart I: Donor funding GP 01 January 2012 – 22 June 2018 – pledged proportion per donor (sources: UNODC annual financial statements 2012-2014; donor pledges 2015-2018)\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14} The Justice Section also managed three GPs on maritime crime, namely the ‘Global Maritime Programme’ (GLOX99), ‘Project to support Initiatives Countering Maritime Crime’ (GLOZ06), which were both launched in 2013, and ‘Construction works implemented through Trust Fund to improve the criminal justice infrastructure of states countering maritime crime within a sound rule of law framework’ (GLOZ81). The Justice Section also housed ‘UNODC Global E-learning - making the world safer from drugs, crime and terrorism’ (GLOU61). The project ‘Implementation of the Doha Declaration: towards the promotion of a culture of lawfulness’ (GLOZ82) launched in 2016 was further partially implemented by the Justice Section but managed by the Corruption and Economic Crime Branch.

\textsuperscript{15} The pie chart includes data of pledges made before 2012 with funds collected in 2012.
The GP was funded by 23 donors\textsuperscript{16} since 2008, with 15 donors (fourteen States and One UN Vietnam) providing voluntary contributions from 2012 onwards. The three largest donors were Thailand (21 percent), the United States of America (18 percent) and Germany (18 percent) with a total amount of pledges of respectively USD 1,200,657, USD 1,026,460 and USD 980,843 from 01 January 2012 to 22 June 2018. All these contributions were earmarked for particular outputs.

The total budget of the GP was USD 9,665,425, out of which USD 7,417,249 was the total project budget from 01 January 2012 to 22 June 2018 (including funds that were later transferred to other projects or returned to donors).\textsuperscript{17} USD 6,012,692 was spent in the period 01 January 2012 to 31 December 2017 June. On 13 June 2018, the project balance was USD 77,562.\textsuperscript{18} In 2016, USD 82,498 (UAE) and USD 122,148 (Germany) were transferred to GLOZ85. Unspent hard earmarked funds were returned to Germany and Switzerland.

Figure I. GP budget - balance beginning/end of year, donor pledges and expenditures (source: UNODC annual financial statements 2012-2017)

\textbf{Evaluation scope and objective}

As foreseen in the project document of 2009, subsequent project revisions and as per UNODC Evaluation Policy, a final Independent Project Evaluation of the GP was planned to be undertaken before its completion. The evaluation Terms of Reference outlined the following objectives of this final Independent Project Evaluation\textsuperscript{19}:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Argentina; Australia; Austria; Brazil; Canada; China; France; Germany; Israel; Japan; New Zealand; Norway; One UN - Vietnam; South Africa; Sweden; Switzerland; Thailand; Turkey; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom; United States of America; UNDP; UNICEF
\item \textsuperscript{17} Written response project management team.
\item \textsuperscript{18} The Profi figures for the period 2016-2018 (with date 13 June 2018) were the following: released budget USD 1448775; consumption USD 1371212 and overall implementation rate 95.5 percent (divided in an implementation rate of 53 percent for 2016, 36 percent for 2017 and 6 percent for 2018).
\item \textsuperscript{19} Evaluation Terms of Reference GLOT63, 2018: 9
\end{itemize}
‘an assessment of outcome-level results, both intended and unintended’;

‘assess the implementation of the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation that took place in 2012’;

‘capture the lessons learned from implementation to inform future programming, including whether or not one or more new projects should be developed, policy-making and overall organizational learning of UNODC, and in particular the Justice Section’ and ‘[identify] lessons learned and best practices and recommendations based on the findings […]’;

‘specifically assess how gender aspects have been mainstreamed into the programme’.

This evaluation was further undertaken for accountability and learning purposes.

The unit of analysis of this final Independent Project Evaluation was the project ‘Support to Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform’ (GLOT63).

The evaluation covered the time period from 1 January 2012 until 22 June 2018 (the end of the field mission).

The geographical coverage of the evaluation was global, however in line with the theoretical scope of the GP, with a particular emphasis on regions actually covered by the programme. The field mission from 13 to 22 June was to Vienna, Austria, with phone/Skype interviews with stakeholders in the field. Additionally, the inclusion of two global online surveys was to further ensure an adequate coverage of this evaluation.

The main stakeholders of this final project evaluation were UNODC, UN Member States, direct beneficiaries, partner organizations (UN agencies and other international organizations), civil society organizations, universities and donors.

This evaluation considered the criteria relevance, design, efficiency, partnerships and cooperation, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and human rights and gender equality. The evaluation also identified good practices and lessons learned.

The composition of the evaluation team

The evaluation team comprised an independent, external international evaluation team leader and an independent, external international senior criminal justice expert from respectively the Netherlands and Finland. This gender-balanced team had expertise in leading and conducting complex evaluations in the field of criminal justice prevention and reform, including at the global level, and a strong background in using quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods.
Evaluation methodology

This final Independent Project Evaluation was undertaken by means of a participatory mixed-method methodology with a gender-responsive evaluation methodology in line with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and UNODC Norms and Standards. The methodology comprised a desk review, semi-structured interviews and two online surveys, which were the methods to collect data related to all evaluation criteria. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used for analysis. Gender analysis was undertaken with available data, and findings presented in a gender-sensitive manner.

A desk review of different types of documents was conducted, including the project document, project revisions and (semi-)annual progress reports, meeting reports, reports and tools prepared for activities under the GP; UNODC strategic documents, including the thematic programme 2012-2015; annual financial reports; donor reports; training assessment reports; the mid-term evaluation of 2012; SDG documents. Additionally, ECOSOC reports were also reviewed as well as relevant GA resolutions. A total of 104 internal and 23 external documents were reviewed in the first phase of the evaluation (125 documents).

During the mission to Vienna from 13-22 June 2018, face-to-face, skype and telephone interviews were held with a range of stakeholders, namely UNODC staff working in the Justice Section, UNODC staff of other branches, sections and field offices, representatives of donor agencies and of partners (governments, international organizations, INGOs, academic institutions and individual consultants). The interview tools in annex II provided the overall direction to these interviews. Questions were prioritized and tailored to the background, function and level of involvement of the different respondents. A total of 47 persons were interviewed (26 F; 21 M).

Figure II. Stakeholders interviewed for this independent evaluation (source: Annex IV: List of persons contacted during the evaluation)

Two online surveys were held, with the first one targeting UNODC field staff appointed as CPCJ focal points and Justice Section staff, and the second one participants of expert meetings and training held in the years 2012-2017 of which lists of participants with personal email addresses
were shared with the evaluation team. Two questionnaires were prepared, and the one for participants of expert meetings and trainings translated into Arabic and Spanish to cover participants from the Middle East and Central America (see annex II for the tools). The survey instrument Unipark was used to send out the questionnaires (and two reminders), and to register, store and organize the data for analysis.

The first survey of UNODC staff had a response rate of 36 percent (15 Justice Section staff, 18 CPCJ focal points and 3 ‘other’; 16 M/15 F and 5 selected the option not to provide their sex).

The second survey of participants of meetings and trainings (see the overview in the questionnaire in Annex II) had a response rate of 12 percent (46 respondents out of a total of 385 invitees; 24 M/20 F).

Data triangulation took place by means of statistical and qualitative analysis. Statistical analysis was done with respect to different data-sets. Information given in the annual progress reports was entered and coded into an SPSS file with 20 variables. This enabled a quantitative analysis to provide information about the geographical and thematic coverage of the GP, amongst others. Data of the online surveys and sex-disaggregated data were also analyzed by means of statistical analysis, and triangulated with other evaluation data. Qualitative analysis was undertaken by means of the classification of data obtained during the desk review and interviews, and subsequently triangulated with different sources.

Ten Core Learning Partnership (CLP) members were identified by the project manager. These partners were considered relevant throughout the evaluation process for review and providing comments to the ToR, review and the draft evaluation report, as well as for facilitating the dissemination and application of evaluation results and other follow-up action.

Limitations to the evaluation

Several limitations related to the global nature and size of the GP, language issues, the issue of attribution and the wider organizational context were addressed to the extent possible. As the GP was global in nature, the evaluation team had an extended mission to Vienna to interview UNODC staff in HQ and the field, partners, and donors. Additionally, the team completed two online surveys to gauge the views of UNODC staff in HQ and the field and trainees/experts.

The evaluation team was only fluent in English. One French-speaking interviewee therefore brought his own interpreter. Questionnaires were translated into Spanish and Arabic for trainees from Latin America and the Middle East, and responses were translated back with an online tool.

Because of the GP’s scope and objectives and the evaluation’s scope and team capacity, the evaluation team was not able to interview indirect beneficiaries, such as victims and offenders. Interviews with international NGOs addressed this limitation to some extent.

Attribution of results and impact analysis posed also challenges considering that multiple factors impacted on the GP’s performance. Including UNODC’s cooperation with a host of partners.20

---

20 See UNODC Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015: 20-2
Additionally, neither the GP’s logframe nor data given in progress reports were supportive of such analysis, and a Theory of Change was not available to underpin contribution analysis. While indications about impact were shared, evaluation resources were not available to follow-up on and verify information.

---

21 https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/contribution_analysis
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Relevance

Evaluation questions:

- To what extent were the outputs, outcomes and objective of the GP relevant to the mandated areas of UNODC? And at this point in time?
- To what extent were the activities implemented under the GP relevant for its beneficiaries?
- To what extent did the GP contribute to addressing gaps in UNODC’s technical assistance, including in the field?
- Was there duplication of efforts with other UNODC projects/programmes and/or other agencies?

The evaluation confirmed that the GP has been relevant to date. The Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015 and the GP were closely aligned, with the Thematic Programme providing the overall strategy and the GP the administrative vehicle to ‘host’ funds. A new Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform was not adopted because of a senior management decision to discontinue thematic programmes. The strategy given in the Thematic Programme reportedly continued to steer this substance area in practice, as the UNODC strategy 2012-2015 (specifically Sub-programme 4 on Justice) and the UNODC Strategic Framework of the biennium 2016-2017 and 2018-2019 (sub-programme 5 on justice) had a different function; the Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015 had sought to operationalize sub-programme 4 on Justice of the UNODC Strategy.

One position was that the GP had become more relevant after 2015 in light of the discontinuation of the Thematic Programme, as it was the only instrument available for ‘CPCJ reform’, which was viewed as being ‘at the heart’ of UNODC’s mandate together with the drug control and crime treaties. This was further supported by the fact that CPCJ reform is an item on the agenda of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ). However, the GP never took over the strategic function of the Thematic Programme considering available project revisions, and actually diminished over time in scope and size. It is therefore recommended that a comprehensive strategy on CPCJ reform is developed and adopted to give guidance to UNODC Headquarters and the field.

---

22 See ECOSOC resolution 1992/22, in which the Council decided that the CCPCJ should include in its agenda a standing item on existing United Nations standards and norms in the field of CPCJ and their use and application.
The relevance of the GP was determined by its function of a flexible, administrative tool that could absorb donor funding within a relatively short time-frame. The wide thematic scope of the GP facilitated this as the three outcomes captured two of the three pillars of the Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015. A difference could be seen in the views of Justice Section and field staff of the relevance of these outcomes. The former in particular valued the development and revision of CPCJ norms and standards and tools, while the latter group was less outspoken in this respect. With the RPs guiding and supporting field-level activities nowadays, and in light of the UN reform process of decentralization, it is therefore recommended to focus on taking these two forms of technical assistance forward. The data given in figure III a and III b also point out that more efforts need to be made to relay the global work on CPCJ norms and standards and related tools to the field (see the section on sustainability).

Figure III a and III b. Relevance of the different types of technical assistance of the GP (source: online survey UNODC staff)

The GP allowed the Justice Section to respond to a variety of requests, including from UNODC governing bodies, ECOSOC and the UNGA. The GP was key for raising the interest of stakeholders in engaging in CPCJ reform processes in their own countries or elsewhere, and – in fact – was instrumental in soliciting donor support based on needs assessments undertaken under the GP (see note 33). The GP was therefore relevant for RPs and some country programmes, including by
providing resources, such as staff capacity, expertise and financial resources, for activities, and ultimately boosting UNODC presence and visibility in a few countries.

The GP’s focus on CPCJ norms and standards and related tools continued to be relevant, although its size and scope had become more limited since the launch of the ‘Global Programme on Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice’ (GLOZ43) in 2015, the ‘Global Prison Challenges’ (GLOZ85) in 2016 and the foreseen ‘Strengthening Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Responses to Violence against Women’ (GLOW65) in 2019. UNODC’s programming architecture with regional programmes (RPs) further diminished the relevance of GP-supported field-level technical support.

Figure IV. Tangible difference GP at the local level / relevance for RP/country programme (source: online survey UNODC staff)

The evaluation team could not fully assess if duplication of efforts had taken place, including with respect to activities and tools of other UN agencies (see limitations evaluation). Activities were regularly implemented jointly or in close cooperation with international and national partners.

Summary - Relevance
The GP has been relevant to date considering UNODC’s mandate on CPCJ reform; especially the development and implementation of CPCJ standards and norms and related tools was considered highly relevant. The GP allowed the Justice Section to respond to a variety of requests, including from UNODC governing bodies, ECOSOC and the UNGA, and was key for

---

23 The question on the relevance of the GP for RPs and Country Programmes was only for CPCJ focal points.
24 International and national key partners (excluding government bodies) included in the area of VAW - UN Women, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and World Health Organization (WHO); in prison reform - the UN Department for Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), International Center for Prison Studies (ICPS), International Confederation of the Red Cross (ICRC), Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (ILANUD), Penal Reform International (PRI) and Thailand Institute of Justice (TIJ); in justice for Children - United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF); in legal aid - Judicial Training Institute (JTI ) and Public Defender’s Office Liberia (PDO); in policing - UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNOHCHR); in migrant protection - International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC); and in urban crime prevention - UN Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT).
raising the interest of stakeholders in engaging in CPCJ reform processes in their own countries or elsewhere. The GP’s focus on CPCJ norms and standards and related tools continued to be relevant, although the launch of two GPs on prison reform and rehabilitation/legal aid/crime prevention and violence against children and the pivotal role of RPs at the regional level decreased the GP’s overall scope and size.

**Design**

**Evaluation questions:**

- To what extent did appropriate and participatory planning processes take place in the design of the GP?

- To what extent did the GP implement recommendations of the mid-term evaluation in 2012 related to design? To what extent did the implementation of recommendations lead to improved design which impacted on programme implementation?

- Was the design of the programme accurate and realistic in relation to its set objectives or should there be any change for any future similar programme?

- How was the logical framework applied in the programme? What were the challenges, if any, in monitoring and evaluation, and how were these addressed? And how was it adapted in light of achieving expected targets?

The evaluation found that the GP’s design reflected in the June 2012 project revision was prepared by a small team of the Justice Section without a broader consultative process. This subsequently took further shape on the basis of a complex process driven by donor interest and earmarked funding, resource-mobilization efforts of UNODC, including Justice Section staff working on particular focus areas, and requests of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ), ECOSOC and the UNGA as well as individual States.\(^{25}\) Donor interests were to some extent driving the selection of regions/countries and focus areas, partially based on relevant expertise and interest of staff, instead of a more coordinated effort by the Justice Section. Activities were generally further tailored to local needs by means of consultations between Justice Section and field staff. A lesson learned was that a comprehensive design can only be formulated by means of a participatory, consultative approach with all responsible staff to build ownership and lay the foundation for cooperation.

The GP’s design had the appearance of being more focused following a profound revision of the logframe, which resulted in a reduction from eight\(^{26}\) to three outcomes, as part of the June 2012 project revision (\textit{Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendation 1}). The three outcomes were the same as given in the Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015. The

---

\(^{25}\) See Annex VIII for an overview of relevant UNGA, ECOSOC and CCPCJ resolutions.

\(^{26}\) The added outcome on piracy in the January 2012 project revision resulted in a total of eight outcomes.
reference to focus areas was removed altogether from the logframe, and the most successful assistance forms (handbooks and trainings), as identified by the Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation, seemed promoted by means of this change. The design could therefore initially be viewed as realistic considering that the objective of the GP was to serve as a flexible, administrative vehicle, and to some extent accurate because of the general nature of the GP’s objective and related outcomes, although further data analysis showed that this design also led to several challenges in coordination, implementation, and monitoring.

Figure V. Clear focus design / Branding GP (source: online survey UNODC staff)

The GP’s direct link with the Thematic Programme CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, and its function of a flexible, administrative vehicle had certain consequences. With the discontinuation of the Thematic Programme, the GP became an ‘orchestra without director’. Between 2012-2015 the GP was not re-branded (Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendation 2) to communicate and promote it more effectively to stakeholders, including donors, although, arguably, the branding should have been informed by the Thematic Programme, which was the strategy on CPCJ reform. The GP was mentioned in relevant reports to intergovernmental bodies and in policy documents, and although initially some efforts were made to strengthen communication on and visibility of the GP to external stakeholders, comprehensive re-branding or targeted PR was not done nor was it necessary given its primary function.

The question if a new GP on CPCJ reform needs to be developed and launched following the completion of the current one cannot be solely answered by means of this evaluation. It is linked to organizational decisions on strategy, the mandate and profile of the Justice Section, the ‘branding’ of projects (e.g. the use of different GPs covering the same thematic areas was confusing for external stakeholders as programming coherence of particular subject areas was missing) and an organization-wide resource-mobilization strategy. It also needs to be considered in light of the process of decentralization, and the different options for the geographic location of projects of a global nature, depending on their focus areas (more focused on a particular region, for instance). The development of norms and standards and tools needs on the one hand to be undertaken at the global level but at the same time tested, operationalized, and implemented at the regional and national level, and a programming architecture needs to underpin these strong interlinkages between the different levels.
The main argument for creating another GP on CPCJ reform was to have another administrative vehicle that could quickly accommodate funding. Its thematic scope would however be more limited than the one evaluated here considering current GPs. Arguably, other GP’s could be ‘stretched’ to absorb donor funding in a short time-frame for related focus areas. Another reason for launching a new GP that came to the fore during this evaluation was to have a reference to CPCJ reform attached to at least one instrument in UNODC’s policy/programming architecture, which would however be a political reason and not supportive of tailored results-based programming. Concerns shared during this evaluation about the current programming architecture on global CPCJ reform was also that the emphasis had been placed on prison reform instead of the entire criminal justice chain and that crime prevention ought to have been given more emphasis (and developed into a full-fledged GP in order to support programme development and UNODC’s profile in this particular area). It is therefore recommended to give adequate attention to all focus areas of CPCJ reform in future programming.

Irrespective of organizational decisions on the above subject matter, it is paramount that lessons learned of this GP will be taken into account.

The GP’s logframe-based monitoring system was based on quantitative indicators at the activity/output level that excluded focus areas and were neither qualitative in nature nor included policy and institutional changes ([Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendation 5](#)). Annual GP activity plans were not available; the schedules accompanying hard earmarked funding were generally used instead in addition to targets given in the logframe. Monitoring was to a large extent done on the basis of counting completed activities in countries. Non-comparable data were combined for reporting with the consequence that analysis was far from informative. Data for ‘branding’, visibility and resource-mobilization purposes were not available.

A lesson learned was therefore that quantitative and qualitative indicators must be selected to monitor performance, and to support project management in managing a GP. Another lesson learned was that outcomes and indicators must be clearly defined to support collection of the right data sets. A third lesson learned was that a comprehensive monitoring system needs to be developed with corresponding planning documents and based on a logical framework that supports the collection of quantitative and qualitative data to measure outputs and normative and institutional changes at the outcome level.

### Summary - Design

The GP was designed in such a way in the June 2012 project revision that it supported its primary function as a flexible, administrative vehicle, with the consequence that it neither provided a strategy on CPCJ reform, which was captured in the Thematic Programme on CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, nor a logframe to support results-based management. The design was not adapted after 2015, and the GP was not rebranded in such a way that it became clearer to stakeholders, incl. donors. Its monitoring system was mostly based on quantitative and qualitative indicators at the activity/output level that excluded focus areas and were neither qualitative in nature nor included policy and institutional changes ([Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendation 5](#)). Annual GP activity plans were not available; the schedules accompanying hard earmarked funding were generally used instead in addition to targets given in the logframe. Monitoring was to a large extent done on the basis of counting completed activities in countries. Non-comparable data were combined for reporting with the consequence that analysis was far from informative. Data for ‘branding’, visibility and resource-mobilization purposes were not available.

A lesson learned was therefore that quantitative and qualitative indicators must be selected to monitor performance, and to support project management in managing a GP. Another lesson learned was that outcomes and indicators must be clearly defined to support collection of the right data sets. A third lesson learned was that a comprehensive monitoring system needs to be developed with corresponding planning documents and based on a logical framework that supports the collection of quantitative and qualitative data to measure outputs and normative and institutional changes at the outcome level.

---

27 ‘Global Programme on Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice’ (GLOZ43) and ‘Global Prison Challenges’ (GLOZ85)

28 E.g. a couple of training assessment reports were shared with the evaluation team
activity/output indicators, which were not adequately defined, which did not support informative reporting per focus area and results-based management.

Efficiency

Evaluation questions:

- What were the main challenges with respect to an efficient implementation of the GP? What measures were taken during planning and implementation to address these challenges, including activities to ensure that resources were efficiently used?
- To what extent did internal cooperation contribute to the efficiency of implementation of the GP?

The GP was efficient to some extent. Data triangulation confirmed that the GP was implemented cost-efficiently as resources were often maximized by joint implementation with other agencies (e.g. International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent (IFRC), UN Office of the High Commission for Human Rights (OHCHR), United Nations Development Fund (UNDP), UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UNWomen)) and/or by means of selecting a location other than Vienna. This also nurtured partnerships and supported a broader alliance to promote particular CPCJ norms and standards. It however also compromised visibility to some extent as UNODC was one of multiple actors, including other UN-agencies, supporting a particular focus area. In some areas, available funding limited options in design, such as in training when this led to the absence of professional trainers/diversity in trainers, with an effect on the quality of the training given, and those expert meetings when diplomatic status was stressed over thematic expertise.

The GP as administrative vehicle was efficient; new funding could easily be absorbed by means of a budget revision because of the fictive budget given in the project document/revisions instead of a more time-consuming project revision or processing a new project. This meant a comparatively quick start of the implementation of concerned activities, which were implemented efficiently, especially in the case of earmarked funding with short time-frames. Small pledges (USD 4,000-10,000) were however less efficient considering the time needed to manage these administratively.

Delays in implementation occurred due to internal and external factors; only the latter ones were reported on in UNODC progress reports. The introduction of Umoja in 2015, the new administrative system of the UN Secretariat, impacted on performance, including donor reporting, and delays were also a consequence of staff absorption capacity. Meetings and workshops were generally well-organized, although a lesson learned was that these could sometimes have been more cost-efficient and effective if (multiple) teleconferences had been

29 For instance, in 2015, field-level activities were brought to a stop because of health (legal aid in Liberia) or security risks (penal reform in Libya). Activities were therefore conducted outside the respective countries.
organized instead of international meetings, albeit depending on objectives and the profile of the participants.

Part-time project management responsibilities were with a CPCJ Officer occupying a P4 RB-funded position before and also after 2011 (Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendation 4). Until 2015 the GP project manager was supported by a CPCJ Officer, occupying a P3 RB-funded position, who was responsible for administrative tasks, such as report writing, as well as a Programme Assistant (G6). A replacement was not made following the departure of this CPCJ officer. These staff members comprised the project team. The annual progress reports of 2016 and 2017 and one donor report were therefore only prepared and shared as a consequence of this evaluation. The Chief of Section supervised staff working in particular focus areas, including those whose salaries were partially covered by the GP. This created management challenges in the Justice Section, including with respect to the allocation of soft-earmarked funds, resource-mobilization (and information-sharing about related activities) and getting access to data for monitoring and reporting as a common GP data/information storage system was not available. Additionally, interlinkages between the different focus areas were not explored as a consequence of this set-up.

The use of RB-funded staff for project management could be historically explained by the origins of the GP and seemed the right choice at that time, also to guarantee the build-up of institutional memory. With the change in budgetary allocations, project-funded staff for administrative functions to free RB-funded staff could however have been decided on. The part-time nature of the position of project manager was also not viewed as optimal. This would however need to be determined in relation to responsibilities and the size and structure of the GP together with the level of seniority of the project manager on the basis of actual responsibilities (e.g. a P3 level staff member for a strict administrative role or a P4 for a more comprehensive project management function).

The above analysis provided the lessons learned with respect the roles and responsibilities of a project manager, the interpretation of ‘project team’, team coordination, including resource mobilization, a GP information storage facility, and the use of RB-funded and project staff (see chapter V Best Practices and Lessons Learned).

Generally, communication between CPCJ staff and field staff was effective, including concerning the political analysis of the local context (Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendations 6 and 8). Good practices with respect to inter-office coordination were noted as well as an occasional lesson learned when coordination had not adequately taken place, resulting in an increased risk of duplication of efforts, less informed choices about the selection of inputs, occasional competition for resources and/or weak advocacy and donor visibility.

The GP contributed to positions in UNODC’s Regional Office for West and Central Africa in Senegal and UNODC’s Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa in Egypt, and national offices in UNODC’s Country Offices in Vietnam and Colombia (see chapter 1), which was often directly linked to particular field-based activities, and the reporting line of concerned staff continued therefore to be to their direct line manager. Backstopping by CPCJ staff was overall viewed as highly supportive but occasionally as rather minimal or non-existent.
Annual meetings of CPCJ focal points contributed towards maintaining effective communication channels between headquarters and field-based staff. The last one was held in 2015, and it is recommended to re-install annual CPCJ focal point meetings to support internal coordination and information-sharing, especially as CPCJ focal points had a less positive assessment of clear communication between the wider project team (including staff working on particular focus areas) and the field (see figure VI).

Figure VI. Clear communication between the project team and field staff (source: Online survey UNODC staff)

Summary - Efficiency
The GP was to some extent (cost)efficiently implemented. The organization of the project management function led to several challenges in the Justice Section, and lessons learned were amongst others to align relevant roles and responsibilities with functions, agree on a common fundraising strategy and clarify the interlinkages between focus areas. Communication between the wider project team and the field resulted in good practices as well as lessons learned; annual CPCJ focal point meetings had supported Headquarters-field communication.

Partnerships and cooperation

Evaluation questions:
- To what extent have the activities and outputs benefited from the expertise of and cooperation with other relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations? How have these partnerships been experienced by UNODC and concerned organizations?
- To what extent have relevant partnerships with donors been considered efficient and effective, and how have donor-related challenges been addressed by project management and by UNODC?
The evaluation found that partnerships with international organizations and governments, including donors, supported the design and implementation of activities, including training events, expert meetings and the development, revision and updating of instruments and tools. While the right partnerships were generally established, nurtured and sometimes also strengthened by GP-supported activities, these were also decided on and driven by earmarked funding and the budget for particular events (see the section on efficiency). Intra-regional cooperation was supported by means of hosting regional and bilateral events and inviting the sharing of expertise and hosting events, such as with respect to the Regional Training of Trainers Workshop on Effective Prosecution Responses to Violence against Women and Girls in Bangkok, Bangkok, 4-6 May 2016 and supporting a two-months training of Libyan prison staff in Algeria which commenced on 10 December 2017.

Figure VII. Right partnerships under the GP (source: online survey UNODC staff)

Partnerships and cooperation with governments (see countries covered by the GP in Map 1), including direct counterparts, were overall supportive of concerned areas covered by the GP (see impact and sustainability), and data confirm the overall satisfaction of these partners with the work undertaken under the GP. For instance, 75 percent of respondents who had participated in at least one meeting/training shared their overall satisfaction about their cooperation with UNODC. UNODC staff was generally viewed as highly professional, knowledgeable and responsive at different levels, and appreciation was expressed about the Office’s effective implementation of the mandates given by policy-making bodies, especially in light of available resources (Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendation 8). Additionally, results were often achieved because of the diversity of participants representing different professional backgrounds and entities (UN agencies, academia, civil society organizations and government experts), which led to cross-fertilization and a further understanding of different positions in order to reach consensus.30

UNODC’s specialised expertise on CPCJ was considered its added value, and this comparative advantage was promoted and capitalized on in some thematic areas (Mid-Term Independent

---

30 An example highlighted frequently during this evaluation were the expert meetings, especially the first, third and fourth meetings, leading up to the formulation of the Mandela Rules.
Project Evaluation recommendation 3B). Joint implementation was not only cost-effective but also helped to push a particular agenda, furthered the development and implementation of CPCJ norms and standards, and built more broadly on existing capacities and constituencies. Partners included UN agencies as well as INGOs, academia, individual experts and consultants (see footnote 24 for an overview).

One of the good practices was UNODC’s ability to gather experts and actors from different regions and legal domains from their global network, although with a lesson learned to guarantee the inclusion of a wide range of local contexts with respect to the development and application of particular norms and standards.

Donor partnerships were instrumental considering that 15 donors provided funding for the GP from 2012 onwards. Donors were overall satisfied with results, and generally valued the partnership with UNODC which was shaped by means of the GP, amongst others. Some areas, such as information-sharing, donor reporting and visibility, were occasionally undertaken in a less efficient manner (see lesson learned on headquarters-field communication in section on efficiency). Donor interests were also supported by the GP by means of showcasing support for particular thematic areas (e.g. VAW, legal assistance and migrant protection) and/or countries/regions and by lifting their profile, especially of less traditional donors.

Summary - Partnerships and cooperation

Partnerships and cooperation with governments and other actors have been fundamental to the achievements of the GP, including for the expert meetings. Each thematic area had partners, which were instrumental to showcase UNODC’s ‘added value’, build more broadly on capacities and constituencies, and push the agenda to further the development and implementation of CPCJ norms and standards. Cooperation with donors was generally satisfactory.

Effectiveness

Evaluation questions:

- To what extent did the GP achieve its objective and outcomes?

The evaluation found that the GP had to a large extent been effective in view of the achieved targets of outcome and objective indicators (see annex VI). The objective ‘States improve CPCJ systems in line with UN standards and norms in CPCJ and other relevant international instruments’ has to a large degree been achieved. The GP contributed to the development of the following three guiding documents on standards and norms adopted by the UNGA (see also outcome 3):

31 Canada, France, Germany, Israel, Japan, Norway, One UN Vietnam, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, USA


The GP further contributed to the drafting, finalization and/or publication of 17 handbooks, resource books, checklists and training manuals of which some supported the implementation of the above-mentioned GA resolutions (see annex VII).32 ‘The use of UNODC tools, manuals and training materials to improve criminal justice procedures and practices and to develop, adopt and implement effective strategies and programmes for crime prevention’ (outcome 2) was achieved considering a comparison of target and results, with at least 75 countries using tools and training in the framework of CPCJ initiatives.

The result ‘States develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies based on UNODC assessments, advice and programme support’ (outcome 1) was also achieved to some extent considering that over 60 technical assistance initiatives were developed and/ or implemented with GLOT63 support until 2015. Examples include the project proposals prepared with support of the GP, of which some were funded to enable UNODC to implement full-fledged projects33 and financial support to national staff (including one UNV position) to ‘grow UNODC roots’ in a particular country and focus area (e.g. Vietnam on VAW and Colombia on restorative justice) ([Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendation 3A]. One recent example was the ‘Caribbean Human Rights and Use of Force Model Policy’, which was the outcome of the Caribbean Use of Force in Law Enforcement Conference hosted in Kingston, Jamaica by the Independent Commission of Investigations (INDECOM), in close partnership with the UN, from May 31 to June 2, 2017.34

Summary - Effectiveness
The GP has been effective considering that its objective and the outcomes were to a large extent met. The GP contributed to three UNGA resolutions and supported the drafting, editing

32 The GP contributed also to the following publication: UNWomen, UNODC and UNDP (2017) ‘The Trial of Rape: Understanding the criminal justice system response to sexual violence in Thailand and Viet Nam’.
33 GLOT63-paid staff assisted in developing the project ‘Support to the Justice Sector in Nigeria’ (NGA/V18), which was funded by the EU. Furthermore, four project concept notes were prepared for Central Asia, with the project concept note for Kyrgyzstan being funded under Sub-programme 2 ‘Crime Prevention, Criminal Justice and Integrity’ (XACZ61) of the Central Asia Programme. An assessment undertaken in Vietnam with support of the GP jumpstarted activities (and funding) on VAW. Furthermore, ‘seed’ money for training of prison staff in Iraq underpinned the preparation of a large project with the same donor, but national concerns about human rights abuses brought this fundraising process to a halt. The training of Libyan prison officials in Algeria in 2017 also led to a project concept note for fund-raising.
and publication of seventeen handbooks and other documents to support the implementation of CPCJ norms and standards. The GP also had an impact at the local level, including by supporting the development of UNODC project proposals (with one funded in Central Asia and one in Nigeria) and staff capacity to ‘grow roots’ in focus areas (e.g. Colombia and Vietnam).

Impact

Evaluation questions:

- To what extent did the GP contribute, or is likely to contribute, to impact and/or intermediate results (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended) for its beneficiaries, target groups, communities involved, and institutions?
- To what extent did the GP contribute to (achieving) the related SDGs?

While indications about the impact of the GP were shared during this evaluation, the evaluation team had neither the needed capacity nor time and other resources to follow-up and verify these data, including in prison reform (e.g. prison conditions, the rehabilitation of prisoners and the use of alternative sanctions), human rights, crime prevention, the protection of children and women’s human rights. The contribution of the GP to CPCJ reform was at the international normative, standard-setting level, especially in the field of prisoner’s rights, child protection and women’s human rights (UNGA resolutions A/RES/68/189; A/RES/70/175; A/RES/70/176), and by offering guidance on the application of CPCJ norms and standards by the 17 tools developed in five focus areas of the project (see annex VII).

The areas covered by the GP were relevant in light of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These were however not considered in its design as the SDGs were only set in 2015. Three goals were in particular relevant, namely Gender Equality (goal 5), Sustainable Cities and Communities (goal 11) and Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions (goal 16). In the absence of meaningful indicators in the GPs logframe, including in relation to these three areas, it is not possible to undertake an analysis about its contribution to these SDGs. More alignment between the SDGs and the GP’s indicators could have resulted in a more focused GP, and a lesson learned is therefore that relevant logframes include indicators of relevant SDGs.

Summary - Impact

While indications about the impact of the GP were shared, the evaluation team did not have the necessary resources to follow-up and verify these data, including in prison reform (e.g. prison conditions, the rehabilitation of prisoners and the use of alternative sanctions), human rights, crime prevention, the protection of children and women’s human rights. The GP’s contribution to the SDGs could also not be measured due to the absence of related indicators in the GP’s logframe.
Sustainability

Evaluation questions:

- To what extent have the programme stakeholders and beneficiaries taken ownership of the results and goals of the GP? To what extent are they committed to continue working towards these results after implementation of the activities?
- To what extent are the results likely to be sustained and applied in countries?

Data analysis showed that sustainability had been considered in the design and implementation of the GP. The 2012 project revision referred predominantly to sustainability in relation to seed-funding (e.g. a temporary UNV position to capitalize on presence and subsequent results to successfully obtain further funding) or capacity for writing project proposals), which continued to be an effective means to support implementation, seek and obtain funding, create partnerships, set up cooperation mechanisms and ‘grow roots’ in a particular country and focus area (Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation recommendation 7).

Sustainability was also considered in supporting and promoting ownership of stakeholders at the international and national level, which was visible in the adoption of the three UNGA resolutions35, and the requests of political bodies to UNODC to work on particular issues, including by providing guidance to the implementation of these resolutions. The participation of a wide range of stakeholders in international expert meetings was pivotal to inviting, supporting and strengthening ownership of particular norms and standards. Efforts were made to implement these resolutions, including in countries supported under the GP, although international support was often only short-term and national-level commitment for CPCJ reform processes subject to political priorities, resources, including budget and technical capacity, and possible cultural sensitivities.

The GP was instrumental in developing and publishing seventeen handbooks, checklists and resource books in five thematic areas, namely prison reform, violence against children, VAW, migrant protection and police and community policing (see annex VII). One way to guarantee their use is to keep them up-to-date. In most areas, this was considered to be still the case. Only the prison reform tools required updating with the Mandela Rules, and it is recommended to do this in the short-term.

Although the tools were reportedly disseminated to relevant stakeholders via email and by sharing hard copies at CCPCJ events, for instance, this had not at all times been done efficiently, and relevant actors, such as CPCJ focal points, were not always aware of particular tools. A GP-

---

wide strategy to support one common dissemination practice had not been developed. The tools on violence against migrants and policing/police reform\(^{36}\) appear to be least known with one explanation being the limited resources available for dissemination. It is therefore recommended to prepare a comprehensive communication strategy to improve dissemination of CPCJ tools and related information. While the tools could all be downloaded from the UNODC website, the concerned webpage could only be found with prior knowledge and/or UNODC’s work in this field. It is therefore recommended to strengthen online access to CPCJ tools.

The CPCJ tools on prison reform were considered to be highly useful, with the “Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners” (the Mandela Rules) topping the list of respondents of the online survey for experts/trainees, followed by the “Handbook on Strategies to Reduce Overcrowding as well as the tools on VAW and Justice for Children” (see Annex VII). These guiding documents were viewed as comprehensive reference books, and used for preparing presentations, papers, training, and the sharing of technical knowledge with partners.

While the CPCJ tools supported advocacy on and actual changes in legislation, policies and practice at the national level, available tools were sometimes also viewed as not sufficiently user-friendly in terms of available languages and with theoretical language not inviting their use by end-users in the field. The GP contributed to translation of different tools although by mid 2018 not all tools were already available in all UN languages.\(^{37}\) It is therefore recommended to continue with fund-raising and exploring options to translate these tools into all UN languages.

Additionally, tools were regularly viewed as rather lengthy and theoretical and therefore not reflective of regional and national contexts to invite their use in practice. This was partially seen as a consequence of the design process; theoretical experts with limited field experience were invited, while experienced UNODC field-based staff, for instance, and training/communication experts were not included to consultative meetings. In some instances, tools were further operationalized, such as by means of training curricula or a checklist\(^{38}\), while in one instance the further operationalization was considered too sensitive (e.g. use of force\(^{39}\)). It is recommended to continue to examine ways to further adapt global tools to regional and national contexts and to elaborate on existing ones and make them more tailored and practical (e.g. a roadmap) to


\(^{38}\) E.g. ‘Planning the implementation of the UN Model Strategies and Practical Measures on the Elimination of Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice: A Checklist (2015)’ in the field of justice for children; Assessing compliance with the Nelson Mandela Rules - A checklist for internal inspection mechanism (2017) to support the implementation of UNGA Resolution A/RES/70/175; The ‘Resource Book for Trainers on Effective Prosecution Responses to Violence against women and girls’ (2017), which operationalized the ‘Handbook for prosecutors on effective responses to violence against women and girls’ (2014) in the field of VAW.

\(^{39}\) See https://www.gcsp.ch/Courses/Legal-Dimensions-of-Contemporary-and-Future-Use-of-Force-2018
encourage their use, including by local training institutes. Additionally, it is recommended to explore options to integrate the ‘field-perspective’ in expert meetings. A lesson learned is that the development of these tools must ideally be integrated into programming by means of piloting the tools in training and by planning for training to support their application.

Further feedback concerned their design and availability in soft copy only, while nowadays a host of technical options are available for training curricula to make information accessible in different ways. Thus, the use of video to make dynamics between victims, witnesses, offenders and professional actors visible and flags to give short introductions about new tools could be considered. The option of e-learning for training modules was viewed as too costly, amongst others, and therefore not selected by the project management team (Mid-Term Independent Project Evaluation Recommendation 9). It is recommended that a) different communication means are explored to make CPCJ norms and standards, including their practical application, more accessible; b) create links on the UNODC tools webpage to other websites with useful tools (with concerned organization’s permission) to promote the use of available global tools.

Training was further supported in all focus areas. These were often one-time events, and therefore not supportive of a sustainable approach. It was further not known how all trainees used their newly acquired knowledge and/or skills as such data were not collected by project management, although some positive experiences were shared during this evaluation (e.g. by providing lectures on the prosecution of VAW cases or prison management or by means of training, coaching and mentoring colleagues). A lesson learned is that the application of knowledge and skills to measure impact and support follow-up activities needs to be monitored for evaluation and planning purposes.

The one-time trainings were not sustainable, and the pooling of UNODC resources in selected countries is therefore recommended as one way to support a sustainable CPCJ reform process. The management of expectations would then however be necessary, as such processes must be owned and taken forward by national counterparts.

Summary - Sustainability
Sustainability of results was to some extent considered and visible in the GP’s design and implementation, including in the adoption of three UNGA resolutions, and requests to UNODC for further technical assistance. Efforts were made to implement these resolutions, although support was often only short-term and national-level commitment for CPCJ reform processes subject to political priorities, resources, including budget and technical capacity, and possible cultural sensitivities. Not all opportunities to ensure sustainability of results were adequately capitalized on, such as with respect to dissemination and accessibility of tools, their adaptation to regional and local realities and specific target groups and opportunities to capitalize on and pool resources to support reform processes.
Human Rights and Gender Equality

Evaluation questions:

- To what extent were human rights considerations included in the programme design and implementation? To what extent have measures been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that human rights aspects were mainstreamed?
- To what extent were gender equality considerations included in the programme design and implementation?
- To what extent were under-represented and vulnerable groups included in the design and implementation of the GP?

**Human Rights**

Human rights, gender equality and ‘leaving no one behind’ were only to some extent mainstreamed in the focus areas of the GP. GP activities were guided by norms given in UN human rights treaties, and CPCJ ‘soft law’ was essentially considered human rights standards. The GP was geared towards advancing the human rights of victims, witnesses and offenders and contributed to the reform of CPCJ structures and systems to strengthen adherence to human rights standards. For instance, the majority of Justice Section and field staff noted that human rights had adequately been taken into account into the design and implementation of the GP. However, a human rights-based approach (HRBA), including the use of human rights indicators, was missing, and therefore a lesson learned and related recommendation for future programming.

Figure IX. Adequately taking into account human rights, gender equality and vulnerable groups into GP design and implementation (source: Online survey UNODC staff, final evaluation of GLOT63)

Human rights were taken into regard in the development of instruments and tools, including by means of the participation of human rights experts and making human rights an integral part of
discussions in expert meetings. The promotion of human rights sometimes required careful navigation for political and/or cultural reasons in training, and norms and standards were then explained without explicitly referring to human rights. The tools were considered strong instruments to promote and support the implementation of human rights in different focus areas, including by offering guidance on measures to address the needs of vulnerable groups in the justice system.

**Gender Equality**

The evaluation found that gender equality was only to some extent mainstreamed in the design and implementation of the GP. The project directly enabled the development and implementation of norms and standards on women’s rights and gender equality, such as the UNGA resolution ‘Recommendations on Action against Gender-related Killing of Women and Girls’ (2014). The work on VAW followed a human rights and victim-centred approach in line with CEDAW and other relevant international instruments on gender equality. For instance, the Regional Training of Trainers Workshop on Effective Prosecution Responses to Violence against Women and Girls in Bangkok held from 4 to 6 May 2016 included a discussion of the terminology around gender and sex, gender equality and gender stereotyping. Tools addressing women’s human rights were only to some extent known and used by UNODC staff in the field.

The GP’s logframe had one indicator on gender balance in training. The proportion of female participants of only the majority of training activities had been registered in UNODC progress reports, as data had not at all times been collected and/or shared by concerned staff. Monitoring and planning could have benefited from their collection per focus area to show variations and inform strategy. The gender balance was less than half, namely 41 (2012-2015) and 49 (2012-2017) percent of female trainees. Overall, gender equality could have been mainstreamed more comprehensively, including in the logframe and by promoting available tools on women’s human rights. It is recommended that this will be done in future project design and management.

**Summary - Human Rights and Gender Equality**

Human Rights and Gender Equality were considered only to some extent in the GP. While international human rights and gender equality norms and standards were central in CPCJ instruments, tools and training, these had not been given sufficient attention in the GPs logframe and related planning and monitoring mechanisms. Moreover, while the GP had to some degree been instrumental in advancing human rights and gender equality norms, limited awareness of tools amongst UNODC field staff had limited opportunities to further these in practice.
III. CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation confirmed that the GP was instrumental in the development and updating of norms and standards resulting in three UNGA resolutions on minimum standards for prisoners (the ‘Mandela rules’), gender-related killings and CPCJ model strategies and practical measures to eliminate violence against children.\(^{40}\) Additionally, the GP supported the drafting and publication of tools on prison reform, justice for children, VAW, police reform and policing and migrant protection. Partnerships with national counterparts, international and national organizations and institutions and individual experts were pivotal to achieving the above results by creating ownership, enabling a broader constituency for reform, pooling available resources and by allowing for the cross-pollination of different perspectives. The tailoring of tools to operational needs and their access and dissemination had however been less optimal from a sustainability perspective, and human rights and gender equality were only to some extent mainstreamed in the GP.

Initially as the administrative vehicle of the Thematic Programme on CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, the GP was used as a flexible tool that could easily absorb donor funding within a short time-frame. This was reflected in its design, with quantitative output-level indicators providing data that were not informative about achievements and in support of decision-making about the GP’s implementation, including in particular focus areas. The launch of two GPs on prison reform and rehabilitation/legal aid/crime prevention and justice for children and the pivotal role of RPs at the regional level decreased the GP’s overall scope and size.\(^{41}\) The advocates for a new GP on CPCJ reform noted that a new administrative vehicle would be necessary to host incoming funds although by ‘stretching’ existing GPs this function could be covered to avoid the creation of another project more responsive to donor needs than supporting the implementation of a coherent approach on CPCJ reform.

A UNODC-wide strategy on CPCJ reform has not been adopted since 2016, while CPCJ reform continues to be a standing item on the agenda of the CCPCJ. This evaluation confirmed that CPCJ norms and standards continue to be at the heart of UNODC’s mandate together with the crime and drug conventions. An organizational decision is therefore needed to promote coherence and provide guidance by adopting an agency-wide CPCJ reform strategy and related programming architecture.


\(^{41}\) ‘Global Programme on Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice’ (GLOZ43) and ‘Global Prison Challenges’ (GLOZ85) in respectively 2015 and 2016. The launch of the GP ‘Strengthening Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Responses to Violence against Women’ (GLOW65) has been planned for 2019.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1. UNODC-wide CPCJ strategy, incl. programming structure. The GP was the administrative vehicle of the Thematic Programme on CPCJ Reform 2012-2015, UNODC’s strategy which included a programming structure for this area of work. A new thematic programme was not adopted after 2015, while the CCPCJ still has a standing agenda item on CPCJ standards and norms. The current emphasis on prison reform, and the limited attention given to crime prevention, was viewed by some as limiting the execution of UNODC’s mandate. It is recommended to formalize, complete and adopt a CPCJ reform strategy, including a programming structure covering all focus areas ((Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in cooperation with sections in headquarters and regional offices; UNODC senior management/CCPCJ).

Recommendation 2. Resource mobilization. Resource mobilization was coordinated to some extent within UNODC. The absence of a CPCJ fundraising strategy, and the focus on the ‘usual’ donors, limited opportunities and led to some internal competition. It is recommended to prepare a CPCJ resource-mobilization strategy with a clear division of responsibilities, incl. a strategy for ‘new’ donors (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in close cooperation with the Co-financing and Partnership Section and regional offices).

Recommendation 3. Project management. The GP had a project manager function with limited administrative and supervisory responsibilities shared between two RB-covered CPCJ officers at P3 (until 2015 with no replacement) and P4 level. This led to limited coordination and after 2015 also administrative follow-up and the less optimal use of the technical expertise of RB-covered staff. It is recommended to allocate fulltime administrative project functions to project-funded staff, accompanied with sufficient supervisory responsibilities, and allocate technical responsibilities to RB-covered staff (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC).

Recommendation 4. Monitoring, incl. indicators. Monitoring was done for reporting, but data collection, registration and sharing was fragmented and not conducive for results-based management and evidence-based reporting per focus area, partially as a result of the GP’s quantitative indicators. SDG, human rights and gender-sensitive indicators were also largely missing, which contributed to weak gender equality mainstreaming in focus areas (except in prison reform and VAW in particular). It is recommended to a) develop meaningful indicators in CPCJ projects to support results-based management, including SDG, human rights and gendered ones for all focus areas; b) integrate comprehensive monitoring mechanisms in CPCJ projects (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC).

Recommendation 5. Communication. Dissemination of tools was partially similarly organized across the GP. Key stakeholders were not always aware of available tools. The UNODC website and webpage did not support easy access. Tools were mostly only in soft copy and not in all UN languages; modern technology and tools developed by other organizations were not capitalized on. It is therefore recommended to adopt and implement a communication strategy for the
translation, dissemination and use of CPCJ tools following the completion of GLOT63 (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC)

**Recommendation 6. Administrative function GP.** The GP’s administrative function continued to be valued after 2015. No decision had been made yet to ensure a continuation of this function in light of the GP’s completion at the end of 2018, such as the development of a new GP and/or the use of existing GPs. It is recommended to decide on a short-term mechanism to guarantee a continuation of the administrative function of the GP (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in cooperation with Strategic Planning Unit)

**Recommendation 7. CPCJ norms and standards.** The development and updating of CPCJ norms and standards was highly relevant. Expert meetings were generally inclusive, although sometimes affected by funding, political taking precedence over technical interests and insufficient consideration of local perspectives. Modern technology was not used to replace meetings on location. No concrete opportunities were visible at the time of this evaluation. It is recommended to continue with monitoring the political environment for opportunities to develop/update particular CPCJ norms and standards by means of inclusive expert consultations following the completion of GLOT63 (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC)

**Recommendation 8. Tools.** CPCJ tools were greatly valued by stakeholders. Their theoretical nature sometimes reduced their relevance for local application, and their testing and inclusion in training as part of the roll-out process was not a standard practice. Prison reform tools required updating with the Mandela Rules. It is recommended to a) update prison tools with the Mandela Rules under GLOZ85 and/or (an)other relevant project(s); b) integrate the development of new tools into a comprehensive testing and training implementation plan in GLOZ43, GLOZ85 and/or other CPCJ projects (Justice Section, Division for Operations, in cooperation with UNODC regional offices)

**Recommendation 9. Cooperation HQ-field.** UNODC field offices had hardly been involved in the GP’s design. Field communication was to some extent efficient; the last CPCJ focal point meeting in 2015 was a good practice. GP field activities, often one-time with limited to no sustainability, were moved to RPs. It is recommended to strengthen cooperation with regional offices by a) requesting their participation in the design of global CPCJ programming; b) organizing regular CPCJ focal point meetings; c) examining pooling resources for CPCJ reform in particular countries (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC in cooperation with regional offices)

**Recommendation 10. Human rights and gender equality.** Human rights and gender equality were only to some extent mainstreamed in the GP. While such norms and standards were considered in CPCJ instruments, tools and training, these had not been given sufficient attention in project planning and monitoring. It is therefore recommended to enhance human rights and gender mainstreaming in CPCJ projects, especially but not only in project planning and monitoring (Justice Section, Division for Operations, UNODC)
VI. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

The evaluation encountered good practices in different areas. Partnerships were effective such as the joint efforts with other UN agencies to support CPCJ reform, pool resources, build on each other’s complementarities, mobilize a wider constituency and build on, utilize and showcase UNODC’s expertise. Furthermore, the different functions of tools developed under the GP was also highlighted as a good practice as these not only supported training and the application of CPCJ norms but also visibility about UNODC’s expertise and achievements, and able to gauge donors’ interests in funding particular focus areas. The ability of UNODC to gather experts and actors from different regions and legal domains from their global network was noted as well as the practice of piloting a project/utilizing ‘seed’ money to start activities in a country, build up a network and explore partnerships and cooperation arrangements by capitalizing on sharing UNODC’s expertise in CPCJ reform.

The evaluation also identified several lessons learned, including in design. A comprehensive design needs to be formulated by means of a participatory, consultative process in which all responsible staff take part to develop and fine-tune a project. The development of CPCJ tools needs to be integrated into programming by means of piloting the tools in training and by planning for training to support their application. The interlinkages between the different outcomes should be made more explicit in practice, while also avoiding the thinly spreading of resources by selecting target countries for a more sustained effort for CPCJ reform. Additionally, the use of only quantitative indicators, the absence of clear definitions of these indicators, the absence of SDG, human rights-based and gender-sensitive indicators and annual planning documents posed challenges to results-based performance monitoring. A common information/data storage facility for complex projects is further a prerequisite for such monitoring based on clear data sharing protocols.

Lessons learned were further identified in the field of project management, with respect to resource-mobilization and the organization of expert meetings. Staff functions (e.g. project coordinator) must be accompanied by corresponding roles, responsibilities, legitimacy and support to enable the incumbent to function effectively. Furthermore, project-funded staff should be used for administrative project functions to free RB-funded staff for work on substance (e.g. servicing the CCPCJ as was originally mandated). In case of joint headquarters-field activities, the division of roles and responsibilities cannot be assumed but needs to be clearly delineated to avoid possible misunderstandings. Resource-mobilization cannot be done by individual staff members without internal coordination to avoid intra-team competition for scarce resources. Additionally, it could sometimes be more cost-efficient and effective to hold teleconferences instead of expert meetings on location, depending on meeting objectives and participant profiles, and to further widen the resource base to include more local perspectives.
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Project overview and historical context

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has a broad mandate in supporting member states in crime prevention and criminal justice reform, derived from numerous resolutions. General Assembly (GA) resolution 44/72: “Crime prevention and criminal justice” identified the main objectives of the United Nations (UN) in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice as: promotion of a more effective administration of justice, the strengthening of international cooperation in the fight against transnational crime, the observance of human rights and the pursuance of the highest standards of fairness, efficiency, humanity and professional conduct.

The Strategy for the period 2008-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime was developed after extensive consultations with the stakeholders of UNODC. The strategy linked mandates enshrined in the resolutions to allow UNODC to act effectively as the custodian of UN standards and norms in the area of crime prevention and criminal justice. The strategy was further supplemented by the Thematic Programme (TP) for the period 2010-2011, which was a strategic programme document for UNODC’s work in this area. Since its inception, the Global Programme also implemented the UNODC Strategy for the period 2012-2015, specifically sub-programme 4 “Justice”. Further, under the strategic framework for the biennium 2016-2017, the Global Programme fell under sub-programme 5: “Justice”.

Global Programme GLOT63 “Support to Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform” was an operationalisation of the Strategy for the period 2008-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. It was launched in January 2008 as a global “umbrella project”, which addressed all the key areas enumerated in the aforementioned strategic documents. The overall objective of the Global Programme was to support policy-makers and professionals, in countries in receipt of UNODC advice and assistance in designing and implementing evidence-based crime prevention and criminal justice reform policies and programmes, with focus – at the strategy level - on increased investment by the member states in these policy areas. It also took on a function that had been covered by a former type of UN account (FSB account) which allowed for funds to be raised from donors and spent with relative discretion. In 2007, it was decided to terminate such accounts in view of the lack of accountability and oversight. The Global Programme was designed as the main fundraising tool for the expansion of the work of UNODC in the area of standards and norms which had been a neglected area of work in the office.

The Global Programme included activities targeting the needs of women in the criminal justice system and as victims or offenders such as the “training-of-trainers” workshop on effective prosecution responses to violence against women and girls that took place on 4-6 May 2016 in Bangkok. Many of the tools developed under the Global Programme provide specific guidance on measures to address the needs of vulnerable groups as well as women in the justice system. An example of such a tool would include the publication titled “Strengthening Crime prevention and Criminal Justice Responses to Violence against Women” which aimed to provide countries with comprehensive guidance on how to improve, both from a normative and operational perspective, the response of their criminal justice system to violence against women. Efforts were made to use the Gender components in the Criminal Justice System Assessment Toolkit both when carrying out general assessments and as a basis for particular programmes focusing on gender in the criminal justice system. This toolkit is a practical guide intended for use by those charged with the assessment of criminal justice systems and the implementation of criminal justice reform. It was designed to be a dynamic set of documents that continue to meet assessment needs as they evolve. More specifically, this toolkit includes the “Gender in the Criminal Justice System Assessment Tool” which seeks to complement the other tools by highlighting gender relevant
issues in the assessment of criminal justice systems and implementation of criminal justice reforms. Specific assessment using the gender tool has been carried out in Vietnam. Further, provisions were also made to disaggregate training statistics by gender by keeping records of participants by gender for each training.

The Global Programme was geared towards the implementation of human rights of victims, witnesses and offenders and in general building crime prevention and criminal justice systems which ensure human rights for all. The UN standards and norms on crime prevention and criminal justice are essentially international human rights standards and Global Programme staff and activities are also constantly guided by UN Human rights treaties. The project contributed to the implementation of the Executive Director’s Guidance Note on Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, through review of UNODC training of staff and beneficiaries in various areas from a human rights perspective, development of particular tools focusing on human rights aspects of UNODC’s work and implementation of risks assessments. Several of the staff supporting and implementing the project are themselves experts on human rights. A stronger partnership with OHCHR as well as the Institutes of the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network (PNIs) and other institutes working on human rights were also a part of the strategy of the project.

Main challenges during implementation

The implementation of the project has been confronted with a number of challenges, some of which were addressed with the in-depth revision based on the 2012 mid-term evaluation. These challenges included weak communication channels between HQ and field office and progress reports lacking sufficient quantitative data analysis. Other challenges continued such as: (1) the difficulties to raise funds for such a broad area of work within a general difficult fundraising climate with internal and external competition; (2) the limited branding of the project; and (3) the need to coordinate both internally in the section and externally with other UNODC branches and field offices, including with regard to placement of staff in the field.

Another linked challenge is the difficulty to measure the impact and results in view of the complex nature of crime prevention and criminal justice reform which makes it more difficult to convince donors to invest in long-term efforts. This issue was further exacerbated by the increased hard-earmarking of funds by donors of funds often provided only for one year or less.

Project documents and revisions of the original project document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Please provide general information regarding the original project document.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project document</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programmes, provision of short and medium-term expertise to UNODC at large and in particular the field office network. The project is implemented with a strong focus on partnerships with other UN agencies and international NGOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project revision</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reason &amp; purpose (max. 2 sentences per revision)</th>
<th>Change in (please check)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Revision to reflect the increase in the total collected pledged amount by the contribution of the United Arab Emirates.</td>
<td>X Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Revision include an increase in budget and extend the duration of the project to 31.12.2013.</td>
<td>X Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Revision to include a set of outcomes, indicators and outputs on criminal justice responses to piracy. Inclusion of two positions in the project P3 “Expert” and P5 “Senior Expert”.</td>
<td>X Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Revisions to the log frame, staffing, related budget and management arrangements of the project.</td>
<td>X Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Revision to staffing table to abolish P5 post “Senior Expert” and creating a new P4 post “Crime prevention and Criminal Justice Officer (Human rights)”.</td>
<td>X Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Revision to staffing table to abolish the post P4 “CPCJ Officer (Human Rights)”, amend two P4 posts “Expert, CPCJ reform (Human Rights)” and P4 “Expert CPCJ reform (Justice for Children)” to ensure adaptability, and to extend the duration of the project until 31.12.2016.</td>
<td>X Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X Log frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Revision to reinstate P2 post “Associate Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer” which was originally included in the project in 2009.</td>
<td>X Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X Log frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Revision to include the TORs of the P3 position “Programme Officer, Cairo”, and to extend the duration of the project until 30.06.2018.</td>
<td>X Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X Log frame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main objectives and outcomes

Baselines have been established and used, and revised when the project was extended.

**Objective of the project/programme (as per project document/revision):**

| Objective: | States improve CPCJ systems in line with UN standards and norms in CPCJ and other relevant international instruments. |

Outcomes of the project/programme (as per project document/revision)

| Outcome 1: | Technical assistance: States develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies based on UNODC assessments, advice and programme support |
| Performance indicators: | Number of technical assistance initiatives developed and/or implemented with GLOT63 support. Baseline: 65 (2008-2011) Target: 80 (2012-2018) |

| Outcome 2: | Tools and training: States and the international community develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies using UNODC tools and trainings. |

| Outcome 3: | Support to inter-governmental bodies: States develop or update standards and norms with UNODC support |

Contribution to UNODC’s country, regional or thematic programme

Contribution to the following UNODC country and regional programmes:
1. Relates to relevant sub-programmes on justice of country programmes
2. Relates to relevant sub-programmes on justice of regional programmes

Contribution to the following thematic programme(s):
1. Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice 2012-2018

The Global Programme has continued serving as a strategic tool for developing new thematic areas and/or new outcomes/outputs in regions and countries where UNODC was not very present or not implementing many projects in the area of justice.
Linkage to UNODC strategic framework, UNDAFs and to Sustainable Development Goals

The Project/Programme contributes to the following Sustainable Development Goals, Targets and Performance Indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant UN Sustainable Development Goals</th>
<th>Target(s)</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Gender Equality</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2.1, 5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – Sustainable Cities and Communities</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions</td>
<td>16.1, 16.2, 16.3</td>
<td>16.1.1, 16.1.3, 16.1.4, 16.2.1, 16.2.3, 16.3.1, 16.3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Global Programme GLOT63 was developed under the UNODC Strategy for the period 2008-2011. The global programme also implemented the UNODC Strategy for the period 2012-2015. Under the strategic framework for the biennium 2016-2017, the Global Programme GLOT63 fell under sub-programme 5: “Justice”.

II. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time periods throughout the lifetime of the project (MMYYYY – MMYYYY) (add the number of rows needed)</th>
<th>Total Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Expenditure in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

44 All SDGs and targets can be found here: http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/

ANNEXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period that will be covered by the evaluation (MMYYYY – MMYYYYY)</th>
<th>Total Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Expenditure in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2012 – 22/06/2018</td>
<td>$9,697,829</td>
<td>$6,012,691.60</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

As foreseen in the project document (GLOT63) as well as per UNODC Evaluation Policy, norms and standards and the UNEG evaluation norms and standards, a final independent project evaluation of the global programme on Support to Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform will be undertaken in the period from May to September 2018 by a team of independent external evaluators, with the guidance, quality assurance and evaluation expertise of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). IEU further interacts with the project manager and the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process. IEU may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation-process.

The final evaluation will focus on the assessment of outcome-level results, both intended and unintended. The final evaluation will also further assess the implementation of the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation that took place in 2012, and capture the lessons learned from implementation to inform future programming, including whether or not one or...
more new projects should be developed, policymaking and overall organizational learning of
UNODC, and in particular the Justice Section.

The main users of the evaluation would include the main stakeholders, i.e. UNODC staff, project
managers, member states, partners and beneficiaries.

The following DAC criteria will be assessed during the evaluation: relevance, efficiency,
effectiveness, impact and sustainability. In addition, established partnerships and cooperation as
well as aspects of human rights and gender mainstreaming will be assessed. The evaluation will
specifically assess how gender aspects have been mainstreamed into the programme. Furthermore, lessons learned and best practices will be identified and recommendations based
on the findings formulated.

IV. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

| Unit of analysis (full project/programme/ parts of the project/programme; etc.) | Full Project with particular focus on January 2012-June 2018 |
| Time period of the project/programme covered by the evaluation | January 2012-June 2018 (i.e. until the end of the field mission) |
| Geographical coverage of the evaluation | Global, field mission to only include Vienna, Austria, with phone/Skype interviews with stakeholders in the field |

V. KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency,
effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as design, partnerships and cooperation, human
rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind as well as lessons learned and best practices.
The questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team.

| Design |
| The Design of a project or programme measures the extent to which the logical framework approach was adopted. |
| 1. To what extent did appropriate and participatory planning processes take place in the design of the programme? |
| 2. Was the design of the programme accurate and realistic in relation to its set objectives or should there be any change for any future similar programme (i.e. covering all UN standards and norms or focus on certain thematic areas in view of existing global programmes, regional and country programmes?) |

| Relevance |
| Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. |
3. To what extent did the programme implement recommendations of the mid-term evaluation in 2012? To what extent did the implementation of recommendations lead to improved design and/or implementation of the programme?

4. To what extent were the outputs, outcomes and objectives of this programme relevant to the mandated areas of UNODC?

5. To what extent were the activities implemented under the programme relevant for its beneficiaries and target groups?

### Efficiency

*Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs.*

6. What measures were taken during the planning and implementation of the activities to ensure that resources were efficiently used?

7. To what extent did the cooperation with international and external partners contribute to the efficiency of the programme implementation for improved crime prevention and criminal justice reform policies and programmes for its beneficiaries and target groups?

### Effectiveness

*Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.*

8. To what extent did the programme achieve its objective and expected results (outputs and outcomes)?

9. To what extent did the programme contribute to addressing gaps in UNODC field-based technical assistance?

### Impact

*Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.*

10. To what extent did the programme contribute, or is likely to contribute, to long-term impact and/or intermediate results (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended) for its beneficiaries, target groups, communities involved, and institutions related to the programme?

11. To what extent did the programme contribute to achieving the related Sustainable Development Goals and targets?

### Sustainability

*Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.*

12. To what extent are the results (outcomes and impact) generated through the activities likely to be sustained in the countries after the end of the programme?

13. To what extent have the programme stakeholders and beneficiaries taken ownership of the results, activities and goals of the programmes? To what extent are they committed to continue working towards these results after implementation of the activities?

### Partnerships and cooperation

*The evaluation assesses the partnerships and cooperation established during the project/programme as well as their functioning and value.*

14. To what extent have the activities and outputs benefited from the expertise of and cooperation with other relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations?
15. To what extent was the programme cooperating with other potential partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs?

**Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind**

The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming throughout the project/programme of human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Human Rights</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. To what extent were human rights considerations included in the programme design and implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. To what extent have measures been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that human rights aspects were mainstreamed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gender Equality</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. To what extent were gender equality considerations included in the programme design and implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What were some of the lessons learned with regards to gender equality with regards to the activities of the programme? How could these be taken further in future programmes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Leaving no one behind (optional)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. To what extent were under-represented and vulnerable groups included in the programme design and implementation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lessons learned and best practices</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. What good practices in general emerged from the implementation of this programme that can be replicated to improve performance, results and effectiveness of similar future programmes and projects?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The promotion and protection of Human Rights and Gender Equality are central principles to the mandate of the UN and all UN agencies must work to fundamentally enhance and contribute to their realization by addressing the underlying causes of human rights violations, including discrimination against women and girls, and utilizing processes that are in line with and support these principles. Those UN interventions that do not consider these principles risk reinforcing patterns of discrimination and exclusion or leaving them unchanged.

According to the UNODC Evaluation Policy, Handbook and Guidelines and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, the integration of Human Rights & Gender Equality dimensions in the evaluation process will enable the UN system to better learn lessons, hold key stakeholders accountable for results, and in turn improve policies and programming, which will contribute to the realization of HR & GE and meeting the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and other UN mandates. Regardless of the size of the intervention, an evaluation design which applies a mixed-method approach will be the most appropriate to generate an accurate and comprehensive picture of how HR & GE are integrated into an evaluation.
Consideration of HR & GE adds important principles of equality, inclusion and non-discrimination to evaluation. It contributes to the social and economic change process by identifying and analysing the inequalities, discriminatory practices and unjust power relations that are central to development problems.

The methods used to collect and analyse data
This evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR and the availability of stakeholders. In all cases, the evaluation team is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, thematic programmes, internal review reports, programme files, evaluation reports (if available), financial reports and any other documents that may provide further evidence for triangulation, on which their conclusions will be based. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties identified as the key stakeholders of the project/programme, the Core Learning Partners (CLP).

The present ToR provide basic information as regards to the methodology, which should not be understood as exhaustive. It is rather meant to guide the evaluation team in elaborating an effective, efficient, and appropriate evaluation methodology that should be proposed, explained and justified in the Inception Report.

In addition, the evaluation team will be asked to present a summarized methodology (including an evaluation matrix) in the Inception Report outlining the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards as well as the UNODC Evaluation Policy, Norms and Standards.

While the evaluation team shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods is mandatory due to its appropriateness to ensure a gender-sensitive, inclusive methodology. Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. Indeed, information stemming from secondary sources will be cross-checked and triangulated through data retrieved from primary research methods. Primary data collection methods need to be gender-sensitive as well as inclusive.

The credibility of the data collection and analysis are key to the evaluation. Rival theories and competing explanations must be tested once plausible patterns emerge from triangulating data.

The limitations to the evaluation need to be identified and discussed by the evaluation team in the Inception Report, e.g. data constraints (such as missing baseline and monitoring data). Potential limitations as well as the chosen mitigating measures should be discussed.

When designing the evaluation data collection tools and instruments, the evaluation team needs to consider the analysis of certain relevant or innovative topics in the form of short case studies, analyses, etc. that would benefit the evaluation results.
The main elements of the evaluation process are the following:

- Preliminary desk review of all relevant project documentation, (Annex II of the evaluation ToR), as provided by the Project Manager and as further requested by the evaluation team, as well as relevant external documents (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; UN and global/regional strategies; etc.);
- Preparation and submission of an Inception Report (containing preliminary findings of the desk review, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, limitations to the evaluation, and timetable) to IEU for review and clearance before any field mission may take place;
- Initial meetings and interviews with the Project Manager and other UNODC staff as well as stakeholders
- Interviews (face-to-face or by telephone/skype), with key project stakeholders and beneficiaries, both individually and (as appropriate) in small groups/focus groups, as well as using surveys, questionnaires or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation;
- Analysis of all available information;
- Preparation of the draft evaluation report (based on Guidelines for Evaluation Report and Template Report to be found on the IEU website http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html). The lead evaluator submits the draft report to the Project Manager for the review of factual errors (copying IEU) and the Project Manager shares with IEU for review, comments and clearance. Subsequently IEU shares the final draft report with all CLPs for comments.
- Preparation of the final evaluation report and Evaluation Brief. The evaluation team incorporates the necessary and requested changes and finalizes the evaluation report in accordance with the feedback received from IEU, the Project Manager and CLPs. It further includes a 2-page Evaluation Brief and a PowerPoint presentation on final evaluation findings and recommendations;
- Presentation of final evaluation report with its findings and recommendations to the target audience, stakeholders etc. (in person or if necessary through Skype).
- In conducting the evaluation, the UNODC and the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards are to be taken into account. All tools, norms and templates to be mandatorily 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
The evaluation will utilize a mixture of primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources include, among others, interviews with key stakeholders (face-to-face or by telephone), the use of surveys and questionnaires, field missions for case studies, focus group interviews, observation and other participatory techniques. Secondary data sources will include project documents and their revisions, progress and monitoring reports, external reports and strategies (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; country/regional/global strategies; etc.) and all other relevant documents, including visual information (e.g. eLearning, pictures, videos, etc.).

Desk Review
The evaluation team will perform a desk review of all existing documentation (please see the preliminary list of documents to be consulted in Annex II of the evaluation ToR). This list is
however not to be regarded as exhaustive as additional documentation may be requested by the evaluation team. The evaluation team needs to ensure that sufficient external documentation is used for the desk review.

**Phone interviews / face-to-face consultations**
The evaluation team will conduct phone interviews / face-to-face consultations with identified individuals from the following groups of stakeholders:

- Member States (including national counterparts and donors);
- Relevant international and regional organizations: e.g. OHCHR;
- Non-governmental organizations working with UNODC: Omega Foundation; PRI; ICRC; VSE; WSV.
- Academia e.g. Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights;
- UNODC management and staff at HQ and in the field;
- UN agencies;
- Human rights institutes e.g. OHCHR;
- Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Networks.
- Etc.

**Questionnaire**
A questionnaire (on-line) is to be developed and used in order to help collect the views of additional stakeholders (e.g. trainees, counterparts, partners, etc.), if deemed appropriate.

**VII. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and drafting of Inception Report</td>
<td>07/05/2018 – 23/05/2018 (12 working days for lead evaluator and 10 for senior expert)</td>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>Draft Inception report in line with UNODC evaluation norms and standards46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of draft Inception Report by IEU</td>
<td>24/05/2018 – 29/05/2018 (1 week for IEU review)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Comments on the draft Inception Report to the evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of comments from IEU</td>
<td>30/05/2018 – 08/06/2018 (3 w/d for lead</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Revised draft Inception Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Deliverable A: Final Inception Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates

**By 08/06/2018**

(overall 15 w/d for lead evaluator and 12 for senior expert)

**Final Inception report to be cleared by IEU before the field mission can get started**

### Evaluation mission:

briefing, interviews with staff at UNODC HQ/FO (including by phone/skype); observation; focus groups; presentation of preliminary observations (if applicable)

**13/06/2018 – 22/06/2018** (7 w/d for lead evaluator and 7 w/d for senior expert)

**UNODC/HQ; Interviews and data collection**

### Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to Project Management and IEU;

**25/06/2018 - 13/07/2018** (15 w/d for lead evaluator and 13 for senior expert)

**Home base; Draft evaluation report**

### Review of IEU for quality assurance and Project Management for factual errors

**16/07/2018-30/07/2018**

(2 weeks for review)

**Comments on the draft evaluation report to the evaluation team**

### Consideration of comments from the project manager and incorporation of comments from IEU (can entail various rounds of comments)

**31/07/2018 – 17/08/2018** (6 w/d for lead evaluator and 4 for senior expert)

**Home base; Revised draft evaluation report**

### Deliverable B: Draft Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates

**By 17/08/2018**

(overall 28 w/d for lead evaluator and 24 for senior expert)

**Draft evaluation report, to be cleared by IEU**
| IEU to share draft evaluation report with Core Learning Partners for comments | 20/08/2018 – 03/09/2018 (2 weeks) | Comments of CLPs on the draft report |
| Consideration of comments from Core Learning Partners | 04/09/2018-05/09/2018 (2 w/d for lead evaluator and 1 for senior expert) | Home base |
| Revised draft evaluation report | Revised draft evaluation report |
| Final review by IEU; incorporation of comments and finalization of report and 2-page Evaluation Brief (can entail various rounds of comments) | 06/09/2018-17/09/2018 (3 w/d for lead evaluator and 2 for senior expert) | Home base |
| Revised draft evaluation report | Revised draft evaluation report |
| Presentation of evaluation results (to be reviewed and cleared by IEU) | Tentative: 18/09/2018 (1 w/d for lead evaluator) | Presentation of evaluation results |
| Presentation of evaluation results | Presentation of evaluation results |
| Deliverable C: Final evaluation report; Evaluation Brief, presentation of evaluation results | By 17/09/2018 (6 overall w/d for lead evaluator and 3 w/d for senior expert) | Final evaluation report and presentation of evaluation results, both to be cleared by IEU |
| Project Management: Finalise Evaluation Follow-up Plan in ProFi | By 24/09/2018 | Final Evaluation Follow-up Plan to be cleared by IEU |
| Project Management: Disseminate final evaluation report | By 01/10/2018 | Final evaluation report disseminated to internal and external stakeholders |
| IEU: facilitate the external Evaluation Quality Assessment of the Final Report | By 31/01/2019 | External Evaluation Quality Assessment of the final evaluation report |
VIII. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of consultants/ evaluators (national/international)</th>
<th>Specific expertise required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Evaluator</td>
<td>1 Independent international evaluator</td>
<td>Evaluation methodology, sound knowledge in the thematic areas of crime prevention and criminal justice reform; experience in gender sensitive evaluation methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Expert</td>
<td>1 Independent international evaluator</td>
<td>Knowledge in the thematic areas of crime prevention and criminal justice reform; sound knowledge of evaluation methodology, experience in gender sensitive evaluation methodologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial. The qualifications and responsibilities for each evaluator are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1).

Absence of Conflict of Interest

According to UNODC rules, the evaluators 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.

Furthermore, the evaluators shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner.

IX. MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager

The Project Manager is responsible for:

- managing the evaluation process
- drafting and finalizing the ToR,
- selecting Core Learning Partners (representing a balance of men, women and other marginalised groups) and informing them of their role,
- recruiting the evaluation team following clearance by IEU, ensuring issued contracts ahead of the start of the evaluation process in line with the cleared ToR. In case of any delay, IEU and the evaluation team are to be immediately notified,
- providing desk review materials (including data and information on men, women and other marginalised groups) to the evaluation team including the full TOR,
- liaising with the Core Learning Partners,
- reviewing the draft report for factual errors only,
- developing a follow-up plan for the usage of the evaluation results and recording of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations (to be updated once per year),
- disseminate the final evaluation report and communicate evaluation results to relevant stakeholders as well as facilitate the presentation of evaluation results;
- ensure that all payments related to the evaluation are fulfilled within 5 working days after IEU’s request - non-compliance by Project/Programme Management may result in the decision to discontinue the evaluation by IEU.

The Project Manager will be in charge of **providing logistical support** to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team, including but not limited to:

- All logistical arrangements for the travel (including travel details; DSA-payments; transportation; etc.)
- All logistical arrangements for the meetings/interviews/focus groups/etc., ensuring interview partners adequately represent men, women and other marginalised groups (including independent translator/interpreter if needed); set-up of interview schedules; arrangement of ad-hoc meetings as requested by the evaluation team; transportation from/to the interview venues; scheduling sufficient time for the interviews (around 45 minutes); ensuring that members of the evaluation team and the respective interviewees are present during the interviews; etc.)
- All logistical arrangements for the presentation of the evaluation results;
- Ensure timely payment of all fees/DSA/etc. (payments for the evaluation team need to be released within 5 working days after the respective deliverable is cleared by IEU).

Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are identified by the project managers. The CLPs are the main stakeholders, i.e. a limited number of those deemed as particularly relevant to be involved throughout the evaluation process, i.e. in reviewing and commenting on the TOR and the evaluation questions, reviewing and commenting on the draft evaluation report, as well as facilitating the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action. Stakeholders include all those to be invited to participate in the interviews and surveys, including the CLPs.

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 website: [http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html). Furthermore, IEU provides guidance, quality assurance and evaluation expertise, as well as interacts with the project manager and the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process. IEU may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation process.

IEU reviews, comments on and clears all steps and deliverables during the evaluation process: Terms of Reference; Selection of the evaluation team, Inception Report; Draft Evaluation Report;
Final Evaluation Report; Evaluation Follow-up Plan. IEU further publishes the final evaluation report and the Evaluation Brief on the UNODC website, as well as sends the final evaluation report to an external evaluation quality assurance provider. Moreover, IEU may decide, in consultation with Project Management, to upgrade any Independent Project Evaluation to an In-Depth Evaluation considering e.g. an unforeseen higher involvement of IEU staff in the evaluation process.

X. PAYMENT MODALITIES

The evaluation team will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. The contracts are legally binding documents in which the evaluation team agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines. Payment is correlated to deliverables and three instalments are typically foreseen:

1. The first payment upon clearance of the Inception Report (in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates) by IEU;
2. The second payment upon clearance of the Draft Evaluation Report (in line with UNODC norms, standards, evaluation guidelines and templates) by IEU;
3. The third and final payment (i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report (in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates) and clearance by IEU, as well as presentation of final evaluation findings and recommendations.

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 forms.
ANNEX II. EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

Questionnaire for the Final Independent Project Evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

NOTE: THIS A PAPER FORMAT (WORD) VERSION

Global Programme “Support to crime prevention and criminal justice reform” (GLOT63)

The Independent Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is in the process of undertaking a final, Independent Project Evaluation of the Global Programme “Support to crime prevention and criminal justice reform” (GLOT63).

The aim of the evaluation is to assess the results of the Global Programme, to identify lessons learned and to provide good practices in order to inform future programming in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice reform. The evaluation will also specifically assess the implementation of the recommendations of the 2012 evaluation of the Global Programme, and how gender equality has been mainstreamed into its design and implementation.

The evaluation is being carried out by a team of external independent evaluators, Ms. Elca Stigter (lead evaluator) and Mr. Tapio Lappi-Seppälä (senior expert).

As a CPCJ focal point your views are very important to this evaluation. The independent evaluation team would therefore appreciate your assistance through completion of this short questionnaire. While the evaluation team appreciates that some respondents have already been interviewed, and some will be in the near future, we would be grateful for your responses to this brief questionnaire in order to draw quantitative data.

Most questions request an assessment in numeric form. However, you are also asked to detail your answer in words. Please use this opportunity in order to clarify and complement your views.

The online questionnaire can be accessed by using the following link:

The deadline for filling out the questionnaire is 20 June 2018.

For any questions and/or if you are unable to access the online questionnaire, please fill in the Word document attached to this email, and send it to/contact Mr Tapio Lappi-Seppälä at Tapio.Lappi-Seppala@helsinki.fin
Confidentiality

You are assured of complete confidentiality. You are not required to provide your name or title when completing the survey and all information provided will only be seen by the evaluation team. The data will be presented only in an aggregated form and no individual will be identified.

Thank you very much for your participation!
Questionnaire for the Final Independent Project Evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

Global Programme “Support to crime prevention and criminal justice reform” (GLOT63)

Questionnaire for UNODC CPCJ Focal Points

I BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Do not want to say

2. Where do you work?
   - UNODC HEADQUARTERS Justice Section
   - UNODC HEADQUARTERS - Other
   - UNODC regional office
   - UNODC national office
   - Other – please specify.................................................................

3. In which of the following thematic fields do you work? Tick more than one if relevant.
   - Prison reform
   - Probation services
   - Crime prevention
   - Violence against women
   - Protection of victims & witnesses
   - Justice for children
   - Restorative justice
   - Legal aid
   - Border control
   - Maritime crime
   - Police and policing
   - Prosecution services, judiciary and the courts
   - Trafficking in persons
   - Other, please specify_________
4. In which activities of the Global Programme GLOT63 were you directly involved? Please tick more than one if relevant.

- [ ] Assessment of national policies and legislation
- [ ] Project/programme development
- [ ] Production of CPCJ tools
- [ ] Training activities
- [ ] Revision of CPCJ standards and norms
- [ ] Development of national/regional strategies/action plans
- [ ] None
- [ ] Other, please specify_______________________________________________________

II. RELEVANCE

5. How relevant has the Global Programme been to supporting the overall objectives to strengthen crime prevention and criminal justice responses?

- [ ] Highly relevant
- [ ] Relevant
- [ ] Relevant to some extent
- [ ] Not relevant
- [ ] Do not know
- [ ] No answer

Please provide more detail:

____________________________________________________________

6. [Only for field-level staff] How relevant has the Global Programme been for the implementation of the Regional/Country Programme in your region?

- [ ] Highly relevant
- [ ] Relevant
- [ ] Relevant to some extent
- [ ] Not relevant
- [ ] Do not know
- [ ] No answer

Please provide more detail:

____________________________________________________________
7. How relevant were the various forms of support and activities undertaken under the Global Programme from your perspective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly relevant</th>
<th>Relevant to some extent</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of criminal justice systems and crime prevention strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of crime prevention and criminal justice policies and programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of crime prevention and criminal justice programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and dissemination of tools (such as handbooks and guides)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and implementation of training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative and/ or Secretariat support for the development of UN-standards and norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer:

III. DESIGN

8. Has the Global Programme been designed with clear focus areas since 2012?

☐ Yes
☐ To some extent
☐ No
☐ Do not know
☐ No answer

Please explain your answer:............................

IV. EFFICIENCY

9. Are you familiar with the global instruments and tools listed below?

☑ If yes, please rate their usefulness.
☑ If no, please move on to the next question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not familiar</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Less useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Do not know/no answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison reform: Handbook on Women and Imprisonment (second edition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison reform: Handbook on Strategies to Reduce Overcrowding in Prisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison reform: Handbook on the management of violent extremist offenders and the prevention of radicalization to violence in prisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison reform: Nelson Mandela Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women: Strengthening Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Responses to Violence against Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women: Handbook for prosecutors on effective responses to violence against women and girls (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women: Model Action Plan on Violence against Women for the Criminal Justice System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women: Training curricula based on the UN rules for the treatment of women prisoners and non-custodial measures for women offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women: Training curricula on prosecution responses to violence against women and girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against migrants: technical paper to facilitate UNODC technical assistance to Member States with the aim to support them in their efforts to eliminate violence against migrants, migrant workers and their families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice for children: Practical measures on the elimination of violence against children in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justice for Children: Training Curricula for Prosecutors and Judges and Law Enforcement Officials on the Treatment of Child Victims and Witnesses of Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice for Victims: Handbook and Training Modules on Justice for Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing and Police Reform: Handbook on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Official - Co-authored with OHCHR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer:

10. Has the Global Programme made a tangible difference at the local level?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] To some extent
- [ ] No
- [ ] Do not know
- [ ] No answer

Please explain your answer:

11. Has there been clear communication between the project team and field staff, based on a clear delineation of responsibilities, when implementing the Global Programme?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] To some extent
- [ ] No
- [ ] Do not know
- [ ] No answer

Please explain your answer:
12. Has the Global Programme been clearly branded from your perspective?
   - Yes
   - To some extent
   - No
   - Do not know
   - No answer

Please explain your answer:

V. PARTNERSHIPS

13. Have the right partnerships been initiated, nurtured and strengthened to support the implementation of the Global Programme?
   - Yes
   - To some extent
   - No
   - Do not know
   - No answer

Please explain your answer:

VI. EFFECTIVENESS

14. To what extent has the support provided by the Global Programme from 2012 onwards been effective in encouraging the states to develop and implement crime prevention and criminal justice reform initiatives? Please indicate per substance area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Effective to some extent</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Improving prison conditions and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Advancing women’s rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Protecting children in the criminal justice system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Protecting migrants and taking care of their rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing judicial integrity</td>
<td>Increasing effectiveness in police work and prosecution</td>
<td>Providing legal aid</td>
<td>Preventing violent crime generally</td>
<td>Providing more options for restorative justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please explain your answer:**

**15.** To what extent have the UNODC tools, manuals and training materials been effective to improve criminal justice procedures and practices, and strategies and programmes for crime prevention? Please indicate per substance area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Effective to some extent</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Improving prison conditions and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Advancing women’s rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Protecting children in the criminal justice system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Protecting migrants and taking care of their rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Enhancing judicial integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Increasing effectiveness in police work and prosecution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Providing legal aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Preventing violent crime generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Providing more options for restorative justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please explain your answer:**
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16. To what extent has the support and technical assistance and advice provided by the Global Programme been effective in encouraging the development of new UN standards and norms and the updating of the existing ones in crime prevention and criminal justice? Please indicate per substance area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Area</th>
<th>Highly effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Effective to some extent</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improving prison conditions and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improving women’s rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Protecting children in the criminal justice system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protecting migrants and taking care of their rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enhancing judicial integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increasing effectiveness in police work and prosecution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Providing legal aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Preventing violent crime generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Providing more options for restorative justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer:

VI. IMPACT / SUSTAINABILITY

17. Are there any concrete changes due to the implementation of the Global Programme? Please tick the appropriate.

- [ ] Improvements in prison conditions
- [ ] Improvements in human rights
- [ ] Improvements in the protection of children
- [ ] Improvements in victim-protection
- [ ] Improvements in witness-protection
☐ Improvements in crime prevention
☐ Reducing the use of imprisonment
☐ Advancing women’s rights in the criminal justice system
☐ Increasing the use of alternative sanctions
☐ Increasing the use of restorative practices
☐ Increasing prosecution efficiency
☐ Increasing police cooperation
☐ Enhanced professional skills and expertise of criminal justice practitioners
☐ Increased public awareness and knowledge-base
☐ Influence in concrete national strategies or action plans
☐ Changes in legislation
☐ Changes in judicial and administrative practices
☐ Improved physical infrastructure
☐ Other – please specify

Please explain your answer:

VII. HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER

18. Have human rights been adequately taken into account into the design and implementation of the Global Programme?

☐ Yes
☐ Partially
☐ No
☐ Do not know
☐ No answer

Please explain your answer:

19. Has gender equality been adequately taken into account into the design and implementation of the Global Programme?

☐ Yes
☐ Partially
☐ No
☐ Do not know
☐ No answer

Please explain your answer:
20. Do you feel that the Global Programme has been able to advance the rights women, children or vulnerable groups in the criminal justice system as victims, witnesses or offenders?

☐ Yes  ☐ To some extent  ☐ Hardly  ☐ Not at all  ☐ Do not know  ☐ No answer

Please explain your answer:

VIII. CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

21. Please share at least one good practice of the Global Programme?

______________________________________________________________________

22. Please share at least one lessons learned of the Global Programme?

______________________________________________________________________

23. Do you have any recommendations?

______________________________________________________________________

Further comments:
Questionnaire for the Final Independent Project Evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

NOTE: THIS A PAPER FORMAT (WORD) VERSION

Global Programme “Support to crime prevention and criminal justice reform” (GLOT63)

The Independent Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is in the process of undertaking a final, Independent Project Evaluation of the Global Programme “Support to crime prevention and criminal justice reform” (GLOT63).

The aim of the evaluation is to assess the results of the project, to identify lessons learned and to provide good practices in order to inform future programming in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice reform. The evaluation will also specifically assess how gender equality has been mainstreamed into the project.

As a participant in at least one UNODC expert meeting or training held under this programme, your views are very important to this evaluation.

The evaluation is being carried out by a team of external independent evaluators, Ms. Elca Stigter (lead evaluator) and Mr. Tapio Lappi-Seppälä (senior expert). The evaluation team would appreciate your assistance through completion of this short questionnaire.

The deadline for filling out the questionnaire is 20 June 2018.

Most questions request an assessment in numeric form. However, you are also asked to detail your answer in words. Please use this opportunity in order to clarify and complement your reasons and views.

The online questionnaire can be accessed by using one of the following links:

English:

Spanish:

Arabic

For any questions and/or if you are unable to access the online questionnaire, please fill in the Word document attached to this email, and send it to/contact Mr Tapio Lappi-Seppälä at Tapio.Lappi-Seppala@helsinki.fin
Confidentiality

You are assured of complete confidentiality. You are not required to provide your name or title when completing the survey and all information provided will only be seen by the evaluation team. The data will be presented only in an aggregated form and no individual will be identified.

Thank you very much for your participation!
Questionnaire for the Final Independent Project Evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

Global Programme “Support to crime prevention and criminal justice reform”
(GLOT63)

Target group: experts/trainees

I BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. In which one of the following meetings and/or trainings have you participated? Please tick the appropriate.

☐ Intergovernmental Expert Group meeting on the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, Vienna, 31 January-2 February 2012
☐ Expert Group meeting on the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, Cape Town, 2-5 March 2015
☐ Open-ended intergovernmental Expert Group meeting on the development of a draft set of model strategies and practical measures on the elimination of violence against children in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice, Bangkok, 18-21 February 2014
☐ Expert Group Meeting on the Management of Violent Extremist Prisoners and the Prevention of Radicalisation to Violence in Prisons, Vienna, 16-18 December 2015
☐ UNODC Regional Training of Trainers Workshop on Effective Prosecution Responses to Violence against Women and Girls in Bangkok, Bangkok, 4-6 May 2016
☐ Meeting on Multi-Sectoral Services to Respond to Gender-Based Violence against Women and Girls in Asia and the Pacific, co-organized by UNODC, UNFPA, UN Women and WHO, Bangkok, June 2017
☐ Sub-regional workshop for Central American countries on the implementation of the Bangkok Rules, held in Panama, Panama, 19 September 2017
☐ Regional training workshop on the conduct of law enforcement officials in maintaining order and responding to crime in the Middle East and North African Countries, Abu Dhabi, 27 February-1 March 2017
☐ None of the meetings

2. For which type of institution/organization do you work?

☐ International organization
☐ Government
☐ Academic/research institute
☐ International NGO
3. What is the nature of your work?

☐ Policy and planning
☐ Operational - programme/project implementation
☐ Administrative
☐ Judicial adjudication
☐ Research
☐ Other - please specify:

4. What is your gender?

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Prefer not to share it

II. RELEVANCE

5. How relevant was/were the meeting(s)/training(s) you attended in light of global/regional and/or national needs?

☐ Highly relevant
☐ Relevant
☐ Relevant to some extent
☐ Not relevant
☐ Do not know
☐ No answer

Please explain your answer:

III. EFFICIENCY

6. How useful did you find the meeting(s)/workshop(s) attended?

☐ Highly useful
☐ Useful
☐ Useful to some extent
☐ Not useful
☐ Do not know
☐ No answer
Please explain your answer:

7. Are you familiar with the global instruments and tools given below?
   - If yes, please rate the concerned tools.
   - If no, please continue with the next question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not familiar with tool</th>
<th>Familiar with tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useful to some extent</td>
<td>Not useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not know / No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Prison Reform: Handbook on Strategies to Reduce Overcrowding in Prisons
- Prison Reform: Handbook on the International Transfer of Sentenced Persons
- Prison reform: Handbook on Women and Imprisonment
- Prison reform: Nelson Mandela Rules
- Prison reform: Handbook on the management of violent extremist offenders and the prevention of radicalization to violence in prisons
- Violence against women: Strengthening Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Responses to Violence against Women
- Violence against women: Handbook for prosecutors on effective responses to violence against women and girls
- Violence against women: Model Action Plan on Violence against Women for the Criminal Justice System
- Violence against women: Training modules based on the UN rules for the treatment of women prisoners and non-custodial measures for women offenders
- Violence against women: Training curriculum on prosecution responses to violence against women and girls
V. PARTNERSHIPS and COOPERATION

8. Have you overall been satisfied with your cooperation with UNODC?

- Yes
- To some extent
- No
- Do not know
- No answer

Please explain your answer:

VI. EFFECTIVENESS

9. Has/have the meeting(s)/training(s) been effective in encouraging the development and implementation of crime prevention and criminal justice reform initiatives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highly effective</th>
<th>Effective to some extent</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving prison conditions and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing women’s rights in the criminal justice system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer:
Protecting children in the criminal justice system

Enhanced professional skills and expertise in criminal justice practitioners

Please explain your answer:

10. Have the UNODC tools, manuals and training materials been effective in improving criminal justice procedures, practices and work in the field of crime prevention?

- Highly effective
- Effective
- Effective to some extent
- Not effective
- Do not know
- No answer

Please explain your answer:

11. To what extent has the support provided been effective in encouraging the development of new UN standards and norms and/or the updating of the existing ones in crime prevention and criminal justice?

- Highly effective
- Effective
- Effective to some extent
- Not effective
- Do not know
- No answer

Please explain your answer:
V. IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

12. Are there any concrete changes in one or more of the following areas as a result of the meeting(s)/training(s) you participated in? Select the appropriate answers.

☐ Improvements in prison conditions
☐ Improvements in human rights
☐ Improvements in women’s position in the criminal justice
☐ Improvements in the protection of children
☐ Improvements in victim-protection
☐ Improvements in witness-protection
☐ Improvements in crime prevention
☐ Reducing the use of imprisonment
☐ Increasing the use of alternative sanctions
☐ Increasing the use of restorative practices
☐ Increasing prosecution efficiency
☐ Increasing police cooperation
☐ Enhanced professional skills and expertise of criminal justice practitioners
☐ Increased public awareness and knowledge-base
☐ Influence in concrete national strategies or action plans
☐ Changes in legislation
☐ Changes in judicial and administrative practices
☐ Improved physical infrastructure
☐ Other – please describe

Please explain your answer and give examples:

13. How has/have the meeting(s)/training(s) you attended been useful for you and/or your organization/institution? Select the appropriate answers.

☐ Broadened my understanding of the nature of the issues
☐ Enhanced my knowledge and/or skills
☐ Supported and improved my daily work
☐ Led to a reconsideration of my own values and priorities
☐ A lasting positive difference in my work
☐ Enabled me to conduct training
☐ Supported training of colleagues after the ToT
☐ Not been useful
☐ Other – please describe

Please explain your answer and give examples:
VI. HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENDER

14. Have human rights been adequately taken into account in the meeting(s)/training(s) you attended?

☐ Yes
☐ Partially
☐ No
☐ Do not know
☐ No answer

Please explain your answer:

15. Has gender equality been adequately taken into account in the meeting(s)/training(s) you attended?

☐ Yes
☐ Partially
☐ No
☐ Do not know
☐ No answer

Please explain your answer:

16. Do you feel that the outcomes of the meeting(s)/training(s) has contributed to further advancing the rights of women, children or vulnerable groups in the criminal justice system as victims, witnesses or offenders?

☐ Yes
☐ To some extent
☐ Hardly
☐ No
☐ Do not know
☐ No answer

Please explain your answer:
VII. CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

17. Please share at least one good practice:

______________________________________________________________________

18. Please share at least one lessons learned:

______________________________________________________________________

19. Do you have any recommendations for UNODC?

______________________________________________________________________

20. Further comments:

______________________________________________________________________
ANNEX III. DESK REVIEW LIST

UNODC documents

- Project document (1 doc);
- Project revisions 2011, 2012, 2015, 2016, 2017 (6 docs);
- Annual progress reports 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 (6 docs);
- Semi-annual progress reports 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 (5 docs);
- Training assessment reports (5 docs);
- 2012 mid-term independent project evaluation GLO/T63 (1 doc);
- Donor contracts 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 (9 docs)
- Donor reports Germany, Switzerland, Japan, Thailand (7 docs);
- Donor letters (2 docs);
- Tools (see table Overview publications prepared with contribution from the GP) (18 docs);
- IEGM documents, incl. lists of participants and meeting reports (12 docs);
- JUSTICE SECTION Programmes (GLOX99; GLOZ06; GLOZ43; GLOZ81; GLOZ82; GLOZ85; GLOW65) (7 docs);
- Mid-term independent project evaluation Doha project (1 doc)
- Thematic Programme CPCJ 2012-2015 (1 doc)
- UNODC Gender Equality Strategy (1 doc)
- UNODC SDG documents (3 docs)

Number of internal documents reviewed: 104

External documents

• UNGA resolutions (3 docs)

• ECOSOC documents - Reports of the Executive Director on the activities of UNODC for the CCPCJ and the Committee on Narcotic Drugs 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 (6 docs)


• SDG background material/reports (3 docs)

• UN reform (1 doc)

• PRI reports on SMR (2 docs)

Number of external documents reviewed: 21

Overall number of documents reviewed: 125
ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of interviewees</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Sex disaggregated data</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>Male: 8</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Male: 6</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Male: 3</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UN/ICRC</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Male: 0</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Male: 3</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organization/incl. consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Male: 1</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex disaggregated data</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male: 21</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 This could be e.g. Civil Society Organisation; Project/Programme implementer; Government recipient; Donor; Academia/Research institute; etc.
### ANNEX V. FOLLOW-UP RECOMMENDATIONS 2012 INDEPENDENT MID-TERM PROJECT EVALUATION GLOT63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main findings 2012 independent mid-term evaluation</th>
<th>Recommendations 2012 independent mid-term evaluation</th>
<th>Assessment Project Team (included in project revision 2017)</th>
<th>Key findings 2018 independent final project evaluation: implementation recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The project has very broad thematic scope encompassing seven outcome areas ranging from penal reform to preventing violence against women.</td>
<td>1. The project should be redesigned. It is essential that focus areas are agreed upon, so that the thematic scope can be narrowed, the most successful assistance forms (handbooks, trainings) should be promoted.</td>
<td>1. Implemented</td>
<td>1. Partially implemented. The GP has been redesigned. The logframe was changed with a reduction in the number of outcomes and outputs in order to align it with the Thematic Programme on CPCJ Reform 2012-2015. Focus areas were altogether removed from the logframe. The thematic scope of the GP has gradually been narrowed with the launch of GPs on justice for children and prison reform (incl. legal aid and crime prevention). No particular action has been undertaken to promote the most successful assistance forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The project’s strategy and objective are not always clear to stakeholders. Donors would like to receive regular updates on the state of implementation of the project, highlighting its main achievements.</td>
<td>2. Rebranding of the project must be clearly communicated to all stakeholders, especially the donors, who should also receive regular updates on the funded activities performed within the scope of the project.</td>
<td>2. Partially implemented</td>
<td>2. Not implemented. Branding of the GP was not a priority considering its primary purpose as administrative vehicle. No regular updates were provided to donors about the GP’s performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Donors are interested in the difference the provided funding</td>
<td>3. A. The project’s activities should be focused on making a tangible difference at the</td>
<td>3. Partially implemented</td>
<td>3. Partially implemented. The GP’s activities have to some extent been implemented at the field level, in close cooperation with regional and field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:**

The follow-up recommendations from the 2012 independent mid-term evaluation highlight the need for redesigning the project to focus on specific outcomes and assist forms, improving clarity of strategy and objectives, and better communication of project achievements to stakeholders. The 2018 independent final project evaluation supports these recommendations, noting the importance of a clear thematic scope and regular updates for effective project management.
| makes for the intended beneficiaries. | local level. B. These activities must be in areas where GLOT63 has a comparative advantage over other rule of law actors. | offices. The GP’s objective was however also to support work at the normative and policy level. This work is pivotal too, and the phrase ‘making a tangible difference at the local level’ may not be the optimal way to utilize global, headquarters-based resources since the launch of the RPs. UNODC Justice Section staff had a comparative advantage over other actors in terms of its solid expertise in criminal justice reform, and the GP has capitalized on that in relevant areas, often in close cooperation with other rule of law actors. |
| 4. GLOT63 has had no full-time project manager with the responsibility for implementing its strategic vision and sufficient administrative power. | 4. The post of full-time project manager, with strong administrative powers should be created. | 4. Not implemented 4. Not implemented. GLOT63 had a part-time project manager, a CPCJ Officer appointed at the P4-level (RB-funded) prior to and since 2012. This must however be contextualized as GLOT63 also had a part-time CPCJ officer at the P3 level (RB-funded) responsible for administrative support and reporting in addition to administrative assistant support until 2015. Other CPCJ officers working in the Justice Section had however access to usage of GP funds without involvement of the project manager, and strong administrative powers were not given to the project management team/project manager. |
| 5. Progress reports do not always contain sufficient quantitative data analysis, the project documentation lacks certain types of information. | 5. The project should receive a built-in progress monitoring system, including baseline studies, quantitative and qualitative indicators of achievement of objectives. | 5. Partially implemented 5. Partially implemented. UNODC semi-annual and annual progress reports provide quantitative data analysis, which, arguably, was built-in as part of indicator reporting. However, the GP did not have a comprehensive monitoring system which clearly delineated the type of data required for monitoring per CPCJ officer, including qualitative data to measure achievements at the outcome and objective levels. Additionally, a storage system for all GP-related documentation was missing. |
6. The communication channels between the Headquarters and field offices are in some areas weak, the reporting is irregular and the support from Headquarters not always sufficient.

6. The communication between Headquarters and field offices should be improved, clear delineation of functions and responsibilities is required. UNODC to consider dovetailing accounting systems.

6. Implemented

6. Implemented to a large extent. The communication between headquarters and the field was overall assessed in a positive light, and viewed as very supportive in terms of overall support and technical expertise provided. At times a clearer delineation of functions and responsibilities was however desired. Additionally, the competition for resources also compromised occasionally transparent and effective communication between headquarters and the field.

7. The concept of “seed funding” should be carefully applied and always preceded by an extensive analysis of potential risks, benefits and suitable exit strategy completed by GLOT63 PM and FO representatives.

7. Implemented

7. Implemented to a large extent. The concept of ‘seed funding’ which has also been referred to as ‘pilot projects’, has been used in different ways, including the provision of funding for a temporary UNV position, and the conduct of assessments to prepare project proposals etc. It has been carefully applied and been effective in some instances to develop ‘roots’ in a particular country, and obtain donor funding to support programmes. Extensive analysis appears to have been done to calculate risks.

8. UNODC is widely regarded as a professional and impartial organization, which could encourage key regional stakeholders to work together.

8. UNODC should promote its “honest broker” role and always analyse the regional political environment before taking action at the local level.

8. Implemented

8. Implemented to a large extent. UNODC expertise was highly appreciated by stakeholders, although its ‘honest broker’ role came less to the fore during this evaluation, possibly because of the headquarters focus. Headquarters staff, in close cooperation with field offices, analysed the political environment before taking action.

9. The most successful forms of assistance performed under GLOT63 are the on-line available handbooks and other technical tools along

9. Given the interest in UNODC on-line handbooks and training materials, development of e-learning courses could be both efficient and cost effective way of

9. Partially implemented

9. Not implemented. The development and use of e-learning courses was no panacea to improve the general visibility of the GP with stakeholders, and it was also not considered cost-effective.
with trainings organized by UNODC. building capacity and improving the general visibility of the project with the stakeholders, including donors.
### ANNEX VI. INDICATORS, TARGETS AND RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>States improve CPCJ systems in line with UN standards and norms in CPCJ and other relevant international instruments</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target 2015 / Reached 2015</th>
<th>Target 2018/ Reached 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries that implement CPCJ system reforms with GLOT63 support</td>
<td>70 / 75</td>
<td>70 / NA*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of standards and norms in CPCJ adopted by ECOSOC and/or the General Assembly with GLOT63 support</td>
<td>4 / 3</td>
<td>4 / ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Technical assistance: States develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies based on UNODC assessments, advice and programme support</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target 2015 / Reached 2015</th>
<th>Target 2018/ Reached 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of technical assistance initiatives developed and/or implemented with GLOT63 support</td>
<td>60 / 62</td>
<td>80 / NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.1</th>
<th>Criminal justice systems and crime prevention strategies are assessed and support is provided to Member States developing CPCJ policies and strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target 2015 / Reached 2015</th>
<th>Target 2018/ Reached 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of assessments and reports shared with national counterparts</td>
<td>30 / 26</td>
<td>40 / 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.2</th>
<th>Technical assistance programmes aimed at CP and CJ reform are designed and implemented based on applicable standards and norms and within the framework of UNODC thematic, regional and country programmes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target 2015 / Reached 2015</th>
<th>Target 2018/ Reached 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of CPCJ programmes developed</td>
<td>35 / 33</td>
<td>45 / 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CPCJ pilot projects delivered</td>
<td>8 / 8</td>
<td>10 / 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>States and the international community develop and implement CPCJ policies and strategies using UNODC tools and training</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target 2015 / Reached 2015</th>
<th>Target 2018/ Reached 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries using tools and training programmes in the framework of CPCJ initiatives</td>
<td>65 / 75</td>
<td>75 / NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.1</th>
<th>Tools based on international standards and best practices, are developed and made available for practitioners’ use, in multiple languages (with priority to UN official languages).</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target 2015 / Reached 2015</th>
<th>Target 2018/ Reached 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tools developed and used that promote UN standards and norms in CPCJ and facilitate their implementation</td>
<td>15 / 21</td>
<td>25 / 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.2</th>
<th>Training programmes are developed and implemented to assist CPCJ practitioners, trainers and UNODC staff</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target 2015 / Reached 2015</th>
<th>Target 2018/ Reached 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of trainings conducted or supported</td>
<td>20 / 30</td>
<td>30 / 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people trained (% of female trainees)</td>
<td>50 % / 41 %</td>
<td>50 % / 49 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>Support to intergovernmental bodies: states develop or update standards and norms with UNODC support</td>
<td>Number of UN CPCJ standards and norms developed or updated with GLOT63 support</td>
<td>4 / 3</td>
<td>4 / 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.1</td>
<td>States receive normative and/or secretariat support</td>
<td>Number of working groups (IEGM, CCPCJ, Congress) provided with GLOT63 support</td>
<td>4 / 4</td>
<td>4 / 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA = not available in APRs

Source: Annual Progress Reports
### ANNEX VII. OVERVIEW PUBLICATIONS PREPARED WITH SUPPORT OF THE GP

Table I. Overview publications prepared with support of the GP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison reform</th>
<th>Justice for children</th>
<th>Violence against women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handbook on Women and Imprisonment (2nd edition 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training curriculum on Women and Imprisonment version 1.0 (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook on the management of violent extremist prisoners and the prevention of radicalization to violence in prisons (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing compliance with the Nelson Mandela Rules – A checklist for internal inspection mechanisms (2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant protection</td>
<td>Law enforcement, incl. private security services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource book on the use of force and firearms in law enforcement (2017 - co-authored with UNOHCHR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX VIII. OVERVIEW RELEVANT UNGA, ECOSOC AND CCPCJ RESOLUTIONS

UNited Nation General Assembly Resolutions (UNGA)

*bold and underlined in resolutions added by authors of this evaluation report


10. Also requests the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice to establish, in line with paragraph 49 of the Salvador Declaration, an open-ended intergovernmental expert group, to be convened between the twentieth and twenty-first sessions of the Commission, to exchange information on best practices, as well as national legislation and existing international law, and on the revision of existing United Nations standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners so that they reflect recent advances in correctional science and best practices, with a view to making recommendations to the Commission on possible next steps;

12. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, in the development and implementation of its technical assistance programmes, to aim for sustainable and long-lasting results in the prevention, prosecution and punishment of crime, in particular by building, modernizing and strengthening criminal justice systems, as well as promoting the rule of law, and to design such programmes to achieve those aims for all components of the criminal justice system, in an integrated way and with a long-term perspective, increasing the capacity of requesting States to prevent and suppress the various types of crime affecting societies, including organized crime and cybercrime;

65/228/2010. Strengthening crime prevention and criminal justice responses to violence against women

17. Calls upon the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to support national efforts to promote the empowerment of women and gender equality in order to enhance national efforts to eliminate violence against women, including by strengthening throughout its programme of work its crime prevention and criminal justice efforts in response to violence against women;

18. Urges the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and Member States and invites the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network to continue to offer training and capacity-building opportunities, in particular for practitioners working in the area of crime prevention and criminal justice and providers of support services to
victims of violence against women, and to make available and disseminate information on successful intervention models, preventive programmes and other practices;

19. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to intensify its efforts to ensure the widest possible use and dissemination of the updated Model Strategies and Practical Measures, including through the development or revision of relevant tools, such as handbooks, training manuals, programmes and modules, including online capacity-building modules for each section of the updated Model Strategies and Practical Measures, as an efficient and practical way to disseminate the relevant content, and invites Member States and other donors to provide extrabudgetary contributions for that purpose, in accordance with the rules and procedures of the United Nations;

20. Invites the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to strengthen coordination in its activities in the area of violence against women with other relevant entities of the United Nations system, particularly the United Nations Development Fund for Women, the Division for the Advancement of Women of the Secretariat, the United Nations Children’s Fund, the United Nations Population Fund and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, as well as other relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, so as to make efficient use of the financial, technical, material and human resources in the application of the updated Model Strategies and Practical Measures;

21. Also invites the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to cooperate with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations of the Secretariat in the development of training material based on the updated Model Strategies and Practical Measures for military, police and civilian personnel of peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations;

67/185/2012. Promoting efforts to eliminate violence against migrants, migrant workers and their families

(directed at member states, no directs requests for the UNODC)


6. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources, to continue to provide advisory services and technical assistance to Member States, upon request, in the area of criminal justice reform, including restorative justice, alternatives to imprisonment and the development of integrated plans for the provision of legal aid;

7. Also requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources, to make the Principles and Guidelines widely available, including through the development of relevant tools such as handbooks and training manuals;
12. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to provide substantive contributions to the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) with regard to efforts to complement the development of United Nations guidelines on safer cities, taking into consideration the Guidelines for Cooperation and Technical Assistance in the Field of Urban Crime Prevention and the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime, and to regularly inform Member States of the progress made in that regard, with a view to receiving comments;

13. Invites the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network to continue to include in their work programmes the issue of the rule of law, as well as to consider exploring the challenges posed to the rule of law and development and to develop appropriate training material;

68/189/2013 Model strategies and practical measures on the elimination of violence against children in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice

6. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to continue providing advisory services and technical assistance to Member States, upon request, to support the implementation of United Nations standards and norms relating to crime prevention and to child rights in the administration of criminal justice, with a view to promoting and protecting the rights of children alleged as, accused of or recognized as having infringed criminal law, as well as of child victims and witnesses of crime;

7. Invites the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and the Human Rights Council, as well as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Office of the High Commissioner and the United Nations Children’s Fund, to closely coordinate their activities relating to child rights in the administration of justice and the prevention of and responses to violence against children in the criminal justice system, in cooperation with the Committee on the Rights of the Child;

8. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to convene a meeting of an open-ended intergovernmental expert group, in collaboration with all relevant United Nations entities, in particular the United Nations Children’s Fund, the Office of the High Commissioner and the Special Representative on Violence against Children, to develop a draft set of model strategies and practical measures on the elimination of violence against children in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice, to be considered by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its session following the meeting of the open-ended intergovernmental expert group, and welcomes the offer of the Government of Thailand to act as host to that meeting in 2013;

9. Invites the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network to include in their work programmes the issue of violence against children, develop training materials and offer training and other capacity-building opportunities, in particular for
practitioners working in the areas of crime prevention and criminal justice and providers of support services for the victims of violence against children and for child witnesses within the criminal justice system, and to make available and disseminate information on successful intervention models, preventive programmes and other practices;

68/191/2013 Taking action against gender-related killing of women and girls

9. Encourages relevant United Nations entities and agencies, in particular United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Commission on the Status of Women, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), to support Member States in developing and implementing strategies and policies, upon request, at the national, regional and international levels to address and prevent gender-related killing of women and girls;

10. Encourages the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network to facilitate the gathering and dissemination of relevant and reliable data and other related information to be provided by Member States on their efforts to implement the present resolution;

11. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network to continue conducting and coordinating relevant research on gender-related killing of women and girls, particularly in connection with the standardization of the collection and analysis of data;

12. Encourages relevant United Nations entities and agencies, including the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Commission on the Status of Women, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, UN-Women and other specialized funds and programmes of the United Nations, to raise awareness among Member States regarding gender-related killing of women and girls;


11. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to take steps to ensure the broad dissemination of the Model Strategies and Practical Measures;

12. Also requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, at the request of Member States, to identify the needs and capacities of countries and to provide technical assistance and advisory services to Member States in order to develop or strengthen, as appropriate, legislation, procedures, policies and practices to prevent and respond to violence against children and to ensure respect for the rights of the child in the administration of justice;

13. Further requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to closely coordinate with the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme and with other
relevant national and regional institutes with a view to developing training materials and offering training and other capacity-building opportunities, in particular for practitioners working in the areas of crime prevention and criminal justice and for providers of support services for the victims of violence against children and for child witnesses within the criminal justice system, and to disseminate information on successful practices;

14. Invites the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and the Human Rights Council, as well as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the United Nations Children’s Fund, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Violence against Children, the Committee on the Rights of the Child and relevant regional and international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, to strengthen cooperation in supporting the efforts of States to eliminate all forms of violence against children;

70/176/2015. Taking action against gender-related killing of women and girls

15. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network to continue to conduct and coordinate relevant research on gender-related killing of women and girls, particularly in connection with the standardization of the collection, disaggregation, analysis and reporting of data;

16. Also requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to prepare, in collaboration with Member States, an analytical study on gender-related killing of women and girls at the global level, containing disaggregated data, including from relevant stakeholders, on this phenomenon to illustrate its different forms and patterns;


15. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to ensure broad dissemination of the Nelson Mandela Rules, to design guidance material and to provide technical assistance and advisory services to Member States in the field of penal reform, in order to develop or strengthen penitentiary legislation, procedures, policies and practices in line with the Rules;

71/209/2016. Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

12. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to continue to provide technical assistance to Member States, upon request, to strengthen the rule of law, taking also into account the work undertaken by other United Nations entities, within existing mandates, as well as regional and bilateral efforts, and to continue to ensure coordination and coherence, including through the Rule of Law Coordination and Resource Group;

51. Encourages Member States to take relevant measures, as appropriate to their national contexts, to ensure the diffusion, use and application of the United Nations standards and norms
in crime prevention and criminal justice, including the consideration and, where they deem it necessary, dissemination of existing manuals and handbooks developed and published by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime;

**ECOSOC RESOLUTIONS**

**2013/34. Model strategies and practical measures on the elimination of violence against children in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice**

6. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to continue providing advisory services and technical assistance to Member States, upon request, to support the implementation of United Nations standards and norms relating to crime prevention and to child rights in the administration of criminal justice, with a view to promoting and protecting the rights of children alleged as, accused of or recognized as having infringed criminal law, as well as of child victims and witnesses of crime;

7. Invites the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and the Human Rights Council, as well as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Office of the High Commissioner and the United Nations Children’s Fund, to closely coordinate their activities relating to child rights in the administration of justice and the prevention of and responses to violence against children in the criminal justice system, in cooperation with the Committee on the Rights of the Child;

8. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to convene a meeting of an open-ended intergovernmental expert group, in collaboration with all relevant United Nations entities, in particular the United Nations Children’s Fund, the Office of the High Commissioner and the Special Representative on Violence against Children, to develop a draft set of model strategies and practical measures on the elimination of violence against children in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice, to be considered by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its session following the meeting of the open-ended intergovernmental expert group, and welcomes the offer of the Government of Thailand to act as host to that meeting in 2013;

**2013/36. Taking action against gender-related killing of women and girls**

11. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network to continue conducting and coordinating relevant research on gender-related killing of women and girls, particularly in connection with the standardization of the collection and analysis of data;

**2014/21. Strengthening social policies as a tool for crime prevention**
7. Commends the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime for its development of tools and facilitation of technical assistance programmes, urges the Office to continue to strengthen such programmes, and calls upon the Organization, upon request by Member States, to support the sharing of successful experiences and best practices between Member States;

2016/17. Restorative justice in criminal matters

6. Invites the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to develop training materials on restorative justice and continue to offer training and other capacity-building opportunities in this regard, in particular for practitioners working in the areas of crime prevention and criminal justice, and to make available and disseminate information on successful restorative justice models and practices, in close coordination with the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network;

7. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to continue to provide advisory services and technical assistance to Member States, upon request, in the area of restorative juvenile justice;

2016/18. Mainstreaming holistic approaches in youth crime prevention

6. Calls upon the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Member States and relevant international and regional organizations to enhance cooperation and coordination at all levels, including with relevant non-governmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders, in order to better identify, understand, prevent and respond to the involvement of children and youth in criminal activities, and to share information, while preserving the best interests of the child, and knowledge and best practices regarding youth crime prevention;

7. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, together with the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network, to continue its efforts in promoting, as necessary, the collection, analysis and dissemination of data, disaggregated by sex and age, and systematic research on particular situations of social risk and exploitation of children and youth in criminal activities in all forms and manifestations;

8. Encourages Member States to make full use of the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime and the United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (the Riyadh Guidelines), as appropriate, in the wider context of their national economic and social policies, in order to strengthen gendersensitive crime prevention strategies aimed at children and youth and criminal justice approaches leading to adequate responses to crime in all its forms and manifestations including emerging forms of crime;

2017/19. Promoting and encouraging the implementation of alternatives to imprisonment as part of comprehensive crime prevention and criminal justice policies
8. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, together with the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network, to continue its efforts to promote the collection, analysis and dissemination of statistical data on relevant policies that relate to the social reintegration of offenders and reduce recidivism;

CCPCJ RESOLUTIONS

18/2 Civilian private security services: their role, oversight and contribution to crime prevention and community safety

2. Decides to establish an ad hoc open-ended intergovernmental expert group, inviting experts from academia and the private sector to become members of that group in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Economic and Social Council, to study the role of civilian private security services and their contribution to crime prevention and community safety and to consider, inter alia, issues relating to their oversight by competent State authorities, and invites Member States and other donors to provide extrabudgetary contributions in accordance with the rules and procedures of the United Nations;

3. Welcomes the offer of the Government of the United Arab Emirates to act as host to a meeting of the above-mentioned expert group;

4. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to prepare a report on the implementation of the present resolution for consideration by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its twentieth session.

21/1 Strengthening Government oversight of civilian private security services and the contribution of such services to crime prevention and community safety

2. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to circulate the Abu Dhabi draft preliminary recommendations on the oversight and regulation of civilian private security services and on their contribution to crime prevention and community safety to all Member States, through a note verbale requesting their response;

3. Also requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to prepare a report that summarizes and provides a synthesis of the responses of Member States, to be submitted to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its twenty-second session;

25/2/2016 Promoting legal aid, including through a network of legal aid providers

9. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to work closely with other United Nations agencies to continue to develop and disseminate, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources, relevant tools such as best practices, handbooks and training manuals,
and to provide advisory services and technical assistance to Member States, upon request, in the area of legal aid, and to continue reporting at future sessions of the Commission on its efforts in this regard;

26/3/2017 Mainstreaming a gender perspective into crime prevention and criminal justice policies and programmes and into efforts to prevent and combat transnational organized crime

17. Requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to continue to support Member States, upon request, in mainstreaming a gender perspective into their policies and programmes related to crime prevention and criminal justice and in preventing and combating transnational organized crime, and invites other relevant United Nations entities, within their mandates, to cooperate in this regard;

18. Also requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to continue to mainstream a gender perspective into all its practices, policies, programmes and tools related to transnational organized crime and to contribute appropriately, within its mandate, to the Sustainable Development Goals and the targets contained in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;