

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

Independent project evaluation of the

**Strengthening Termez River Port
Checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan Border**

UZB/J49
March 2011
(Revised December 2011)

Independent Evaluation Unit
December 2011



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2011

This evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of Mr. Hardy Roehling in cooperation with the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

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

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

Disclaimer

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

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

© United Nations, Month Year. All rights reserved.

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

This publication has not been formally edited.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BCP	Border Crossing Point
BPC	Border Protection Committee
CBP DHS	Customs and Border Protection of US Department of Homeland Security (CBP DHS)
CBP	Customs Border Protection (CBP), Department of Homeland Security (USA)
EXBS	Export Control and Related Border Security (US)
HAZMAT	Hazardous Materials
IBIT	International Border Interdiction Training
INL	International Narcotic and Law Enforcement Agency/ US Embassy
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NPO	National Project Officer
NSS	National Security Service
ROCA	Regional Office for Central Asia (UNODC)
SCC	State Customs Committee
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNOV	United Nations Office in Vienna
UPS	Uninterrupted Power Supply
UV	Ultra violet
WCO	World Customs Organization

CONTENTS

Executive summary	vi
Summary matrix.....	ix
I. Introduction.....	1
Background and context.....	1
Background and context of project	1
Purpose and scope of the evaluation	2
Methodology	3
Limitations to the evaluation.....	4
II. Evaluation findings and conclusions.....	5
Executing modalities of the project.....	5
Relevance	5
Effectiveness	6
Efficiency	7
Impact.....	8
Sustainability.....	8
Partnerships and cooperation	8
III. Recommendations	10
Cooperation with beneficiary	10
Purchase of equipment	10
Education and training activities	11
Relationship with the donor	11
Visibility.....	12
IV. Lessons learned and best practices.....	13

Annexes

I.	Terms of reference of the evaluation	15
II.	Mission schedule	21
III.	Evaluation tools: interview reports and questionnaires	22
IV.	List of persons contacted during the evaluation	24
V.	Desk review list	26
VI.	Map of heroin seizures in Uzbekistan, 2009	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

The UNODC Regional office in Tashkent contracted the evaluator to carry out the evaluation of the Project AD/UZB/J49 “Strengthening Termez River Port checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan border”.

The Final Evaluation Report is an abstract of the information compiled after the Expert received the relevant documents for the evaluation and conducted the Mission to Uzbekistan; the Report provides an analysis of the documents reviewed; Interviews and description of different recommendations for further consideration.

This evaluation of the project was envisaged in the project document and is conducted after the end of implementation of the project (February / March 2011).

The main objective of the project AD/UZB/J49 is to strengthen the interdiction capacity of law enforcement agencies located at the Termez River Port on the Uzbek-Afghan border. Meaning, the Termez River Port checkpoint is properly equipped with the specific equipment, the officers are trained to provide better interdiction services and Mechanisms for information exchange and coordination of efforts are established.

A number of activities were conducted to achieve the outcomes, like an Assessment of the River Port checkpoint facility and to identify the needs in terms of equipment, the provision of specialized equipment and communication facilities, the Provision of training in different areas

The project AD/UZB/J49 was implemented from March 2008 – December 2010 with an approved budget of US\$ 1,236,100.

Key findings

Executing modalities of the project

During the interviews and review of provided documents an elementary finding is that the UNODC ROCA office possesses all resources to implement the project successfully, the communication with all partners, reports and challenges regarding the lost of a project officers were covered by own resources in a professional way.

Meetings

There is a mutual importance confirmed from all stakeholders to combat the drug trafficking from Afghanistan.

The border management is a very sensitive topic in this region; therefore it is difficult to demonstrate facts and figures about seizures and results of trainings or provision of equipment, most of the information in these areas are classified.

The meetings with local authorities stated satisfactions and success during the implementation of the project regarding cooperation, communication and timely execution; some challenges with the function of equipment were solved immediately .

The donor of the project stated that UNODC performed professional in solving problems during the implementation and envisage having a higher visibility in future.

An overlapping with other projects or other activities could not be found

Training activities

During the project implementation external experts conducted two training courses with a number of topics related to the handling of equipment and modern border control procedures, the feedback from participants was positive and continuation of such trainings is requested in future under different projects.

Key conclusions

The relevance of the project is high since all important facts and issues were included, like the beneficiaries priorities, the lessons learned from previous projects and composition of equipment, training and infrastructure.

The implementing agency (UNODC) achieved the project objectives, outcomes and outputs to a maximum extent as intended in the project design and in close cooperation with the relevant agencies at this border crossing point.

The efficiency is justified through cost efficient and effective use of human resources to implement the project, there was a permanent timely management and purchasing equipment, reporting and communication with the stakeholders, minor adjustments needs to be taking into account in future (detail in the section).

In summary the impact from this type of project is high since the local authorities gathered an example for efficient upgrading border posts with different component like infrastructure, equipment and training, this might encourage them replicate this in other locations, minor adjustments shall happened from both sides with regards to human resources and access to the site.

The sustainability was ensured through different mechanisms, the equipment has local supplier warranty, the training delivered will have an impact on future training activities from the local border agencies and it is expected that the detection of border crimes will increase.

The cooperation between all relevant partners in this project was relevant, the communication was efficient and additional formal meeting, such as steering committee meeting, were not envisaged as essential for a good partnership.

Key recommendations

The following recommendations are directed towards UNODC for consideration:

(a) The constant cooperation with all beneficiary agencies is one of the most important subjects to design and to implement successful projects, in order to design and deliver training, to identify specific equipment and necessary infrastructure

(b) The purchase and maintenance of equipment is crucial to benefit to the needs of the agencies working at the project location, therefore the identification of the equipment, handling and future maintenance is important to make them operational

(c) The education and training activities through the implementation and beyond are important to secure the officers in handling equipment and proper procedures at borders

(d) The relationship with the donor is a main factor to ensure the satisfaction and knowledge of the donor on stages of implementation, through meetings and reports

(e) The visibility of a project ensures the information for all participating partners and beneficiaries and promotes the success of different stages of a project

SUMMARY MATRIX

Main findings	Supporting evidence	Recommendations
<p>Beneficiaries and the donors stated clearly satisfaction with the implementation procedures and performance of UNODC.</p> <p>Reports were accepted by all counterparts and counterparts stressed the success of the project and its timely execution</p> <p>No Project Steering Group was established.</p>	<p>Interviews with beneficiaries and the donors</p> <p>Annual / Semi Annual / Quarterly Reports</p>	<p>UNODC shall continue to maintain its good relation with beneficiaries and donors as demonstrated in this project</p> <p>Regular strategy meetings should continue to be held between stakeholders to continuously review effectiveness and to verify the intervention logic</p> <p>The initial proposal of having Steering Committee meetings would have greatly contributed to improved dialogue, ownership and sustainability.</p>
<p>The identification of the equipment, handling and future maintenance is important to make them operational</p> <p>The port infrastructure has been upgraded, the skills of the officers enhanced and the volume of seizures of drugs increased in the last year (confirmed by the Customs Service)</p> <p>Some equipment needs remain that could not be achieved within this project's available budget.</p> <p>Some challenges with the function of equipment were solved immediately from the local supply partner</p>	<p>Interviews with beneficiaries and the donors</p> <p>Meetings with local authorities</p>	<p>All partners should agree on the purchase and maintenance of equipment. As a result, the needs of the agencies working at the project location will be addressed</p> <p>Further, UNODC should prepare a clear agreement with the local stakeholders to gain access to the project site at later stage to monitor implementation and impact</p>
<p>Two training courses were delivered. 26 customs officials and border guards participated.</p> <p>No pre- or post -training tests or analysis were conducted ; however representatives perceived the skills of the officers had visibly enhanced and target groups claimed to have developed their skills</p>	<p>Training reports from the expert trainers and feedback from participants</p> <p>Meetings with representatives of beneficiaries</p>	<p>UNODC should communicate with partners/beneficiaries to design the most valuable training programs to which the approach allows for a more indirect effect - through subsequent adoption of regulatory and policy changes by beneficiaries.</p> <p>Training activities should be clearly linked with border infrastructure in order to maximise relevance,</p>

<p>through the training courses provided under the project.</p>		<p>applicability and counterpart motivation.</p> <p>All training courses should be subject to pre- and post training analysis. This will ensure proper follow up training and support adjustments to the training curriculum.</p> <p>Training sessions to beneficiaries should continue during the implementation of projects and afterwards in order to achieve goals like the proper handling of equipment and enhanced modern procedures at borders.</p>
<p>The visibility of a project ensures the information for all participating partners and beneficiaries and promotes the success of different stages of a project</p> <p>The visibility during the project duration is considered as limited</p>	<p>Meeting with representatives of the US Embassy who reported that they would appreciate a more constant visibility in newsletters or other sources for the project</p>	<p>UNODC should continue to involve Donor and Implementing Agency representatives in key event and promote the content and quality of project activities.</p> <p>UNODC should build specific visibility activities into future projects. A separate 'visibility plan' could be a useful tool for future projects to promote the content and quality of project</p> <p>UNODC in cooperation with the beneficiary agencies envisage an official handover event after the finalization of the project. This should demonstrate successful cooperation among the partners.</p> <p>A proactive approach on visibility is recommended for each single project. The first aspect of visibility involves the full range of activities carried out by the implementing agency to make the project known and to market these activities with beneficiaries, other donors and the general public.</p> <p>UNODC should continue as conducted in this project to involve Donor and Implementing Agency representatives in key events: opening of buildings, hand-over of equipment, PR events.</p>

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and context

Project Number and Title	TD/UZB/J49 “Strengthening Termez River Port checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan border”
Duration	June 2008 – December 2010
Strategic Theme	1.Rule of Law
Result Area / Result	1.2 International cooperation in criminal justice matters 1.2.1 Enhanced capacity for international cooperation against crime, organised crime, corruption, drug trafficking and terrorism
Total Approved Budget	US\$ 1,236,100
Donors:	USA

Background and context of project

The project was designed in line with the UNODC Strategic Programme Framework for Central Asia for June 2008 - December 2011 and supports the Government’s current endeavours by increasing the capability for border guards, customs and law enforcement bodies posted in Termez River Port checkpoint and improving their interdiction abilities. This project provided specialized equipment and training in order to update and upgrade the expertise of law enforcement personnel. It is also aimed at improving cooperation and coordination between law enforcement agencies serving at Termez River Port.

The project objective is to strengthen the interdiction capacity of law enforcement bodies posted at Termez River Port on the Uzbek-Afghan border.

The project outcome: Termez River Port checkpoint is properly equipped, operational officers are trained to provide better interdiction services and mechanisms for information exchange and coordination of efforts are established.

Outputs

(a) Law enforcement agencies at Termez River Port are strengthened through the provision of specialized equipment and training;

(b) Law enforcement agencies at Termez River Port have effective coordination and cooperation mechanisms.

The primary beneficiary of the project is the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan as a whole. The State Customs Committee and Border Guards along with law enforcement agencies serving at Termez River Port are the direct project beneficiaries.

The project was expected to apply the experiences and methodology gained from the implementation of AD/UZB/G28 and to include coordination with other regional projects, such as AD/RER/E29 “Precursor Control in Central Asia” and AD/RER/F60 “Computer based drug law enforcement training in the member countries of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Sub-Regional Cooperation in Drug Control (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan)”.

The Project document for UZB J49 included a number of lessons learned from the G28 project, such as:

(a) Continue updating the knowledge of Uzbek law enforcement officials in combating illicit trafficking of drugs and precursors via training, field exercises, and study tours.

(b) Seeking the possibilities to procure contemporary drug identification and detection equipment with the technical support option

(c) Exchange of views on the international practices on better communication and cooperation instruments (administrative, legal, practical) at national, regional and international level

These lessons are taken into account in the UZB J49 project, but not with evidences:

Additionally it was noted under project G 28 that the Government of Uzbekistan should:

(a) Continue to be fully committed to ensuring control measures on the borders

(b) Facilitate project implementation by allocating funds from the national budget for further strengthening border controls, inter alia, upon completion of the project

Take the necessary national measures in supporting the inter-agency drug control coordination among law enforcement agencies in the country.

Purpose and scope of the evaluation

In compliance with the project document, the external final evaluation is aimed at elaborating recommendations regarding the intervention’s relevance, design and progress towards achieving its stated objectives. The evaluation is expected to provide an assessment of project implementation and management, achieved results, lessons learned and recommendations with regard to efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, impact and sustainability of the project including any gaps or unintended consequences, the effectiveness of the mode of implementation, and the appropriateness and application of guidelines and policies. The evaluation is also expected contribute to strengthening the monitoring and evaluation system to support results based management of the project.

The schedule for the evaluation

- (a) 27 and 28 January 2011 (Review of relevant documents received from UNODC and other actors)
- (b) 29 January 2011 (Preparation of meetings proposed in Uzbekistan and drafting a relevant Questionnaire)
- (c) 30 January – 04 February 2011 (Field mission to Uzbekistan)
- (d) 17 February 2011 (Draft Evaluation Report submitted)
- (e) 24 and 25 February 2011 (Review of comments received)
- (f) 03 March 2011 (Submission of the Final Evaluation Report)

The external evaluation considered project implemented from its inception date on 8 May 2008 to the project end date of 31 December 2010. The following key components of project design and implementation were to be addressed:

- (a) Relevance
- (b) Effectiveness
- (c) Efficiency
- (d) Impact
- (e) Sustainability
- (f) Partnerships/cooperation
- (g) Lessons learned/best practices

Methodology

The evaluation consisted of a number of separate elements identified in the relevant Terms of Reference. As far as possible, a multi-disciplinary approach was adopted which included meeting officials and practitioners from the relevant agencies and other agencies responsible for the project implementation (list of persons met in ANNEX C).

The evaluator followed the recommendations given in the ToRs and was expected to prepare the following:

- (a) Meeting plan
- (b) Interview reports (Section 3.3)
- (c) Site inspection report (Section 3.4)
- (d) Oral interim debriefing
- (e) Draft evaluation report
- (f) Final evaluation report

The evaluator employed the following methodology:

- (a) Review of the relevant documents received from UNODC and other actors
- (b) Preparation of meetings proposed in Uzbekistan
- (c) Preparation of a questionnaire survey of stakeholders
- (d) Field Mission to Uzbekistan (30 January – 04 February 2011)
- (e) Interviews with project staff and stakeholders
- (f) Review and analysis of information received

Annual / Semi Annual / Quarterly reports were produced for the project, which contributed towards clarifying the chronology.

The mission meetings were held with the following key stakeholders:

- (a) Representatives of the Regional UNODC in Tashkent
- (b) National Drug Control Centre
- (c) Representatives of the Embassy of the United States of America in Tashkent
- (d) State Customs Committee
- (e) Representatives of the Supplier of the scanning equipment
- (f) Country Manager of the BOMCA programme

Reports of these meetings are recorded in the findings section.

Limitations to the evaluation

In general terms it has to be stated that border management in Uzbekistan is a very sensitive topic and any evaluation faces certain challenges (like the lack of permission to access to visit the project site), but there is no question about the importance and justification of a project like this. All stakeholders are well aware of the threat of drug trafficking from Afghanistan (see the illustration as ANNEX F).

Additional it needs to be stated at this point that the communication and cooperation with the beneficiary in Uzbekistan faces limits, therefore there are no facts and figures discovered to underline the effectiveness of the training activities of this project or the increase of seizure of drugs through the purchase of the equipment, most of the relevant information is confident or classified.

A One-Day Site Inspection was envisaged at the Termez River Port checkpoint for the evaluator to assess the situation at the Border Crossing Point since the implementation of the project. Although UNODC ROCA submitted with sufficient notice all necessary requests and permissions to the Uzbek authorities for this visit (including follow up calls) permission was not granted. The Evaluator was not therefore in a position to draft a Site Inspection Report.

The evaluator does not consider this as fatal to developing or finalizing the evaluation.

While conducting the evaluation, the evaluator took account of relevant international standards including “Guiding principles for evaluation at UNODC”, “Standards of evaluation in the UN system”, and “Norms for evaluations in the UN system”.

Quality assurance was provided by the Core Learning Partners. Their role was to review the TORs, including the methodology of the evaluation, the draft report and final report. The consultant considered all comments received and reflected them, as appropriate, without compromising his independence and impartiality.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Executing modalities of the project

UNODC ROCA possesses the technical capacity to support the project and to provide specialised equipment to beneficiaries in order to ensure the project's successful implementation. UNODC ROCA is located in Tashkent and has extensive experience in implementing such projects in Uzbekistan. The project members within UNODC are highly qualified and have maintained significant contacts in the Government of Uzbekistan. Many of the UNODC projects implemented in Uzbekistan are currently in their end stages, meaning ROCA had all the necessary resources available to ensure quality implementation. Trained and experienced UNODC staff oversaw the project's financial management. The project contained built-in internal and external monitoring and reviewing processes, which were based on UNODC HQs procedures and requirements. This evaluation was included in the project's work plan and budget.

Annual / Semi Annual / Quarterly reports were produced for the project, which contributed towards clarifying the chronology.

All documents reviewed were well structured. Any challenges, ambiguities or uncertainties were found to be addressed and solutions suggested in the documentation

None of the National Project Officers within UNODC was interviewed by the evaluator, he was informed that one National Project Officer left abruptly in 2009 following an internal performance evaluation. The second left equally suddenly in late 2010 citing personal and family reasons. Neither officer left any hand-over instructions or facilitated the further implementation of the project. UNODC covered these issues within the own resources.

Relevance

The necessary balance that projects should maintain between infrastructure, equipment and training components was taken into account on the AD/UZB/J 49 project design.

The core question for effective project design is how to achieve maximum effect with limited resources. The border management sector, specific the drugs combating sector in Uzbekistan have huge financial needs and large institutional needs.

The project outcomes and the complementary activities to implement them were consistent; the original design of the project and the implemented activities met the relevant business case.

The project was designed as a result of and based on lessons learned during the Project G28 "Immediate assistance to Uzbekistan for the resumption of activities at Hayraton checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan border

The envisaged outcomes of the AD/UZB/J49 project were:

- (a) Termez River Port checkpoint is properly equipped;
- (b) Operational officers are trained to provide better interdiction services;
- (c) Mechanisms for information exchange and coordination of efforts are established.

The project was well planned with the lessons learned from the G 28 project. Necessary adjustments were coordinated with the relevant stakeholders, and this was underlined in the meetings the evaluator conducted. For example:

(a) Initially the housing and installation of back-up electricity generators was not planned, but the need was identified and the relevant project officers in UNODC engaged an engineer to assess the need and prepare the necessary work (Semi-annual 2010 - Progress Report for Ad/UZB/J49)

(b) The project office initiated a mission to Termez River Port to assess the equipment needs of the project site. The final list of equipment was discussed and finalized with the national authorities. (Semi-annual 2009 - Progress Report for AD/ UZB/J49)

Effectiveness

The implementing agency (UNODC) achieved the project objectives, outcomes and outputs to a maximum extent as intended in the project design and in close cooperation with the relevant agencies at this border crossing point

Real effectiveness and impact of the project can only come from a continuous learning and feedback process involving the partners really going as far as possible into details, continuing to deepen their understanding, and making suggestions for project improvement to the beneficiaries.

At present time there is no specific proposal how this project could have been improved since all relevant aspects and opinions were taken into account and the project was designed following the lessons learned in the previous project G 28 “Immediate assistance to Uzbekistan for the resumption of activities at Hayraton checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan border”. The project design had been agreed with all partners and implemented in accordance with that design.

The limited educational skills from a number of operational officers from different agencies at this border crossing referred to in documents suggests that the target group for training activities needs to be chosen in a way to promote replication/ dissemination (Train the Trainers courses).

Training activities should be clearly linked with border infrastructure/equipment in order to maximise relevance, applicability and counterpart motivation.

Based on the project G 28 a number of short term experts evaluated equipment and training needs as well for the Termez River Port. Training on the equipment provided and other modern methodologies on drug search techniques were delivered.

Two training courses were delivered under the project. The training providers for both courses were officers from the Customs Border Protection department of the USA. The first training course took place in November 2009 with the topic “Targeting and Risk Management” and was attended by 13 customs officials and border guards. The second course on “International Border Interdiction Training” was delivered in October 2010 also for 13 trainees. The training courses were part of the standard training curriculum provided to border control officers in the USA.

No pre- or post -training tests or analysis was conducted, but target groups claimed to have developed their skills through the training courses provided under the project. Training reports from the expert trainers and feedback from participants demonstrated that the training sessions conducted under this project were reasonable and should be continued with support from international experts and from

local experts. The desire and requests for continued training have therefore already had an impact on the future education for the officers.

UNODC is reviewing procurement procedures and training delivery within the UN system and there are strict guidelines to follow.

All equipment was provided according to the original Project document, an equipment needs assessment was conducted and some of the equipment was adjusted during the implementation period, which is here reported like the generator location, again to underline, it is very difficult to assess with the UZBEK authorities the real needs according to western border standards was purchased on time - even the equipment purchased centrally some equipment had extended delivery times due to its specialist nature.

Tender dossiers were advertised and finalized in a timely fashion; Training was prepared and conducted as planned, there are therefore no substantial remarks on how this project could have been more effective.

Efficiency

From the data collected, the implementation of project activities was cost efficient and cost effective. The implementing agency had all necessary resources on the ground before the start of the project, no additional costs were indicated. UNODC also used its resources in Vienna headquarters for several purposes (e.g. the tender of equipment) and maintained necessary day to day communication with the donor and the beneficiary

The objectives were achieved on time; a short delay in the handover of the last pieces of equipment is the result of technical problems with equipment already delivered and purchased (Scanners) and extended delivery times of specialist equipment.

The implementation and project management within UNODC was appropriate and responded to the needs of this project. The fact that two of the National Project Officers unexpectedly left the project earlier did not harm the project since the capacity within UNODC allowed the implementation to continue.

All persons interviewed stated that the project was managed effectively and all issues were addressed by project management on time.

The different project reports were timely and satisfactory, but some of the terms used and issues raised in some reports could be more clearly explained or clarified such as:

- (a) Inadequacies (what are these inadequacies in detail?)
- (b) Corruption (the topic of corruption mentioned in the objectives is not clearly addressed in the reports)
- (c) a Project Steering Committee established (such a committee was never established, but no reason is given why)
- (d) ...UNODC mechanisms (ProFi, FOML, PAT etc.) (How did these mechanisms affect the project activities?)
- (e) ...serviceability of some items of equipment (what were the exact problems of this equipment?)

It might also have been useful to prepare exhaustive logical frameworks at project inception, including a detailed lists of assumptions (risks) and specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely indicators of achievement

Impact

Some minor external factors were discovered which had an impact on the project delivery.

(a) Access to the project site for persons involved in the implementation of the project (UNODC/ Supplier/Donor) was difficult and the administrative procedures imposed by the beneficiaries to grant this access are considerable.

(b) One internal factor inside the UNODC office was the loss of the designated National Project Officers. However, this was addressed in a professional way and did not harm the final outcome of the project.

The objective of the project was to strengthen interdiction capacity of law enforcement at Termez River Port through the provision of equipment and training. Although 100% prevention of drug trafficking will never be fully achieved, the project has contributed to its reduction through the delivery of training and equipment.

The objective and outcomes were accomplished by the project without question as evidenced by the meetings held and the reports reviewed.

The target group has, as usual, more extensive equipment needs than could possibly be covered under this project and, after a review, and the beneficiaries might want to summarize these needs for possible donors.

Sustainability

All equipment was delivered with a full warranty from the supplier. The supplier has local partners in Uzbekistan to ensure maintenance. The stakeholders also confirmed that maintenance up to a certain level can be provided by their own experts.

Training during project implementation is considered successful and the agencies interviewed stated that they want to build on the training delivered and continue with training to enhance the skills of the operational officers.

Although at the present time the Uzbek authorities do not have the capacity to build on the training with their own resources, the long term aim of the training sessions provided by the project was.....“To help build an internal train-the-trainer capacity and eventually infuse the curriculum into the formal training regimen of the host nation.“ (See description of the Course Title International Border Interdiction Training (IBIT II))

It was not specified by the Uzbek authorities how this will be achieved, but it was clearly indicated that the border agencies want to derive benefit from the new equipment and training provided. They see that the experience gained by the use of this equipment will result in more cross border crime detection.

Partnerships and cooperation

Relations are good between the project management and beneficiary institutions involved in the project. In general, projects need to develop their receptiveness to beneficiaries' opinions, needs and suggestions; however, the level of participation of beneficiaries in the implementation of this project is high.

A sustained dialogue between the partners is essential and the initial proposal of having Steering Committee meetings would have greatly contributed to improved dialogue, ownership and sustainability.

From the interviews it was demonstrated that communication between the implementing agency (UNODC) and the beneficiaries took place regularly and the need to hold formal steering committee meetings was not seen as a priority.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are directed towards UNODC for consideration:

Cooperation with beneficiary

Effectiveness in implementing projects is greatly influenced by the degree of ownership and by the cooperation of beneficiaries. This comes down to thinking more in detail about how to mix policy advice with project activities. Each project needs to be 'dialogue-driven', and there are ways to refine the approach in order to accommodate at least in part both Donors' and the beneficiaries' wishes.

For example training courses can be offered in modular form where the sequencing or some degree of selection is offered to the beneficiary.

A related issue is the necessity of realism (on both sides) about the expected pace of change. Overambitious projects often lead to a highly inefficient allocation of resources. The 'ownership' or determination of this pace of change is also a subject for discussion between partners. There is a need for dialogue around this issue and the setting of realistic and jointly understood and agreed change objectives.

Another requirement is careful analysis of the reasons for differences of opinion between partners. If the discrepancy is between perceived needs and real needs, awareness rising may influence the beneficiary's reform agenda, and an intelligent, very well informed approach by the project implementers might be successful.

It is not possible for projects to influence the real priority setting of beneficiaries while concessions by the beneficiary may undermine sustainability.

Through pilot sites, the impact of modern border management techniques can be illustrated. Examples of such impact includes: facilitated transit, better security/ control, trade facilitation, reduced costs, improved working conditions. The choice of the specific accents placed on the desired impact to be demonstrated, plays a role through the choice of the location of the pilot sites. The importance of tuning this choice to beneficiary demand cannot be overemphasised: if they are to be replicated, pilot sites must meet beneficiary priorities. Tailoring pilot sites to specific situations in the region will strengthen impact.

In the future, UNODC in cooperation with the beneficiary should try to strengthen the pilot concept and roll it out to other sites; a detailed description of what exactly the pilot entails should be developed at the start of the project among the project partners.

Purchase of equipment

Maintenance or even operation of specific technical infrastructure and equipment delivered by the project can be highly problematic and can lead to difficult relations with the beneficiaries. The

prospect of long term support for such interventions may lead locally to the assumption that these costs will be borne by donors, especially in view of the importance attached by donors to these projects. A dialogue during project implementation needs to be initiated (e.g. through Steering Committee meetings, which are an excellent platform to find mutual agreements among all partners) There is no essential need to establish it, this is depending on the cooperation with the beneficiary, and if not possible any other tool is useful, like regular meetings and so on

This was envisaged in the project document, but the cooperation with the Uzbek authorities is sometimes challenging and it might have been an agreement just to skip this, involving Ministries of Finance in beneficiary countries and other relevant stakeholders to clarify all technical aspects related to equipment and future maintenance of this equipment.

Education and training activities

The training conducted under the J 49 project activities was reasonable and efficient. It is recommended to continue a dialogue with the beneficiary and the donor in the future and to follow up training activities (as requested in the assessments from the participants and during the interviews with representatives from the border agencies involved) and to focus on a Train-the-Trainers or multiplier methodology in order to reach more operational officers

A pilot approach in training activities strengthened as a means to achieving demonstration effect and a more catalytic usage of funds. This approach envisages a more indirect effect, through subsequent adoption of regulatory and policy changes by beneficiaries. The choice of the specific accents placed on the desired effects to be demonstrated, plays a role through the choice of the location of the pilot sites. The importance of tuning this choice to beneficiary demand cannot be overemphasised: if they are to be replicated, pilot sites must meet counterpart priorities. Tailoring pilot sites to specific situations will strengthen impact.

In future all training courses should be subject to pre- and post training analysis. This will ensure proper follow up training and support adjustments to the training curriculum.

The low skills level of a number of operational officers from different agencies at the borders in the examination of documents suggests that the target group for training activities needs to be chosen in a way to promote replication/ dissemination: management level staff who influence the way things are thought about and who are now or will be in future policy decision makers.

Training activities should be clearly linked with border infrastructure in order to maximise relevance, applicability and counterpart motivation.

Relationship with the donor

In the context of a partly unknown and possibly changing project environment, effective partnership and synergy between Donors and implementing agency is essential for the project to achieve their full potential. Regular strategy meetings should continue to be held, continuously reviewing effectiveness and verifying the intervention logic.

The project achieved cooperation with all relevant actors during meetings supported by regular project reports. From the data collected, the view the level of cooperation was sufficient to meet the project objectives, but there is always the possibility of enhancing cooperation with the beneficiaries and other partners

The TOR of the implementing agency should include, as part of the reporting requirements, direct reference to regular reporting on monitoring and analysis of progress, updates on the project

environment (hypotheses and assumptions as described in the detailed logical framework), and a forward look at opportunities and directions for future.

Visibility

UNODC in cooperation with the beneficiary agencies envisage an official handover event after the finalization of the project. This should demonstrate successful cooperation among the partners.

A proactive approach on visibility is recommended for each single project. The first aspect of visibility involves the full range of activities carried out by the implementing agency to make the project known and to market these activities with beneficiaries, other donors and the general public.

UNODC should continue as conducted in this project to involve Donor and Implementing Agency representatives in key events: opening of buildings, hand-over of equipment, PR events.

The content and quality of project activities should be particularly promoted.

Build specific visibility activities into future projects. A separate 'visibility plan' could be a useful tool for future projects.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

Lessons learned

The mission of such projects is to promote the idea that modern border management has alternative methods and resources to offer: modern policy and management methods, access to networks and information sharing systems, building partnerships. In order to achieve this they must demonstrate how these tools can assist in addressing individual, locally perceived needs. The challenge consists of meshing modern border management best practice with local priorities.

1. The project was designed as a result of and based on lessons learned during the Project G28 “Immediate assistance to Uzbekistan for the resumption of activities at Hayraton checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan border”

The project outputs and the complementary activities to implement them were consistent; the original design of the project and the implemented actions met the relevant business case.

The necessary balance that projects should maintain between infrastructure, equipment and training components was taken into account on the J 49 project design.

The project demonstrated that there is a need to develop future instruments to increase the cooperation with the beneficiary, such as:

- (a) Monitoring of the project (e.g. access to the site)
- (b) A Permanent communication instrument (e.g. Steering committee meeting)

Best practices

(a) Development of an Agreement with the beneficiaries (Memorandum of Understanding) about the monitoring process, regular visits or establishment of a steering group

2. The implementing agency (UNODC) achieved the project objectives, outcomes and outputs to a maximum extent as intended in the project design and in close cooperation with the relevant agencies at this border crossing point

The Training activities should be clearly linked with border infrastructure in order to maximise relevance, applicability and counterpart motivation. The Training needs a strong evaluation process after finalizing the activities

Best practices

(a) Conduct a Training needs assessment in cooperation with the beneficiary to identify the needs and the target groups

(b) Develop during the training a curriculum for the beneficiary to continue training activities

(c) Link the Training with the other project activities (.e.g. purchase of equipment)

1. The implementation and project management within UNODC was appropriate and responded to the needs of this project. The fact that two of the National Project Officers unexpectedly left the project earlier did not harm the project since the capacity within UNODC allowed the implementation to continue.

The different project reports were timely and satisfactory, but some of the terms used and issues raised in some reports could be more clearly explained or clarified

The appointment of a single project officer might influence in a negative way the project implementation. The project Terms of Reference needs to be used exhaustively to address all mentioned subjects.

Best practices

(a) Appointment of additional team members within the implementing agency to back up persons who are leaving the project unexpected

(b) Clearly address in progress reports all concerns and clarify the uncertainties , do not make up reports with unclear terminology

2. The implementing agency had all necessary resources on the ground before the start of the project, no additional costs were indicated. UNODC also used its resources in Vienna headquarters for several purposes (e.g. the tender of equipment) and maintained necessary day to day communication with the donor and the beneficiary
3. Access to the project site for persons involved in the implementation of the project (UNODC/ Supplier/Donor) was difficult and the administrative procedures imposed by the beneficiaries to grant this access are considerable.

Best practice

(a) Agreement with the beneficiary prior to the project start about regular site visits from the relevant project management

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION

I. Job Information	
Job Title:	Independent Evaluator
Project Title/Department:	UZB/J49 “Strengthening Termez River Port checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan border”
Duration of the assignment:	27 January – 10 March 2011 (including 11 working days)
Duty station:	Residence of the Consultant and Tashkent. Uzbekistan
Expected places of travel:	5 days mission in Uzbekistan
Reports To:	UNODC ROCA Regional Representative

II. Background	
<p>The project was designed in line with the UNODC Strategic Programme Framework for Central Asia for 2008-2011 and supports the Government’s current endeavours by increasing the capability for border guards, customs and law enforcement bodies posted in Termez River Port checkpoint and improving their interdiction abilities. This project provided specialized equipment and training in order to update and upgrade the expertise of law enforcement personnel. It is also aimed at improving cooperation and coordination between law enforcement agencies serving at Termez River Port.</p>	
Project title:	“Strengthening Termez River Port checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan border ”
Project number:	TD/UZB/J49
Duration:	2008-2010
Executing agency:	UNODC
Implementing partners:	National Center on Drug Control under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan (coordinating agency)
Total budget:	US\$ 1,236,100
Donors:	USA
<p>The project objective is to strengthen the interdiction capacity of law enforcement bodies posted at Termez River Port on the Uzbek-Afghan border.</p>	
<p>The project outcome: Termez River Port checkpoint is properly equipped, operational officers are trained to provide better interdiction services and mechanisms for information exchange and coordination of efforts are established.</p>	

Outputs:

- Law enforcement agencies at Termez River Port are strengthened through the provision of specialized equipment and training;
- Law enforcement agencies at Termez River Port have effective coordination and cooperation mechanisms.

The primary beneficiary of the project is the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan as a whole. The State Customs Committee and Border Guards along with law enforcement agencies serving at Termez River Port are the direct project beneficiaries.

III. Scope of Work / Outputs / Timeline

In compliance with the project document, the external final evaluation is aiming at elaborating recommendations regarding intervention's relevance, design and progress towards achieving its stated objectives. The evaluation should provide assessment on project implementation and management, achieved results, lessons learned and recommendations with regard to efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, impact and sustainability of the project including any gaps or unintended consequences, the effectiveness of the mode of implementation, and the appropriateness and application of guidelines and policies. The final evaluation should also contribute to strengthening the monitoring and evaluation system to support result based management of the project.

The external evaluation assesses the activities of the project implemented in Uzbekistan. In particular, the following key evaluation questions to be answered by the evaluation:

(1) Relevance

- Were the project outputs and activities consistent with expected outcomes and objectives?
- How strong was the original business case for this project?
- How well did the project design meet this business case?
- How well was the project planned in advance? Were appropriate adjustments made where necessary?

(2) Effectiveness

- To what extent were project objectives, outcomes and outputs achieved?
- How could project planning have been improved?
- Was equipment needs analysis conducted? If so, were the recommendations justified in the light of the end result?
- Was training delivered on how to use specialized equipment?
- Was there a training needs analysis conducted? If so, was the training delivery appropriate in the light of the end result?
- How could the procurement of equipment and the delivery of training be made more effective?

(3) Efficiency

- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the project implemented in the most efficient and cost-effective way compared to alternatives?
- Was the structure and profile of the project management team appropriate?
- Was the project managed effectively and with timely responses to changing circumstances?
- Was project reporting accurate, timely and satisfactory?
- Was procurement of equipment conducted effectively and in timely fashion?

(4) Impact

- What external factors impacted on project delivery? Were they properly addressed?
- What was the anticipated long term impact of this project? Is the project likely to achieve that impact?

- Were there any positive or negative unintended results?
- Is there any additional need or requirement at the target site and within the target group that has not already been addressed?

(5) Sustainability

- What measures are in place to ensure future maintenance and repair of the equipment provided?
- To what extent are project interventions sustainable in the long term? If not, what is needed to ensure their continued resilience and viability in the future?
- What measures are in place to ensure skills are retained within the target group?

(6) Partnerships/cooperation

- Were stakeholders properly engaged and informed?

(7) Lessons learned/best practices

- What lessons have been learned during the implementation of this project and has the best practice been identified?

Expected tangible and measurable output(s):

All deliverables will be the responsibility of the independent evaluator.

- Meeting plan:
The plan should include: who should be interviewed and why, pre-prepared interview questions and a detailed description of proposed evaluation methods. **(January 2011, 20% of lump sum).**
- Brief interview reports:
The interview should be summarized briefly to reflect the opinions expressed by interviewees and any facts or examples given in support of those opinions.
- Brief site inspection report:
This report should detail the general impression of the site and the suitability of the project interventions at that location; an assessment of the quality of any construction, plant and equipment installed at the site, its viability and potential impact on border control; whether the specifications of the interventions match with those foreseen in the project document.
- Oral interim debriefing:
This interim debrief will allow the clarification of any misunderstandings or misconceptions and to answer any points of confusion or ambiguity.
- Draft evaluation report:
This report should be a complete draft document reflecting the evaluation and initial findings. It should be submitted electronically to ROCA for comment and suggested amendment.
- Final evaluation report:
This report should include a review of the original project design, the way in which it was implemented, the impact it has had on border control at the project site and whether there are recommendations or lessons to be learned for the future **(February 2011, 80% of lump sum).**

In conducting the evaluation, the evaluator needs to take account of relevant international standards, including “Guiding principles for evaluation at UNODC”, “Standards of evaluation in the UN system”, and “Norms for evaluations in the UN system”.

Quality assurance is provided by the Core Learning Partners. Their role is to review these very TOR, including the methodology of the evaluation, the draft report and final report. The consultant will consider comments received and will reflect them, as appropriate, without compromising her independence and impartiality. While the Project Managers are also part of the Core Learning Partners, their role is also to manage the process and logistics of the evaluation, while the Independent Evaluation Unit at HQ backstops this evaluation and approves the selection of the consultants, the methodology as well as the draft and final reports.

Composition of the evaluation mission

The final evaluation of the project will be carried out by an independent evaluator appointed by the UNODC.

The donors to the projects may participate in the evaluation as observer. Costs associated with the evaluation will be borne by the project. All costs for a donor appointed observer will be borne by the donor government directly.

The evaluator shall act independently in his/her individual capacity, and not as a representative of the government or organization which appointed him/her. The independent evaluator should adhere to the independence and impartiality of the evaluation process discussed in the UNODC guiding principle for evaluation. The evaluator therefore will not have been involved in the development, implementation or monitoring of the project neither will be not be rendering any service to UNODC in near future, to avoid conflicts of interest due to potential future involvement. The report will be prepared by the independent evaluator.

Planning and implementation arrangements

The evaluator will be briefed and debriefed on the projects by the Regional Office in Tashkent (ROCA). The UNODC staff will also provide necessary substantive and administrative support.

Although the evaluator should be free to discuss all matters relevant to her/his assignment with the authorities concerned, the incumbent is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of UNODC or the Government.

The evaluator will submit a draft report to UNODC Headquarters – the Independent Evaluation Unit, and to ROCA, as well as to all “Core Learning Partners”. The report will contain the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation team as well as a recording of the lessons learned during projects implementation.

The evaluation expert, while considering the comments provided on the draft, should use its independent judgment in preparing the final report.

The final report should be submitted to UNODC no later than three weeks upon completion of the mission. The report should be no longer than 15 pages, excluding annexes and executive summary.

The report will be distributed by UNODC as required to the governmental authorities and respective donors.

The expected timetable of Evaluation Mission as follows:

When? (tentative dates)	Working days	Who?	What task?
31 Jan -1 Feb. 2011	2	Evaluator	Desk review
1 February 2011	0.5	ROCA, Evaluator	Briefing of evaluator
1-2 February 2011	1.5	Evaluator, ROCA, Stakeholders	Meetings with stakeholders
3-4 February 2011	1.5	Evaluator, ROCA, Stakeholders	Site inspection & meeting with local stakeholders
4 February 2011	0.5	Evaluator, ROCA	Debriefing session

21 February - 4 March 2011		ROCA, Stakeholders	Review of draft report by stakeholders
7-8 March 2011	2	Evaluator	Finalization of the report
Total working days	11		

The suggested date for the evaluation mission: **31 January – 4 February 2011 (5 days)**

Performance Indicators for the evaluator

- Timely and accurate submission of the documents;
- Substantive and linguistic quality of the documents prepared;
- Conformity of the project evaluation report with the standard format and guidelines for the preparation of the project evaluation reports and technical guidance received;
- Report should contain recommendations for future course of action.

VI. Qualifications Requirements

The evaluator should have the following qualifications:

Academic Requirements: a minimum first-level university degree or graduation from a recognized academy of a law enforcement service;

Experience: experience of evaluating projects and knowledge of qualitative and quantitative methods (preferably within the UN system and in international projects). At least 5 years of experience in law enforcement (preferably in relation to border management and control).

In addition, the following experience will be an asset:

- Familiarity with Central Asia.
- Knowledge of bilateral/multilateral technical cooperation, particularly in counter-narcotics enforcement issues;
- Excellent analytical, drafting and communication/writing skills in English;
- Knowledge of Russian will be considered as an asset

V. Signatures- Post Description Certification

Incumbent *(if applicable)*

Name

Signature

Date

Supervisor

Masood Karimipour, UNODC Regional Representative for CA

Name / Title

Signature

Date

ANNEX II. MISSION SCHEDULE

The evaluator developed and conducted in close cooperation with the UNODC ROCA office in Tashkent a field mission according to the Terms of Reference from the 30 January – 04 February 2011, the mission was accomplished as follows:

<i>Sunday 30 January 2011</i>
Arrival in Tashkent Document review and preparation for the meetings Meeting with the following actors (upon arrangement through the UNODC office) are requested / envisaged by the evaluator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Drug Control Centre - State Customs Committee - Border Protection Committee under the National Security Service - Department of SCC and BPC in Surkhandarya region - G4S Security Services (supplier of some equipment)
<i>Monday 31 January 2011</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Briefing within the ROCA UNODC office - Pre-arrangements for meetings during the Mission - Additional Documents reviewed - Interview and Discussion with the relevant local Project staff in UNODC Tashkent
<i>Tuesday 01 February 2011</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Briefing within the ROCA UNODC office - Pre-arrangements for meetings during the Mission - Additional Documents reviewed - Meeting with the EU funded Program BOMCA
<i>Wednesday 02 February 2011</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting with representatives of the National Drug Control Centre of the Republic of Uzbekistan - Meeting with representatives of the Embassy of United States in Tashkent/Uzbekistan - Discussion with local UNODC staff in Tashkent about the project
<i>Thursday 03 February 2011</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting with the State Customs Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan - Meeting with the G4S Security Services in Uzbekistan - Briefing from the UNDSS Advisor from UNDP in Tashkent in Security matters - Debriefing with the UNODC office (Brief Results of the Interviews, way forward, initial findings)
<i>Friday 04 February 2011</i>
Departure from Tashkent

ANNEX III. EVALUATION TOOLS: INTERVIEW REPORTS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

List of Questionnaire to be clarified with the Project Management and the Beneficiaries or other Agencies involved in the implementation of the project:

- Q. 1:** Did the project design meet all requirements from the beneficiaries involved?
- Q. 2:** Did the project outcomes meet the original design?
- Q. 3:** What are the expectations from the different agencies as a result of the project (trade facilitation, reduction of cross border crime, more efficient flow of passengers and goods?)
- Q. 4:** What were the major challenges during the design and implementation of the project?
- Q. 5:** What external factors impacted on project delivery?
- Q. 6:** Were there any positive or negative unintended results?
- Q. 7:** Are there trainings in the past conducted with involvement of Afghan authorities at the border?
- Q. 8:** Is there any additional need or requirement at the target site and within the target group that has not already been addressed?
- Q. 9:** What measures are in place to ensure future maintenance and repair of the equipment provided? (From the beneficiaries)
- Q. 10:** What measures are in place to ensure skills are retained within the target group?
- Q. 11:** Were stakeholders properly engaged and informed during the implementation?
- Q. 12:** Is there a Training mission report available and/or Training evaluations from the participants?
(Quarterly and Annual Report: The "Targeting and Risk Management" training was organized by J-49 and held by experienced officers of Customs and Border Protection of US Department of Homeland Security (CBP DHS) on November 16 - 20 in Termez for 12 officers of Uzbekistan's State Customs Committee and the Border Guards C. On 4-8 October 2010 UNODC ROCA organized International Border Interdiction Training (IBIT II) Committee. The training was very productive and successful)
- A. UNODC:** The participants made an assessment of the Trainings (in Uzbek language) and the major remarks are:
- The Mission Report from the Training Experts and the Evaluation from the Participants stated more than satisfactory with the Training performance and the topics
 - request for additional Training with such topics covered by the Trainings in November 2009 and October 2010
 - it was emphasized that the practical exercise was useful and need to be included in future in such trainings
- Q. 13:** When it is envisaged to deliver the last pending equipment in 2011?
- A. UNODC:** All tender procedures are finalized and the envisaged date to hand over the pending equipment is end of February 2011
- Q. 14:** Was there the option envisaged to share equipment among the agencies (endoscopes and so on)?
- Q. 15:** Is there any specialized equipment requested from the agencies which will be not provided?
- Q. 16:** Was there a training conducted for maintenance of the generators?
- Q. 17:** Can you please clarify what were the problems about the 'serviceability' (*Quarterly Report*) of equipment?

A. UNODC: There was a compatibility problem with one of the scanners; this problem was solved in cooperation with the supplier

Q. 18: Is it possible to specify this mechanism? (*Project Document, Page 6: Mechanisms for information exchange and coordination of efforts are established*)

Q. 19: Would it be possible to identify these inadequacies? (*Quarterly / Annual Report: Redressed earlier planning inadequacies and have moved the project activities forward*)

Q. 20: Are there Minutes from the Meetings available? (*Project document, Page 7: Project Steering Committee established*)

A. UNODC: No meetings were held yet, therefore are no minutes available

Q. 21: Can you provide me some brief information about the mechanism in the brackets? (*Semi-Annual Report 2009 monitoring mechanism **UNODC mechanisms (ProFi, FOML, PAT etc.)** For the purpose of constant review and monitoring of the project*)

Q. 22: Are there any reliable facts and figures available from this Border Crossing? (*Flow of passengers, threats, seizures of drugs and so on*)

A. UNODC: At present time there are no reliable facts and figures available for this BCP, these information are confidential and will be not shared from the agencies, but it can be stated that the upgrade of this Border Crossing is one of the priorities from the beneficiaries due to the fact of the threat of drug trafficking

ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

NAME	POSITION AND TITLE / CONTACT DETAILS
Steven David Brown	Senior Law Enforcement Advisor and Regional Coordinator Regional Office for Central Asia United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime 30a, Abdulla Kahhar Street, Tashkent 700100, Uzbekistan Tel.: +998 71 120 80 50; Fax: +998 71 120 62 90 E-mail: steven.brown@unodc.org
Luisa Alimova	Project Assistant of XAC/K22, RER/F60, UZB/J49 projects Regional Office for Central Asia United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime 30a, Abdulla Kahhar Street, Tashkent 700100, Uzbekistan Tel.: +998 71 120 80 50; Fax: +998 71 120 62 90 E-mail: luisa.alimova@unodc.org
Sayora Azizova (Ms.)	Admin/HR Associate United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Regional Office for Central Asia 30a, Abdulla Kahhar Street, Tashkent 700100, Uzbekistan Tel.: +998 71 120 80 50; Fax: +998 71 120 62 90 E-mail: sayora.azizova@unodc.org
Alfiya Musina	Country manager BOMCA EU Border Management Program in Central Asia 14, Makhmood Torobi Street, Tashkent 10090 , Uzbekistan Phone: +998 71 120 68 93 Mail: alfiya.musina@undp.org
Mr. Azizbek Erkabaev	Head of the International Affairs Department, Representative of the National Drug Control Centre under the Cabinet of the Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan
Katrisa B. Peffley	Third Secretary / Political – Economic Officer Embassy of the United States of America Tashkent / Uzbekistan peffleykb@state.gov
Dmitry Dogovorov	RSO/INL Assistant Embassy of the United States of America Tashkent / Uzbekistan dogovorovD@state.gov
Mr. Yunusov, Bakhodir Tulkunovich	Head of the Customs Cooperation Department, State Customs Committee
Mr. Saidov, A.	Head of the Communicatory Technology Department, State Customs Committee
Mr. Musaev,	Head of the Department on the fight against smuggling

Djamol	State Customs Committee
Mr. Ismailov, Djahongir	Senior Inspector of the Communicatory Technology Department, State Customs Committee
Ms. Khabieva, Gulfiya	Senior Inspector of the Customs Cooperation Department, State Customs Committee

ANNEX V. DESK REVIEW LIST

NO.	DESCRIPTION OF THE DOCUMENT
1.	LIST OF EQUIPMENT for the State Customs Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan Border Protection Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan
2.	Course Description <u>Targeting and Risk Management and International Border Interdiction Training (IBIT II)</u>
3.	QUARTERLY INFORMATION ON UZB/J49 PROJECT / 14 January 2011
4.	Semi-annual 2010 - Progress Report for UZBJ49
5.	Annual 2009 - Progress Report for UZBJ49
6.	PROJECT DOCUMENT / AD/UZB/J49 “Strengthening Termez River Port checkpoint on the Uzbek-Afghan border”
7.	J-49 Project Update June 2008 – December 2010
8.	Mission Report (Training) 15 – 21 November 2009
9.	Mission Report (Training) 03 – 09 October 2010
10.	Project Idea : AD/UZB/02/G28 (April 2002)
11.	Final Project Report – AD/UZB/G28
12.	Project Document – Assistance to Uzbekistan for the resumption of activities at the Hayraton checkpoint on the Uzbek – Afghan Border
13.	Project Document – XAC/K22: Countering the trafficking of Afghan opiates via the Northern route by enhancing of key border crossings points (BCPs) and through the establishment of Border Liaison Offices (BLO’s)

ANNEX VI. MAP OF HEROIN SEIZURES IN UZBEKISTAN, 2009

