

March, 2010

The Final Project Evaluation

TDGLOC54FRU

Establishing a global network of youth programmes
for drug abuse prevention

Thematic area: 3. Prevention, treatment and reintegration, and alternative development

3.1.1. Community-centred prevention

3.1.4 Enhancing national capacity to prevent drug abuse

The Russian Federation

Report of the External Independent Evaluator

Ms Solvita Lazdina, MA Educ.

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME

Vienna

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	3
Abbreviations and acronyms	4
Summary matrix of findings, supporting evidences and recommendations	5
Executive summary	6
I. Introduction	
A. Background and context of the project	10
B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation	10
C. Executing modalities of the project	11
D. Evaluation methodology	11
E. Limitations to the evaluation	12
II. Major findings and analysis	
A. Relevance of the project	13
B. Attainment of the project objectives	15
C. Achievement of the project outputs	23
D. Institutional and management arrangements and constraints	26
III. <u>Outcomes, impact and sustainability.</u>	
A. Outcomes	31
B. Impact	37
C. Sustainability	37
IV. Lessons learned and best practices	
A. Lessons learned	39
B. Best practices	40
V. Recommendations	40
VI. Overall conclusions	42
Annexes:	
• Terms of reference of the evaluation	43
• List of persons interviewed and field visit schedule	48
• Evaluation tools	50

Acknowledgments

The project evaluation would have been impossible without the active contribution provided by the following specialists:

- the interest, responsiveness, patience and also the weekend time of the project coordinator, Svitlana Pkhidenko;
- the competence and professional look on the whole process of evaluation of the UNODC project coordinator, Ilze Jekabsons;
- the logistics developed by Timur Norow, the project assistant, and his readiness to help in solving any problems;
- the competence and readiness to cooperate of the project senior officials (Ms. Raziya Sadykova, Mr. Igor Ivanov, Ms. Natalia Sirota, Mr. Vladimir Yaltonsky, Ms. Elena Kotova, and Mr. Boris Spitsyn); the interest of the project partners (Ms. Lilia Khalabuda, Ms. Valentina Chervichenko, Mr. Mikhail Chervichenko, Mr. Vladimir Litvinov, Ms. Tatiana Vorobieva, Ms. Aleksandra Yaltonskaya, Mr. Sergey Yatcyshin, Ms. Ekaterina Chizhova, Ms. Natalia Bogacheva, Ms. Elena Petrova, Ms. Oksana Malysheva, Mr. Eric Carlin, Ms. Ruth Joyce, Ms. Olga Stepanova, Mr. Aleksandr Ditkovsky and Ms. Yulia Deryagina) in improving the future work;
- the effort invested by the regional coordinators (Ms. Anna Sineglazova, Ms. Marina Gorokhova, Mr. Andrey Nevsky and Ms. Olga Vasileva) in preparing the visits to Kazan, Irkutsk, Saint Petersburg, Velikj Novgorod;
- the willingness of other regional coordinators, specialists of NGOs and other institutions, volunteers to share their experience by writing and telling about the development during the project implementation and now, after the completion of the project activities.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACTIS	Norwegian Policy Network on Alcohol and Drugs
DAPC	Drug Abuse Prevention Centre
EC	European Commission
IBPP	Institution Building Partnership Program
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
HQ	Head Quarter
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MF	Mentor Foundation
NA	Not applicable
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NSCA	National Research Centre on Addictions
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNODC RORB	UNODC Regional Office in Russia and Belarus

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.

Summary matrix of findings, supporting evidences and recommendations

Findings	Supporting evidence	Recommendations
As a result of the project at least 20 life skills programmes targeting vulnerable young people have been developed. 900 vulnerable young people have been trained .	Information acquired by use of interviews (with life skills programmes providers), questionnaires, project documentation (progress reports, reports written by local coordinators)	To monitor the programme provision and compare the results with the criteria of best practice to avoid the digress from it.
In all regions involved in the project activities the psychosocial service provision has been expanded or established. In total, 23 new organisations have been involved in service provision, thus increasing the number of services, number of clients in receiving services.	Information acquired by use of interviews (with socio-psychological service providers), questionnaires, project documentation (progress reports, reports written by local coordinators)	There is a need for additional support like experts' involvement, programme / work assessment, funding provision in order to help sustaining and expanding the achieved results.
The understanding of the local administration of the role of NGOs in drug use prevention work has been increased.	The information acquired through the interviews with the local administration, local coordinators, representatives of NGOs and questionnaires fulfilled by NGOs. Examples of forms of cooperation.	Additional investment for strengthening the capacity of NGOs and developing dialogue between the local and state government is needed. To use the developed social network of NGOs and representatives of local administration in other relevant projects.
The level of achievements differ in regions, influenced by such factors as socially – economical situation, prior experience of prevention work, motivation to improve drug use prevention work, local management and level of NGO sector development	The analysis of the information provided by all respondents in the interviews and questionnaires.	Involving regions with different level of development of the prevention work in a project, it is recommended to denote different (appropriate for each region) indicators for evaluating success.
Regular and well-considered monitoring and evaluation has helped to react on the specific needs of the project participants, thus promoting timely development of the project activities.	The analysis of information provided in the interviews by project coordinator, local coordinators. Project documentation (training reports, fulfilled pre/ post evaluation tools, progress reports)	When gathering data, to ascertain their correspondance with the real situation. To use the developed tools in other relevant projects.
The complex structure of the project – the involvement of	The information provided in the interviews by project	The management of complicated projects should be

<p>the wide range of regions, different organizations and partners, may demand additional human resources. In such cases, the management has the decisive role in the achievement of the objectives.</p>	<p>manager, regional coordinators and partners. Project documentation</p>	<p>committed to high qualified specialists, considering adequate time for dealing with and solving complex situations while designing the project.</p>
<p>In some of the regions, data on the institutionalisation and further use of the project benefits was obtained. In other regions additional support is needed to ensure sustainability and secure the NGO role.</p>	<p>The information provided in the interviews by regional coordinators, representatives of NGOs, administrations. Documentation of local administration (prevention programmes etc.)</p>	<p>Additional support is needed – the participation of experts in evaluating and improving the work; additional activities are needed for strengthening the non-governmental sector, continuing the dialogue with the local administration and the state.</p>
<p>The recognition of the UNODC role at the level of regional administrations is a crucial resource for the implementation of prevention activities, promoting the dissemination of drug use prevention evidence based practices in the Russian Federation.</p>	<p>The information provided in the interviews with the regional administration, local coordinators, prevention practitioners.</p>	<p>To continue to exercise regional receptiveness towards the UNODC projects, developing the evidence based prevention work at federal and regional levels in the Russian Federation.</p>

Executive Summary

The project TDGLOC54 “Establishing a global network of youth programmes for drug abuse prevention” (June 2007 – March 2010) was devoted to improvement of the drug abuse situation among youth in the Russian Federation by mobilizing youth organizations to play more active role in drug use prevention and improving a dialogue with local authorities.

The project had three main objectives: to increase the skills and knowledge of youth organizations to carry out effective and sustainable programmes based on life-skills education principles; to improve service provision to vulnerable young people through the establishment of psycho-social services and to increase understanding of local administrations on NGO role in prevention.

The project was implemented by UNODC Office for the Russian Federation with two main partners: the Russian NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Centre”, St. Petersburg, and the Mentor Foundation, UK with support of the Delegation of European Commission in the Russian Federation. The evaluation process was organized from 20 December 2009 to 15 March 2010. The developed evaluation methodology included a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. The data gathering was carried out by using the following methods: document analysis, opinion survey and interviews. It was not possible to carry out impact assessment within the framework of this evaluation, since it was not possible to obtain comparative data on the behaviour changes in the indirect project audience – young people, brought about by project activities.

The conclusions of the evaluation include:

- The project has promoted the wide use of life skills based approach programmes targeted to vulnerable young people in the regions. At least 20 programmes have been developed and 900 vulnerable young people have been trained in these programmes.
- The developed package of drug use prevention methodological materials based on life-skills approach, the conducted trainings has seen as tools which increased the capacity of professionals to develop and carry out the life skills programmes to vulnerable young people.
- Most of the programmes developed within the project respond to the criteria of a good practice.
- As a result of the project, psycho-social services provision to the vulnerable young people have been improved by the increase of number and scope of services, inclusion of additional groups of clients in receiving the services (young people whose parents are dependent, ex-prisoners etc.), and the increase of clients attaining independence.

- The networks of institutions providing services were established or expanded in all project sites, 23 new organisations joined the network of providers of services.
- The training and consultations of specialists providing psycho-social support, as well as development of methodological materials on psycho-social support have promoted the improvement of knowledge and skills of specialists in a work with drug users.
- Although certain weaknesses have been identified: available resources are insufficient to reach all clients in need of services, in some regions specialists have relatively limited previous experience in the social rehabilitation, therefore, they need additional support in order to put acquired knowledge in practice.
- The project has provided significant enhancement in understanding on the role of NGOs by local administrations: new cooperation forms have been developed or existent ones improved (organising a system of information circulation, more regular meetings and exchange of opinion, as well as improving the coordination of prevention work).
- The project created opportunities for closer relations between NGOs and local authorities; regular collaboration and popularising the importance of drug use prevention work provided additional push for regional authorities to allocate funding for implementation of prevention projects even in the situation of economic crisis.
- The reaching of the project objectives is influenced by such global factors as the development of the non-governmental sector in the state in general and the socio-economic situation or the financial crisis, because of which the amount of resources allocated for prevention decreases both throughout the state and in the regions. At the same time, the wish of the local community (professionals of various organisations, government representatives) to improve the prevention work and the previous experience in prevention work under the leadership of a competent project manager creates a totality of resources which allows to overcome the impact of external factors and to reach the planned results.
- Project stakeholders have identified the border changes the project has promoted, and the project is associated as a turning point in drug use prevention in general – moving from informing or even punishing to the usage of life skills and client centred approaches.

The project has created the basis for ensuring the institutionalisation and further use of the gained benefits. For example, there is evidence that NGOs in three regions, in cooperation with the local government, will provide services to their clients, thus supplementing to the local government procurement. At the same time, to ensure the sustainability of project results, improvements are

needed in the following fields of support – availability of financial resources, monitoring of the specialists' work and elimination of weaknesses.

Lessons learned in the project – and identified in the evaluation – include the following issue areas: attainment of objectives, emphasising the need to involve the representatives of local authorities for projects in the Russian Federation, this promotes the recognition and implementation of the project (1), the need for high quality management in projects that involve a number of regions and partners (2); the tolerance and flexibility of partners, which helped to overcome unexpected obstacles caused by political factors (3); and the influence of culture, for example the adjusting of life skills programmes to demands made by schools, rather than complying with principles of good practice (4); the limitations of project design, which shows the need to carry out needs assessment prior to designing the project (5.).

The best practices identified in the project are the following: advocacy visits to local government officials and the flexible attitude of trainers. The advocacy visits had an important role in the project, both in expanding the opportunities for project implementation in project locations, and the attainment of objectives. The trainers' ability to respond in a flexible manner was instrumental in improving the content of seminars and adjusting it to the specific needs of training participants.

The Evaluator developed recommendations for founders of prevention projects (both local and international donors), pointing out the need for providing further financial support to prevention projects, since the economic crisis limits the funding for the social sphere, as well as the importance of promoting the development of the third sector, which in comparison with western Europe remains unstable. The second group of recommendations targets the project designers and managers. When developing future projects, it would be advisable to assess the needs of various involved parties and to coordinate the project design with the needs, activities and the number of regions. Likewise, the project should envisage time for cooperation, especially if several partners are involved in the project, thus decreasing the possible impact of cultural differences. The third group of recommendations targets practitioners, emphasising the need to monitor and assess the programmes developed, using external experts if possible.

Summing up the abovementioned, it can be concluded that the project had a significant role in promoting drug use prevention work in the regions. The implemented cooperation, the established contacts are a resource, which should be used in future projects, especially in the field of secondary prevention.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background and context of the project

The project was approved by the UNODC Executive Director on June, 2007. It is executed under the Agreements of Regional and municipal administrations of eight regions of the Russian Federation: St. Petersburg (Leningrad Oblast), Veliky Novgorod, Novosibirsk, Tver, Yekaterinburg, Nizhny Novgorod, Irkutsk (Irkutsk Oblast), and Kazan (the Republic of Tatarstan). The operational activities under the project started in October 2007. It is expected that the project will be completed by the end of March 2010.

The total approved budget of the project is 762,532 USD. The project is funded by the Institution Building Partnership Program (IBPP) of the Delegation of European Commission in the Russian Federation (80%) and UNODC (20%).

The overall project goal is to improve the drug abuse situation among youth, by mobilizing youth organizations to play more active role in drugs and alcohol prevention and assisting them in the identification and dissemination of up-to-date, culturally-sensitive and youth-friendly drug abuse prevention approaches, and the improvement of a dialogue with local authorities. The project strategy envisaged a greater involvement on youth NGOs in drug prevention activities, specifically targeting vulnerable groups. The project aimed to equip NGOs with necessary skills and knowledge, and advocated for inclusion of NGO activities targeted towards the vulnerable groups in the local or federal level funded programmes.

The project has three main objectives:

1. To increase the skills and knowledge of youth organizations to carry out effective and sustainable programmes based on life-skills education principles;
2. To improve service provision to vulnerable young people through the establishment of psycho-social support services in 8 cities of Russia;
3. To increase understanding of local administrations and government institutions on youth NGO role in the provision of effective programmes aimed at drug and alcohol use prevention among young people in risk groups.

B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

The project evaluation is being conducted at the request of the UNODC Office for the Russian Federation to generate knowledge to help all project stakeholders to comprehend how the context, the

chosen approaches, the methods of work and the management of different levels have affected the outputs and outcomes of the project. During the project evaluation, the impact assessment was not possible as the data was not available at the exact period of time characterizing the project contribution to the target group in comparison with other impact factors.

The evaluation covered the entire period of the project from June 2007 – December 2009.

The geographic coverage of the evaluation was sub-regional. A part of the involved regions was attended in organized visits: Moscow; St. Petersburg (Leningrad Oblast), Veliky Novgorod, Irkutsk (Irkutsk Oblast), and Kazan (the Republic of Tatarstan). The data gathering from the other regions (Novosibirsk, Yekaterinburg, Nizhny Novgorod, Tver) was organized via the use of information and communication technologies.

During the evaluation, 64 various project related documents and products were analysed, questionnaires were filled in, e-mail correspondence and phone interviews (6) were conducted, 5 project implementation sites were visited, individual and group interviews were done, in total interviewing 46 persons, were carried out to obtain data.

UNODC, UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), project partners, and other stakeholders were involved in the evaluation – in the drafting of the plan and the analysis of findings. The evaluation results were analysed and approved during the project stakeholders meeting in Moscow on 24 March 2010.

C. Executing modalities of the project

The project was implemented by UNODC Office for the Russian Federation¹ with two main partners: the Russian NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Centre”, St. Petersburg, and the Mentor Foundation, UK. In June 2009, UNODC started collaboration with Norwegian Policy Network on Alcohol and Drugs (ACTIS). At the federal level, the main project counterpart were the National Research Centre on Addictions (NSCA), Russian Ministry of Health and Social Development, Moscow.

D. Evaluation Methodology

Based on the initial analysis of project documents, a more detailed design of evaluation methodology was developed. To achieve the purpose of the evaluation, to collect evidence-based answers to evaluation questions, and to meet the requirements set by the TOR, a combination of

¹ Until June 2009 – *UNODC Regional Office in Russia and Belarus (UNODC RORB)*

qualitative and quantitative approaches was used. The data gathering included such methods as document analysis, opinion survey and interviews. During the data gathering process the following tools were used: one questionnaire with open and closed questions, two in-depth interviews with life skills programmes providers and specialists working in the psychosocial service delivering, and two interviews – one for senior officials, another for project regional, local managers and partners. (see p. 46).

A proportion of the interviews was conducted in groups, and a proportion was individual interviews. No evidence was found that one or the other way of obtaining data would be limiting the contents of the data. During the interviews, the questions in groups were phrased differently targeting each respondent, thus excluding the possibility of group pressure. The obtained answers characterized each individual experience covering a wide range of topics including shortcomings. Obtaining of quantitative data with survey questionnaires was insufficient – only 9 of 30 sent questionnaires were returned, representing all regions. Since the questionnaires contained both quantitative and qualitative information, the evaluator decided to use them during field visits and in interviews with regional project coordinators, specialists, to verify the genuineness of the provided data. Only the information confirmed by various data sources, was used in further evaluation.

The considerations about data validity and reliability had a significant role in practice it meant the development of the evaluation tools and piloting and improving two of them before use, and the involvement of the stakeholders of different levels in the evaluation process. The stakeholders of all levels were involved: starting from senior officials, to practitioners who work face to face with customers, thus providing the diversity of data sources. Data reliability was ensured also by the reasonable selection of informants – beneficiaries, using as the basis their knowledge and skills in the practice, as well as the use of triangulation for the control of data quality (use and comparison of different data sources), thus verifying the gathered information. The analysis of the report during the final conference was used for additional data verification. In the Conference on evaluation results, a wide range of stakeholders was represented, from federal and regional partners to local managers, which gave an opportunity to obtain feedback on the results of the evaluation. The participants confirmed that the report reflected the actual achievements of the project. Therefore, it can be considered that the report does not contain any misrepresentation of data.

E. Limitations to the evaluation

During the process of planning the project evaluation, the following limitations were identified: the lack of information about the general statistical data characterizing the situation and changes. The

described limitations apply to obtaining background information, which characterises the situation in general, they are not an obstacle for forming an understanding of the project outcomes and making general conclusions.

The evaluation of the project did not cover the final beneficiaries (vulnerable young people) as the vulnerable young people are affected by several factors, individually and in combination. In that case, to identify the project impact it would be necessary to invest more financial, human and time resources starting from the beginning of the project. Therefore, the evaluation of impact during this project was not possible. The main target group of the project was specialists – practitioners in the field of prevention and representatives of local administrations, therefore the evaluation was focused on the changes in these groups.

Even though the project evaluation was organised only in selected sites of project implementation, during the evaluation a sufficient amount of data, characterising various regions, was obtained, which allowed performing an overall evaluation of the project.

In the course of the project evaluation the consultant identified two additional limitations. The first is the relative shortage of time, as the result of which it was not always possible to obtain in-depth information on how the project participants apply the gained knowledge and skills in practice. Simultaneously, the consultant has obtained a sufficient overall opinion, which allows carrying out a proper analysis of trends and limitations in the use of project outcomes.

The second limitation is related to the relative disadvantages of the lack of the team of evaluators. Through disinterested scientifically structured discussion, teamwork would have greatly promoted the development of various interpretations of the obtained data and their analysis. The project is rich in relationships, correlations, meanings and levels of interpretation; it is a challenge for one individual, however highly skilled, to grasp all the complexity of the project in the available limited time. It poses some risk that some facts remained unidentified for that reason. Simultaneously, the consultant did all within her powers to carry out a high quality, scientifically valid evaluation.

II. MAJOR FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

A. Relevance of the project

The Project design and practical implementation are fully relevant both with regard to strategic documents of various levels of the Russian Federation and the regions, and considering the general needs of the target groups. The evidence of the above is present in various sources: the previously described statistic data, the information provided by respondents of various levels, as well as the analysis of the strategic documents.

The project has been designed based on the specific tasks for the reduction of drug demand of the UNODC Strategic Programme Framework for the Russia Federation for the period of 2004-2007, namely – Involvement of government and non-governmental organizations in policy development and the implementation of prevention, in-service training of professionals for carrying out prevention work. An additional source of the project design was the guidelines of EC (Tacis) IBPP programme, which determined the direction of the project towards the empowerment and development of the non governmental organizations (NGO) sector.

Drug abuse prevention is one of the strategic priorities for the Government of the Russian Federation, as reflected in the Federal Target Programme “Complex Activities to Counteract Drug Misuse and their Illegal Market for 2005-2009” the Programme prioritized involvement of 11-24 years old young people in prevention activities, and this it can be considered that the involvement of youth NGOs in prevention work and development of peer education programmes, declared as project objectives and implemented in practical activities, fully correspond to the priority direction for action.

In the course of evaluation the external consultant obtained documents of local (oblast) level documents (strategies, target programmes, conceptions), which confirm the relevance and the correspondence of project goals to local priorities as well. For example, the Drug Prevention Conception for Irkutsk Oblast (adopted in 2001) states that actors of various levels – local governments, non-governmental and business organizations should cooperate in implementing prevention work.

The relevance for the needs of target groups is evidenced by the situation analysis provided by the respondents in 2008, who were asked to characterize prevention work on the national and organization level prior to the start of the project, which correlates with the information reflected in the project proposal documentation.

The key points are as follows:

- The majority of specialists working in the field demonstrate insufficient understanding of evidence-based prevention work, and orientation towards information-giving and punitive approaches;
- Extremely low level of involvement of NGOs and young people in prevention activities, which is related to insufficiently developed work of NGO sector in the country;
- Inconsistent and often low quality of work of organizations, including youth NGOs, in the sphere of prevention.

Respondents – government representatives of various levels (regional government officials, representative of the National Research Centre on Addiction (NRCA)) emphasized that the importance and implementation of the project was influenced not only by the project’s relevance to the priorities

of national and local level, and the use of new, up-to-date and evidence-based strategies, but equally the following factors:

- The project management which was carried out by UNODC Office in the Russian Federation, thus making the participants confident that the project is “really high quality”;
- The cooperation between the regional (oblast) and city administrations, the project coordinator and partners, carried out throughout the project. This cooperation, from one side, actualized the prevention work as a whole, and the importance of various activities within the regions, and from another side, it provided the opportunity to take into account the specific situation and the needs of each region, thus adjusting and improving the project’s working plans locally.

Thus it can be concluded that both the approaches used and the management carried out were appropriate to the project’s resources, which promoted the attainment of the planned aims and objectives of the project.

B. Attainment of the Project Objectives

In accordance with the opinion of government institutions, project partners and local coordinators, the aim and objectives of the project can on the whole be considered clear, realistic and achievable, however the level of achievement in every specific locality differs, and these differences have been influenced by the following factors:

1. The level of development of NGOs (quality of work) and their number/amount in the specific region. Some sources pointed out that in some of the project sites the number of NGOs was quite limited, the organizations worked in a narrow, specific sphere, which considerably hindered the implementation of the project.
2. The social-economic situation: the crisis becoming deeper, the funding for the social sphere becomes limited. In some of the project’s locations NGO funding from the local authorities is decreased, thus in effect restricting NGO activities.
3. Prior experience of prevention work. There is a relatively higher quality of work in developing programmes and providing social-psychological support in the project locations where experienced practitioners are available, and institutions (both governmental and non-governmental) have the experience of carrying out practical work with clients.

4. The motivation to promote the improvement of prevention work in the specific oblast. It is precisely in the regions where specialists (both in the administration and the organizations) showed the highest level of interest, enthusiasm, appreciation of the project's relevance, that the activities implemented are more numerous and broader in scope – both on strategic and practical level, simultaneously carrying out evaluation of their work.
5. Local management. Achievements are relatively higher in the project locations where the local coordinator undertook active organization of project's work. This testifies to the importance of interpersonal relations.

In order to assess the achievements within each of the objectives and outline the possible future developments, each of the objectives will be analyzed separately.

Objective 1. To increase skills and knowledge of youth organizations to carry out effective and sustainable programs based on life-skills education principles through development of standardized peer-to-peer training programs, experience exchange, and training.

The implementation of the objective has been carried out in five project locations (Veliky Novgorod, Novosibirsk, Yekaterinburg, Irkutsk (Irkutsk Oblast), and Kazan (the Republic of Tatarstan)). The representatives from all of the locations confirm that, as the result of the project, in 2010 in all of the regions and cities life skills programmes are implemented on a wider scale than in 2007. In addition, the programmes now are targeted also at vulnerable youth. The dynamic of growth varies, having differences in every location. The initial programme implementation (in 2007) has been assessed in the range from one to four out of six, where one is the lowest (example of a scale is presented in the annex page 50). At the moment of evaluation, all the respondents assess the life skills programme realization at five out of six. Positive developments are acknowledged by all the regions involved in the project, but the highest points are not given, as the respondents do not find the number of involved vulnerable young people adequate yet. The respondents made their comments that the highest assessment points could be given only when at least half of the number of vulnerable youth in each region was involved in the programme. In total, about 900 young people were trained in the programmes, the number closely corresponds to the planned outcomes indicator but from the regional respondents' points of view is insufficient in the context of the much better coverage that might be achieved. Several changes related to programme implementation have been identified in the individual project locations: new programmes developed, used both for educating the specialists working with young people (including NGOs) and for working with peer leaders.

At the same time, the project participants have identified broader changes which promote the prevention work in the regions on a more general level, and associate them precisely with the development of life skills, namely:

- The use of a new prevention approach – moving away from merely informing, which used to be the core working method, to using life skills (the response appears in 4 regions – Irkutsk Oblastj, Novosibirsk, Tver (NT)², Velikiy Novgorod);
- Involvement of diverse organizations in the system emergence or improvement of coordination activities for primary prevention (4 regions – Irkutsk, Kazan, Tver (NT), Yekaterinburg (NT)).

Analysing and assessing the content and form of the implemented programme, the consultant concludes that the examples of good practice, which take into account all recommendations, do exist. For instance, the specialists / professionals from the Republic of Tatarstan, on the basis of the gained knowledge and guidelines from the methodological materials, have developed two programmes – for vulnerable youth in out of school institutions and for children from the risk groups during their time in summer camps. Both programmes have been developed taking into consideration the specific social and economical features of the Republic, considering the locations where the target group could be reached. The content, methods, length and other particularities of the programme correspond with the criteria which characterize good practice and have been used by specialists from different organizations (including NGOs) all over the Republic.

However, three programmes display a digression from the initial understanding of the life skills programme. The evaluation process showed the following digressions:

- The length of the programme was considerably shorter (2-6 hours) (Nizhniy Novgorod);
- The programme is implemented among a relatively older audience – aged 16 or more years (Novosibirsk, Yekaterinburg).

These shortcomings have arisen in the process between programme development and implementation while adjusting the contents with the demands from schools to provide shorter programmes and their realization also for other young people, older than planned. The shortcomings have not arisen due to the lack of knowledge or skills.

The situation described testifies that additional support is needed during the time of programme development and implementation in regions. There is a need for supervision and advice from life-skill experts during these stages. The project did not envisage resources for this kind of support, as in accordance with the grant programme demands it was not possible to include in the activities paid development and implementation of programmes. In particular, if future similar projects are planned,

² Information has not been triangulated, henceforward – NT

and the granting system allows, a budget and time to support expert advice to supervise development of local life-skills based education programs and monitor implementation of these programs at least in initial stages should be foreseen.

Although certain weaknesses have been identified caused by external factors, the Evaluator considers that the Objective has been reached, since the criteria (the increase of the use of new developed life skills programmes for vulnerable young people and the number of young people who participated in the programmes, as well as the compliance of the developed programmes with good practice) confirm the improvement of service provision in all project locations.

Objective 2. *To improve service provision to vulnerable young people through establishment of psycho-social support services in 8 cities of Russia on the basis of network organizations and through involvement of young people in the service provision.*

The objective has been met predominantly through work with dependent drug users, carrying out tertiary prevention in seven of all cities (St. Petersburg, Novosibirsk, Yekaterinburg, Nizhny Novgorod, Irkutsk, Tver and Kazan). Veliky Novgorod worked with high-risk children and young people – orphans, children of dependent parents, who may be using or not using psychoactive substances, while not being dependent – thus both primary and secondary prevention work was implemented.

According to the data obtained from the interviews, specialists – practitioners in the field of prevention who were involved in the project and regional coordinators believe that the service provision as a form of prevention work with drug users has been improved as the result of the project. They emphasize that these results were influenced by the use of the concept of social support, which is a new approach in working with clients. It is precisely the use of this concept, placing the needs of the client in the centre of intervention, as a turn (or a critical point) which ensures further achievements within this Objective.

The respondents express particularly high appreciation for the cooperation networks of organizations established and expanded in the project. Six of the project locations rate the achieved cooperation at six points, thus accentuating both the importance of the goal and the scope of achievement. The following key achievements attained owing to the development or strengthening of the cooperation network, including diverse organizations, regardless of their status (NGO, state, local government, etc) are these:

- The scope of interventions has been expanded (this achievement is acknowledged in all regions). The assessment identified such extended issue areas as provision of legal

assistance, assisting the client with renewal of his/her documentation, assistance in job search, provision of medical assistance, securing a temporary or permanent place to live.

- The client base has been extended (in all regions). The project participants started working with young people whose parents are drug dependent, HIV positive drug users, ex-prisoners, prisoners who would soon be released from prison. A proportion of respondents plan to extend the scope of clients even more, as the social-economic situation worsens.
- The number of clients receiving assistance has been expanded (five regions note that – Veliky Novgorod, Yekaterinburg, Nizhny Novgorod, Irkutsk, and Kazan). The increase of the number of clients is related to the influence of factors described above. The exact number is not available as the data has not been gathered on the number of clients at the beginning of the project, excluding the possibility to estimate the growth. Therefore the growth can be only assessed as a tendency from the questionnaires and interviews.
- The number of individuals who attain independence through received assistance has increased (three regions - St. Petersburg, Veliky Novgorod, and Kazan). Examples, characterizing the changes, are the following: Clients find and keep their jobs at least for 6 months, the amount of taxes paid into the state budget increases, new couples are formed, and clients get involved in supporting other drug abusers.

While working towards the project goals, the cooperation process itself has been improved – according to the opinion of NGO representatives, the specialists from local government and state organizations treat the clients with relatively increased sense of responsibility, providing the necessary services within the scope of competence of their institution. This achievement is also explained by the network influence – knowing that the client’s case is monitored in one organization; the provision of services gets to be perceived with more responsibility, thus decreasing the number of refusals. Respondents also emphasise the importance of the developed system of cooperation, and representatives of all regions completely agree with the statement that the cooperation initialized in the project is being continued, thus pointing to the attainment of the goal.

In addition to identifying considerable achievements, the evaluation provided basis for concluding that the following directions of action where work must be continued, to improve and strengthen service provision:

- In all regions the specialists pointed out that a considerable drawback in the limited funding which precludes them from providing services to all clients who need assistance and this also limits the kinds of services that can be provided (no-fee rehabilitation is regarded as particularly inaccessible by

5 regions (Veliky Novgorod, Novosibirsk, Nizhny Novgorod, Tver, and Kazan), and legal assistance has extremely restricted availability for 3 regions (St. Petersburg, Veliky Novgorod, and Tver).

- In some regions (St. Petersburg, Tver) the cooperation networks has been consolidated by administrative acts or other normative documents, however there is no sufficient information on whether and how the work of the support system is monitored, assessed and stimulated. Insufficient monitoring and assessment may be a threat for targeted support provision within the network.

- In some of the regions (Irkutsk, Veliky Novgorod) specialists have relatively limited experience in the sphere of social rehabilitation; they admit that previously they used the behavioural (punitive) approach. These specialists need additional in-service training and supervision of their work, so that the knowledge acquired can be put to practical use more successfully.

- One of the regions proposed that the network should be expanded, since the number of organizations included remains to be insufficient – thus a concrete direction of necessary activities is identified.

Although certain weaknesses have been identified in the attainment of this Objective – for instance, resources are insufficient to reach all clients in need of services, the Evaluator considers that the Objective has been reached, since the criteria (the increase of the number / scope of services, inclusion of additional groups of clients in receiving the services and the increase of clients attaining independence) confirm the improvement of service provision in all project locations.

Objective 3. *To increase understanding of local administrations and government institutions on youth NGO role in provision of effective programs aimed at drug and alcohol use prevention among young people in high risk groups.*

Eight project locations were involved in achieving the objective. All respondents from diverse groups of stakeholders acknowledge that the project has promoted the cooperation among local administration, specialists from local governments and NGOs, notwithstanding the fact that the cooperation had been at disparate stages of development – from long-standing and rich in tradition cases, to non-existence of such cooperation. The most striking changes have been noted in one of the regions – Irkutsk, where the project has contributed to a radical change in the cooperation between local authorities and NGOs – respondents confirm that there was no cooperation prior to the project, since there was no awareness on possible gains from such cooperation. The serious attitude to cooperation benefits is also confirmed by the grants for project implementation currently awarded to NGOs.

Neither NGOs nor local administrations doubt the achievements and / or improvements, though the opinions about these show the situation from different points of view:

1. The differences in the opinions of the local administrations include questions about the scope and nature of the improvements. Part of respondents (e.g. from Irkutsk) admit the improvements, emphasizing that the benefit for prevention is the increasing number of professional organizations involved. The growth in number of the organizations working in prevention has been reflected also in the reports of the regional coordinators.(see page 29) The other part of respondents (e.g., Kazan, St. Petersburg) give a lower rate to the improvements, commenting that they had cooperation with NGOs before the project, and the project merely expanded or deepened this existing cooperation.

2. NGO representatives did not give the maximum rating to the improvement of cooperation, pointing out that the cooperation remains to be improved and the scope of activities can be developed even more. Examples of responses are: there has been exchange of opinion within the project, we have started to have roundtable discussions, and cooperation has been improved in one specific issue area.

The differences between the opinions of NGOs and local governments can be interpreted as different expectations on what constitutes successful cooperation. NGOs expect financial resources, while local authorities expect NGOs to provide initiative, partially pro bono work, as well as perceive NGOs as their partners. From the perspective of local authorities, financial support is only one of the forms of cooperation. During the project, the opinions of both sides were taken into the consideration, the opinions not being opposite to each other. Due to the global financial crisis, the funding for NGOs from different sources has been reduced; therefore the issue about the financial contribution has taken a leading role (in the perception of NGOs).

The respondents (representatives of various organizations) who had participated in project activities 3 or more times, pointed out a greater growth in the cooperation of both sides, compared to others who participated relatively fewer times (one or two project activities). This can be explained by a deeper involvement, development of relationships in the course of joint activities, which is important in further cooperation.

The most important achievements of cooperation are related to the development and the implementation of a joint information exchange system, the inclusion of NGOs in implementing regional, strategically important goals, including the provision of financial support.

The achievements are characterized by the following examples, obtained from the interviews with various stakeholders, questionnaires and documentation (reports of regional coordinators, documentation from the prevention work of regional administrations):

- Knowledge on relevant processes, exchange of information and experience (five regions – St. Petersburg, Veliky Novgorod, Irkutsk, Tver, and Kazan);

- More often, regular meetings, exchange of opinions (four regions – Veliky Novgorod, Irkutsk, Tver, and Kazan);
- Coordination of work in the region on the whole, developing the system of drug prevention (two regions – Irkutsk and Kazan);
- Project grants obtained by NGOs from local authorities for project implementation (see page 35);
- NGOs projects or implemented activities included in the financial plans for 2010, accepted by regional and city administrations;
- The administration of the Republic of Tatarstan has come to appreciate the role of NGOs and now the issue of complete funding of one programme from the republic budget is being arranged. Currently, the discussion is being led to include the service in the budget project for 2011. The service covers tertiary prevention activities which have been developed during the project.

At the same time, a proportion of NGOs and local authorities in some of the regions, regardless of the successful cooperation, display a lack of mutual trust. An understanding of prevention work as a jointly implemented activity requires further promotion and getting accustomed, as the changes in understanding are time-consuming. Both representatives of administration and local authorities, and NGO participants pointed out the separation between “them” and “us”, emphasizing that one side fails to understand the problems of the other side. This can be explained by a short history of NGOs existence in the Russian Federation (since 1991), which demonstrate historically early stage of relationships between state structures and civil society organizations in spite of many other European countries where history of these relationships counts nearly 50 – 80 years. This sort of thinking points to the necessity to continue the dialogues initiated in the project, strengthening the cooperation of all stakeholders.

Representatives of several local government institutions in 3 regions did not question NGO capacity as such, however they expressed criticism with regard to professionalism of youth NGOs, since specialists have formed the opinion that youth organizations are run only by young, inexperienced people, their work is not sufficiently monitored and assessed. The project evaluation did not yield sufficient information to either confirm or disprove this opinion; however the opinion as such testifies that it is necessary to strengthen both the third sector, providing support in developing programmes and projects, and the cooperation between the state and NGOs, thus increasing the impact of prevention work locally.

Despite the identified difficulties, the objective to increase the understanding of local administration about the role of NGOs in prevention can be regarded as achieved, as both local

administrations and NGOs from all the locations involved in the project admit the increase in the understanding, recognition and the use of different cooperation forms, as well as the development of new cooperation forms.

The project as a whole has made a considerable contribution to implementation of UNODC Strategy 2008 – 2011 in accordance with the Thematic Strand 3 “Prevention, Treatment, and Reintegration, and Alternative Development” result area “Community – Centred Prevention”, specifically – by enhancing the national capacity to prevent drug abuse (3.1.4.), expanding the capacity to foster community-centred drug abuse prevention programmes, and in that context increase the cooperation between UNODC and relevant entities of civil society (3.1.7.)

C. Achievement of the project outputs

All the planned activities have been carried out in the course of the Project, thus attaining all the planned output indicators characterising the Project activities. Tables below demonstrate the main achieved results towards planned outputs indicators.

The overview of outputs by Objective 1 ‘To increase skills and knowledge of youth organisations to carry out programmes based on life skills principles’

Planned/ Achieved indicators	<i>Description , sources of information</i>
<p><i>Trained professionals on life skills approach</i> Planned (P): 295 trained professionals, Achieved (A): 315 persons (135 from NGOs – 15 more than planned, 180 from local government and municipality). Achieved in time : November, 2008</p>	<p>Process of the training³ had been assessed by participants at the end of the event. The average score evaluating satisfaction is 5.3 points from six as a highest. Sources: participation lists with signatures, Trainer’s reports, analysis of the process evaluations obtained from the questionnaires fulfilled by participants</p>
<p><i>Package of methodological materials based on life-skills approach for drug use prevention programs developed and printed</i> P: 2000 copies A: 3500 copies Achieved: 2000 copies in time (2008, June), Additional copies 1,500 by November, 2009 according to the request from local partners</p>	<p>The quality of the materials assessed in the interviews and questionnaires. The respondents confirmed the compliance of the local needs and the use of materials in the programme development. Sources: Description of the interviews, questionnaires, documentation of the process of elaborating the materials (communication, drafts / projects of the materials), Financial documents, approving the printing.</p>

³ The process evaluation included such criteria as the content compliance with the needs of participants, comprehensibility of the content, usability of the knowledge in practice.

<p><i>Achieved an agreement to use materials in out of school settings (both – regional and federal levels).</i> Achieved as planned (November, 2009)</p>	<p>Information from Senior officials and representatives of local government, regional coordinators, obtained in interviews approving the permission to use materials in a work with youth.</p>
<p><i>Participation in the study visit</i> P: 4 professionals from the state and NGOs participated in the study visit. Achieved: September, 2009 (7 months later as planned)</p>	<p>The quality and the conformity to the needs could be linked with the view of participants that the gained experience and received information is an important source for the further prevention programmes development in regions. Sources: Report of the visit, list of participants, interviews.</p>
<p><i>Trained professionals on monitoring and evaluation</i> P: 40 specialists, 2 trainings A :45 specialists, 2 trainings Achieved as planned (February, 2009)</p>	<p>The process of training was evaluated by the participants filling out questionnaires at the end of the event. The first training has a lower scores (4,4 points from 6) than the second one (5,6). According to the information obtained from the regional and local coordinators, partners, the training programme were improved, that is why the second one was evaluated comparatively higher. Despite the low evaluation, the data gathered from the interviews demonstrate practical use of knowledge gained in both trainings. Sources: participation lists with signatures, Trainer’s reports, project reports, interviews</p>

Data obtained from interviews and questionnaires confirmed that the trained specialists, methodological materials and the permission to use them in out of school settings created a basis for developing and implementing the life skills programmes at the regions.

The overview of outputs by Objective 2 ‘To improve service provision to vulnerable young people through the establishment of psycho-social support service’

<i>Planned/ Achieved indicators</i>	<i>Description , sources of information</i>
<p><i>Trained professionals on psychosocial service delivery</i> P: 34 specialists, 2 training events A: 49 specialists, 2 training events , in time</p> <p><i>Experience exchange meetings held</i> P 2 one day meetings, 21 participants Achieved: June, October, 2009..</p>	<p>The feed back from the participants confirms that the training and meeting corresponded to their needs. The gained knowledge and skills were use in the practical work with clients and organizations. Source: interviews with the psychosocial service providers, local coordinators, participation lists with signatures, project partners’ reports.</p>
<p><i>Package of methodological materials on psycho-social support to vulnerable young people developed, printed, distributed</i> P: 100 copies Achieved: December, 2007</p>	<p>As the material contains the most up-to-date tools, for example, ongoing social support and the basics of Motivational interviewing and it is based on the evaluated experience of Russian NGO DAPC. Source: the printed material Financial documents approving the printing, reports of project partners approving the delivery of the materials.</p>

Information obtained from the interviews and questionnaires showed the influence of the participation in the above mentioned activities on the achievement of the outcomes indicators –

establishment of psychosocial services, involvement of new partners, providing psychosocial support, improve of knowledge and skills for service provision.

The overview of outputs by Objective 3 ‘ To increased understanding of local administrations and Government institutions on NGO role’

Planned/ Achieved indicators	Description , sources of information
<p><i>Conducted advocacy visits to regions</i> P: 6 visits Achieved in time: August, 2008.</p>	<p>The Advocacy visits were perceived by the local government officials and NGO’s as a suitable tool promoting mutual cooperation. Thus the expressed views confirm the compliance to planned performance. Source: interviews, project reports</p>
<p><i>Enhanced EEYN web page</i> Achieved in time: December, 2008, regularly updated</p>	<p>The webpage could be assessed as an appropriate site for different kind of the prevention materials, because half of respondents have reported about the regular (once a month or two) use of it. Source: interviews and questionnaires</p>
<p><i>Trained specialists on PR and media</i> P: 20 NGO and state professionals trained on use of PR and media in drug use prevention, 2 training events including distance learning. Achieved as planned; October, 2009.</p>	<p>The quality of the activity was confirmed by the use of knowledge and skills during the homework which were provided and evaluated by trainers. Sources: Participation lists with signatures, Trainer’s reports, project reports.</p>
<p><i>Created thematic TV programmes on drug use prevention</i> P: 4 TV programmes created and broadcasted in 4 regions Achieved as planned: November, 2009.</p>	<p>The process of the creation of the programmes included the supervision of quality of the product done by the project coordinator and prevention experts. Only approved programmes were considered as a product for broadcasting. Thus the process by use of external knowledge provides the evidence for quality. Source: project report, interview with the manager, TV programmes.</p>
<p><i>Organized conferences of project participants</i> P: 2 conferences, 16 participants from all regions Achieved as planned (2008, October; 2009, October)</p>	<p>The programmes included the discussions between representatives of local administrations and coordinators about the promotion of the NGO role in drug use prevention. Source: programme, lists of participants, project reports, participants presentations.</p>

The involvement of the local administration in project activities (advocacy visits, conferences) and in the provision of publicity for the project is evaluated by the representatives of administration and local coordinators as a significant resource, which has promoted cooperation between NGOs and administration, and allocation of funding for NGO activities from the budget even in times of economic crisis. Thus we can conclude that local administration participation has contributed to achieving the project outcome indicators.

D. Institutional and management arrangements and constraints

Project implementation coordination and cooperation

The implementation of project activities was carried out in cooperation of all project partners under the management of the UNODC project coordinator. It is precisely the participation of both project partners that ensured a high quality of attainment of project objectives. The development of social-psychological support and network capacity was carried out based on the expertise and expert knowledge of NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Centre” (DAPC) while the expertise of Mentor Foundation (MF) UK was crucial in the implementation of the life skills component, as well as implementation of the monitoring & evaluation seminar, and development of materials. The selection of partners was carried out based on the specific expert knowledge of each partner, their experience and possibilities, aligning these with the needs of the regions. The practical organization of project activities, management of logistical issues in Russia was carried out in cooperation with DAPC. Although all sides consider this cooperation successful, the project partners voiced the opinion that the opportunities that might have been provided by the DAPC and MF experts have not been used in full. However, this did not have any negative consequences, as the experts were highly qualified, in one case – university staff, in the other – representatives of the local partnering organization (DAPC). Cooperation with the regions was started under agreements with Regional and municipal administrations. Both the partners and representatives of administrations, as well as regional managers, who were visited during the evaluation mission, acknowledged that the project coordination can be considered of high professional level. The regional managers and partners particularly emphasized the input of the project coordinator, pointing out that her supervision and level of attention/interest was a considerable positive influence on the local implementation of project activities according to the plan, since she was instrumental in sorting out undecided issues related to organizing certain activities, recruitment of participants, local level cooperation. In addition, project partners point out that the coordinator was receptive to their suggestions.

Monitoring

Project monitoring was implemented by the UNODC project coordinator jointly with DAPC. During the project, the monitoring of the project process was carried out in order to receive regular data the achievements of outcomes and outputs indicators and the compliance of the project activities with the needs of the target group.

For the measuring of the outcomes, two questionnaires for local coordinators were developed for data collection before and after the project. The obtained data was region-specific, and included

such parameters as the number of NGOs, the number of life skills programmes, grants for NGOs from municipal and federal budgets etc. The data described the changes and the progress towards the objectives of the project. During the evaluation, the data on two categories (the number of life skills programmes and the number of vulnerable youth receiving services) proved to be invalid and non-descriptive. It did not lead to any negative consequences as the planned output indicators were achieved. The described peculiarity of data can be attributed to the impact of culture, as during the evaluation process in regions the same phenomenon occurred.

The control of output indicators was done through the comparison of the planned and the actually implemented activities, and the changes related to the needs and interests of the target group (specialists) within the limits of the budget (changes are presented on page 23).

Another aspect assessed during the project was the contextual match of the activities with the needs of the target group. The participants of every seminar filled in questionnaires, assessing the work process; a proportion of seminars also have assessment of the progress of knowledge of seminar participants. The information thus gathered is written up in reports and used in the further seminars, improving these in accordance with the suggestions of participants.

According to the opinion given by the Mentor Foundation UK, the identification of participant needs in the beginning of the project was not sufficient, therefore at a later stage the developed monitoring and evaluation system was also used for more specific identification of the needs of the target group, and the changes implemented – which attests to the participants' ability to learn.

It can be concluded that the monitoring helped promoting the strengths and correcting the weaknesses, providing an overall view on the situation in the regions, and therefore it can be considered as fully corresponding to the project objectives. The obtained data was used in the project evaluation as one of the data sources for triangulation.

In the further monitoring processes, it is recommended to validate the data showing striking differences between the planned and the achieved numbers, thus preventing the risk of inadequate data collection.

Changes/alterations and management of change

Two major changes occurred in the course of the project:

1. The project was extended for an 8-month period (no-cost extension for 8 month till 31 December, 2009 approved by EC). The reason was the delay of activities under the Specific Objective 2, Activity, aiming to *launch psycho-social services in 8 cities of the Russian Federation* due to the time requirement for the development of the appropriate methodology, and due to lengthy

negotiations with the regions on selecting partner organizations, and appointing local coordinators to support the establishment of psycho-social services.

2. The other alteration is related to the mutual changes of the timing, location of study visit and cooperation partners. Initially, a visit of Russian experts and prevention specialists was planned to the United Kingdom in February 2008. However, due to several bureaucratic factors, the visit was postponed until 2009.

Later in 2008 there were management and staff changes in the Mentor Foundation UK, as the project coordinator and manager left the organization. This resulted in the delay of submission of the Final financial and audit reports to UNODC and further led to the UNODC and DAPC decision to search for an alternative partner for cooperation.

The NGO for further cooperation was found in Norway – the Norwegian Policy Network on Alcohol and Drugs (ACTIS). The study visit was organized to Norway in September/October 2009.

The evaluation process provided evidence that the choice of the country for the study visit was successful for the reason of a relatively similar policy of drug control. At the same time the highly developed prevention work in Norway showed opportunities for practical implementation of prevention work, as well as cooperation between NGOs and other organizations. Thus the changes can be considered beneficial for the project.

The modifications in the project process did not influence the attainment of project objectives. The complicated situations have been resolved through mutual cooperation, the best solutions developed, thus confirming the flexibility of project management and the high quality of work carried out.

Financial management

The project's financial management was carried out aligning the requirements for financial flow control from UNODC and the European Commission. The requirement to provide reports in various currencies to various institutions (USD, EUR) created additional work burden in making various currency exchange calculations and ensuring the control of the use of funds.

A considerable support for timely and detailed financial management was the involvement in financial supervision by Mr Suhrob Raupov, Budget and Finance Assistant, UNODC Office in the Russian Federation. He recruited starting from 20 October 2008 (according to the recommendations of the UNODC internal audit (OIOS) that took place in June 2008) and covers the financial monitoring support functions for all UNODC projects in the Russian Federation. The electronic database to monitor financial obligations of UNODC projects is clear, user-friendly, easy to oversee and pro-active, since it provides data not only on the funding provided to partners incurred by also

about other financial obligations such as dates for financial and substantive reports, outstanding payments and audit reports.

All documentation is available in printed format, are kept in well-structured folders, thus providing the opportunity to assess the details of, for example, tenders for experts or facilitators for project activities. Thus the developed system of financial management has ensured a transparent financial supervision and effective management, which meets the UNODC HQ requirements.

Challenges and constraints

Difficulties encountered in the course of the project are related to challenges inherent in the project's design, divergent prevention policies of project's partner states, as well as cultural barriers.

In developing the project's design, insufficient attention was paid to the first stage of project cycle: there was no detailed analysis of the situation in the regions, identifying the specific needs of prevention specialists. In the course of project implementation no additional time and funding were allocated to these activities. Thus each of the trainers had to be very flexible and had to be able to learn from the drawbacks identified in the first training sessions.

One of the challenges was connected with the limitations of the programme:

The project was financed by the EU programme which was targeted at the training activities only for specialists. There were no possibilities of getting resources for developing and piloting programmes, due to these constraints. On one side, the development of life skills programme shows the training achievements. On the other side, had the piloting of the programmes and the supervision of the work been done, it could have been possible to reduce the identified weak points (see page 17), thus leading project achievements towards excellence.

Considering the data showing that considerable improvements are attained precisely in the locations where a broad scope of project activities was implemented, it can be concluded that the decisions taken have promoted the attainment of project objectives and the improvement of prevention work. However, as it is not possible to assess the hypothetical improvements in the regions where a comparatively low number of activities was available, this aspect should be considered a restriction on the project's activities.

Evaluating the experience in prevention work, the existence of programmes and the cooperation with NGOs, the regions involved in the project show significant differences. During the designing of the project, these differences were not identified and treated accordingly. Therefore, for achieving the goals during the project implementation these differences had to be taken into the consideration and unexpected planning had to be done. The mutual alignment of the project schedule among all partners, experts and regions was a complicated process which took a relatively extensive amount of

time and human resources. Nevertheless, the management of the project succeeded to deal with this task, which is reflected in the outputs and outcomes of the project.

In taking these decisions, priority was given to the dates proposed by the regions, since the regional administration was funding the premises and rent of equipment. However, in some cases it caused difficulties in planning expert involvement. The evaluator argues that in implementing an international project and involving a considerable number of actors, it is virtually impossible to avoid such difficulties. It is possible to alleviate some of the difficulties, provided it is known prior to the start of the project or in the very beginning, where and which kinds of activities are planned, and which experts are going to lead the activities. In other international multilateral projects, where a wide range of partners is involved, these difficulties are predicted at the very beginning of the project designing stage and regular partner meetings are planned (see, for example, http://www.lwl.org/LWL/Jugend/lwl_ks/Projekte_KS1/Fgn-english)

In accordance with the opinion of foreign partners, the implementation of project activities (training) was made complicated by the diverse audience of participants – from state and local government organization representatives to practitioners, and the diverse level of participant knowledge. As the experts justly point out, in this case the participants do not acquire as much knowledge and skills as it would be possible in a more homogeneous group, with similar training needs.

At the same time, these challenges notwithstanding, the participants of seminars/training acknowledge that the diversity of the group was a benefit, since it strengthened the mutual cooperation of the specialists from various organizations, as well as it promoted the development of a joint understanding of prevention work, and fostered network-building. However a more effective improvement of knowledge and skills would have been possible, had the needs and knowledge of participants been more homogeneous.

The participation of representatives of diverse organizations in the seminars is related to the peculiarities of prevention policy in Russia and local culture.

Another aspect causing challenges in the course of the project was cultural differences. For example, the definition of “drugs” in the UK conceptually includes both alcohol and tobacco, since the reasons for alcohol use are no different from the reasons for using other drugs. However, in Russia legal and illegal substances are perceived in different ways. The society and prevention specialists are more tolerant towards alcohol use, as noted by experts. The different situations of the UK and Russia – the level of resources available from the government, the broad involvement of NGOs, the practice of evaluation – all caused temporary communication challenges in the seminars. These difficulties notwithstanding, the partners acknowledge that they are appreciate the opportunity

to learn from the project experience in another country, and even consider it a useful capital for further work.

III. OUTCOMES, IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

A. Outcomes

In the course of project evaluation both planned and unplanned outcomes have been identified. Doubtlessly it is possible to have different views on the precise ways the project produced the outcomes, although a definite borderline cannot be drawn between the impacts of the project outcomes and external factors like level of development of NGOs, social–economical situation etc. Simultaneously, the achieved planned and unplanned outcomes point to the notable role of the project in addressing the issues important for prevention work in the region on the whole.

Outcomes for Objective 1

In accordance to the evaluation carried out in the seminars, all participants acknowledge that they have improved their specific knowledge on the design and implementation of life skills programmes. In the course of project evaluation, specialists of various levels pointed out there were various life skills programmes available in Russia even prior to the current project; however the data acquired testifies that the application of the life skills approach had been incomplete:

1. The approach had not been known in all regions (e.g. Irkutsk, Novosibirsk)
2. the programmes used had not been “authentic” – they emphasized information-providing, and mixed in various other approaches, for instance, the cognitive behavioural and psychodynamic approaches (Kazan, Velikiy Novgorod).

“Before the training course I thought we already knew and could work with all that is relevant about life skills. I thought the objectives set for the project were not relevant. And yet it turned out that we had been doing information-providing! These had not been life skills at all. Now we have designed a system, coherent programmes. And I must say from the vantage point of today’s experience that the objective was indeed relevant and topical, it is just that I could not appreciate it at the time.”

Thus the project has promoted the understanding of the life skills development approach and delivery. Although the improvement of knowledge may only have a temporary effect, the project evaluation has demonstrated that the knowledge is being applied in practical work, developing programmes for vulnerable young people, and carrying out volunteer work.

Estimating the programmes named in the evaluation documents and interviews, it can be concluded that at least 20 life skills programmes have been developed or improved, which corresponds to the planned outcomes indicator. The 250 programmes listed in project reports are misleading, since the local coordinators have counted all programmes for young people that are available in the region (rather than life skills programmes developed as the result of the project). This number, as it is confirmed by the local coordinators, characterizes all the programmes for young people in regions, not identifying specifically those with life skills approach and those made as a result of the project. As the number of the programmes identified corresponds to the planned outcomes, the evaluator interprets the listed 250 programmes as a culture-caused distortion of data which does not result in any significant consequences.

The methodological materials developed in the project are used for developing and delivering programmes. All the respondents admit that the materials are of good quality (both in printing and contents) and understandable. In three regions (Irkutsk, Velikiy Novgorod, Novosibirsk (NT)) respondents point out that these are the only materials available on the life skills approach and its practical use working with youth. The opinion of the respondents on the usefulness of materials varied: a proportion admitted that the material can only be used by specialists in developing programmes (Kazan, St. Petersburg). This was the opinion of the specialists who work with the development of the programme, and ensuring the quality of the programme is essential for them. Other part of respondents pointed out that the materials are also usable by volunteers (Tver, Irkutsk, Novosibirsk) and that the volunteers use them in their practical work. The drawbacks identified in the programmes in the course of evaluation (see page 17) attest that it is important to carry out monitoring and evaluation activities to make sure that non-professional participants use the material in accordance with principles of good practice. This monitoring is currently carried out with success, for example, in Irkutsk and Moscow.

While the practical application of the knowledge acquired in life skills activities was comparatively extensive, there is relatively less information on the practical application of knowledge and skills attained in the monitoring and evaluation seminars, although the participants acknowledge an improvement of knowledge. Although participants did point out that they were carrying out evaluation, the consultant did not form a conclusive belief that the specialists feel certain and assured; there was no instance of mentioning that the data gathered in evaluation was further used in their work. The Experts explained this by the relatively complex subject matter as such, as well as insufficiently developed tradition of carrying out evaluation of the work done. It is possible that the impact could have been greater if the seminar had been linked to practical development of the programmes designed within the component.

An unplanned outcome is the application of knowledge acquired in Monitoring and Evaluation component in Irkutsk – it was put to use in improving the Regional Drug Use Prevention Strategy, developing more specific output/outcome indicators, and improving the reporting systems of the specialists, as well as data gathering processes and tools.

The questionnaires and the interviews with the local coordinators and senior officials presented an unforeseen output – the involvement of higher education establishments in the implementation of prevention work. As the result of the project, two universities (in Moscow the Department of Clinical Psychology of the Moscow State University of Medicine and Dentistry, and Novosibirsk State Pedagogic University) prepare volunteers for working with young people. Volunteers' further activities are continued under the supervision of their professors, since the activities are carried out within the practice components of their course work.

Also, an unforeseen output, identified in the interviews with the representatives of local administrations and NGOs and confirmed in the achievement report of the local coordinator, is the implementation of the prevention programmes, developed in Kazan, in the Programme for Reducing Drug Abuse among Population in the Republic of Tatarstan 2010, thus approving the significance and sustainability of the project.

Outcomes for Objective 2

Due to the project activities, psycho-social services have been established in 8 regions, linking various organizations in a cooperation network. 6 of the networks (Irkutsk, Tver, Nizniy Novgorod, Novosibirsk, and Veliky Novgorod) are new developed on the basis of the previous experience in cooperation of several organizations. 2 networks are extended and strengthened (Kazan, St. Petersburg). As the result of the activity of the networks the clients can receive additional services, which was not possible previously, or the services were not of sufficiently high quality.

All respondents point out that the project has been instrumental in improving knowledge and skills in working with clients in providing comprehensive social-psychological support. Five of the regions (Kazan, Irkutsk, Tver, Veliky Novgorod)) rate the improved skills at 6, thus completely supporting the statement that the knowledge and skills have been improved. The regions that gave a lower rating – 3 to 5 points, comment that the skills have been improved in specific issue areas, for instance in client-oriented work, in case analysis, in cooperation skills enhancement. However, respondents admit that they would have liked to learn more, yet there has not been such opportunity within the project. From the other hand, in Kazan a day-long support meeting with experts was conducted, which although short in duration, turned out effective in providing training to specialists and making sure they are capable of applying this knowledge: to introduce major changes in

providing services to drug dependent users, providing support to them in finding employment. Therefore, we can conclude that the achievements of the project can also depend on the specialists' prior knowledge/experience in working with clients.

In accordance with the DAPC reports, based on the information from local coordinators, the number of organizations providing psycho-social support to drug abusers has grown by 23 organizations (16 of them NGOs) as a result of the project. (NT)

The consultant could obtain relatively less information on the use of methodological materials in practical activities. The evaluation consultant considers the material an essential source of information, since it summarises both the practical experience of NGO DAPC in Russia and the most up-to-date tools, for example, ongoing social support and the basics of Motivational interviewing. However, there is no sufficient data allowing assessing the actual use of the material.

DAPC and project manager reports state that, as the result of the project, services have been used by 1951 vulnerable young people, receiving psycho-social support. The number comprises all clients who have received at least one consultation within the network. Thus this data does not actually characterize the number of clients who used the service of ongoing social support. The data for permanent clients is not available (not gathered).

The role of the project in improving the provision of psycho-social support is considerable, since all the respondents, even those who worked professionally before the project, pointed out that the knowledge gained was "a kind of a push" to tackle previously identified but unresolved problems. This opinion was confirmed also during the conclusion conference both by local coordinators and senior officials. The tendency of the growth in the number of clients implies this, as well.

"We had not thought that the ongoing social support can be extended to be used in providing assistance in finding employment. Now we are using that, and our clients get jobs, the attitude of officials has changed. We have friendly officials, where we can confidently send our clients."

„Now we have clients who we advise to go for a longer rehabilitation, if we consider that he/she is not ready to start independent life yet."

Outcomes for Objective 3

In the project documentation (Logical Framework) only one outcome indicator has been identified – the number of the prevention programmes funded from the state or regional budget, which gives only partial description of the objective reaching direction. The lack of indicators has not made any consequences concerning the reaching of objectives as the indicators for objective 3 have been achieved.

In the course of the project, it was documented that in 2009 25 NGOs received funding from the budget for the implementation of their activities. At the same time, the evaluation provided evidence that in comparison with previous years, the provision of financial resources has decreased. This is explained as the consequence of economic crisis, when the regions have limited their funding for social needs. Thus, it can be concluded that the growth of financing is a valid indicator in the conditions of stable or growing economy. In a situation of financial crisis, the funding shows the level of special recognition of NGO work. In this situation, it is an achievement that NGOs receive funds for the realization of their projects and programmes. This achievement cannot fully be considered as the outcome of the project, as the NGOs were funded by the state and local governments already in 2007 when the project had not started yet. Nevertheless, during the evaluation of the project, significant achievement in the field of financing have been identified – in one of the regions (Irkutsk oblast) the awarding of grants to NGOs has been started only in the course of the project (in total 200 000 RUB), and the administration admits that priori to that they had not been sufficiently aware of the role of NGOs.

At this point of reporting on the project, data is available on the support for NGOs in the following cities / regions in 2010 – Velikiy Novgorod (430 000 RUB equivalent to 14 300 USD according to UN exchange rate of March 2010); Republic of Tatarstan (853 000 RUB equivalent to 28 400 USD according to UN exchange rate of March 2010); Yekaterinburg (50 000 RUB equivalent to 1 600 USD according to UN exchange rate of March 2010), Irkutsk (200 000 RUB equivalent to 6400 USD according to UN exchange rate of March 2010). St. Petersburg DAPC – in the process of the approval of funding (700,000 RUB equivalent to 22 400 USD according to UN exchange rate of March 2010) by Primorsky District Administration (in April 2010) for provision of support services to drug users (namely employment) under the Primorsky District AntiDrug Program. The data do not characterize the complete situation, as the granting processes continue. In all the locations of the project, the local government support NGOs, partly or fully covering the rental expenses, which serves as a significant investment, as well. During the project, in accordance with the information from local coordinators, gathered by DAPC and the project local coordinator (NT), the number of organizations involved in prevention has grown (primary prevention 12 NGOs, tertiary prevention 16 NGOs). The data confirms the direction towards reaching the third objective .

The strengthening of the role of NGOs in a country which has a relatively short experience in involving the society in problem-solving situations is a real challenge. The design of the project is found to be successful, as it gives proper conditions for the cooperation between the local government and NGO. Both NGO and local government had similar responsibility in the implementation of the project – local government, in accordance with the information from interviews, had the possibility to

obtain the information on the NGO work and to participate in the project planning, presenting the needs of the region; whereas the NGO could choose how to implement the knowledge and skills in prevention practice. By this, the design of the project had its influence on the recognition of the role of NGO and the cooperation of partners.

During the interviews with the representatives of local administration a special role was assigned to advocacy visits which promoted the project recognition in the regions, as it was reflected in mass media. The regional/district level administrations were proud of the opportunity to participate in an international project led by UNODC, and considered this to be a sign of appreciation of their work. The contacts made during the visit were instrumental in the further work of the project and opened the doors for the implementation of project activities, for instance, in using the local government resources (premises and equipment) without charge.

The maintenance of project visibility and the role of NGO in prevention was promoted by the training of project participants in PR issues and through the TV programmes developed in 4 regions. Information from 4 regions (Irkutsk oblast, Republic of Tatarstan, St. Petersburg, Tver) verifies that the project participants use the skills mastered during the PR training events in working with mass media, and that they also share their knowledge with colleagues both in their organizations and more extensively – on the level of the city/region. One of the created TV programmes in Veliky Novgorod has already been re-broadcasted twice, thus demonstrating their topicality and potential for further use.

In the course of evaluation, the following unplanned outcomes have been identified:

- Local experts acknowledge that the project has promoted the formation of a deeper understanding of prevention work in the regions, awareness of the regional needs, which can be successfully used in further projects (Irkutsk oblast, Republic of Tatarstan, Novosibirsk).

- Organizations from various regions acknowledged that they have learned from one another and from UNODC about documenting prevention work and report writing, and coordination of prevention work and this knowledge is already being put into practice (Republic of Tatarstan, Irkutsk oblast, Veliky Novgorod) or there is a commitment to do so in the future (St. Petersburg).

- The activities, process and achievements of the project Outcome 1 have been presented in a scientific conference, as well as summarized in theses and published in 2 scientific journals (Moscow). The summary of the project Outcome 2 activities in Kazan is planned to be done in the form of scientific theses and presented in a conference later this year.

- The knowledge and contacts acquired in the course of the project have promoted the improvement of policy documents. The Conception of Drug Prevention in Irkutsk Oblast (2001) was supplemented with outputs and outcomes and their respective indicators.

B. Impact

During the project evaluation, the impact assessment was not done due to limitations described on page 13, however the gathered data show the significant basis for such an impact, as the following changes have been identified as the result of the project:

- The change of understanding of the NGO role/contribution in prevention, thus expanding the scope of partners involved in coordinated prevention work;
- The creation and strengthening of organisations' networks, providing the clients with the necessary services and monitoring achievements;
- Increased understanding of what constitutes evidence-based prevention work;
- Improvement of the professional capacities of specialists in carrying out evidence-based programmes in practice, and thus strengthening the role of their own organizations.

The particulars of the project impact would be different in each region, since the pressure of the problem varies, as does the starting point variables – previous experience of prevention work, the number and the scope of target groups involved, the spectrum of the problems addressed.

The project has provided indirect positive effects towards meeting the MDG targets: by limiting the risk of individuals starting and continuing drug use, and developing a drug dependency, as well as by providing support to users' resocialization, the project has preventively contributed to the MDGs of combating extreme poverty, limiting the spread of HIV/AIDS and also decreased the risk of young people dropping out of elementary/secondary education.

C. Sustainability

As noted before, UNODC had a major role in coordinating and motivating, and there is an evidence that its influence will continue after the life-span of the project: a proportion of knowledge and skills acquired is and will continue to be applied in practice, the cooperation mechanisms created by the project will continue to work, thus sustaining the gains attained during the project. However, this conclusion does not refer to all organizations and all directions of the project work.

Sustainability is promoted by the level of the priority of prevention work, the experience accumulated in a particular region, which has an impact on the funding allocation, and the tradition of cooperation with NGOs, as well as the professionalism of these NGOs.

Sustainability may be considered more likely to manifest itself in the following cases:

1. In the project locations where project results have been institutionalized – included in the annual action plans of the republic/city, and where NGOs are delegated the function to carry out specific tasks. Such facts are confirmed in 3 project locations: Republic of Tatarstan, Saint Petersburg (Primorskiy district), Irkutsk oblast.
2. In the organizations who consider the specific directions of activities their priority, important for the development of the organization, and who currently use the skills gained in the project in their work with clients/groups. These are NGOs and municipal institutions, as well as other public institutions (universities). Such organizations work in the following regions: Velikiy Novgorod, Saint Petersburg, Republic of Tatarstan, Moscow, Irkutsk, Novosibirsk.
3. In the project locations where a cooperation network of organizations has been developed and where the network is considered important both by the management and specialists of the involved organizations, as well as representatives of government. The existence of the network is affirmed by official agreements, which politically outline and regulate the involvement and responsibility. Such experience is manifested in Saint Petersburg (Primorskiy district), Republic of Tatarstan, Tver.

Overall, sustainability is promoted by placing on the regions and organizations the responsibility for carrying out practical activities on local level, which happened in the course of the project.

Simultaneously, for the project results to be applied with maximum effectiveness, the regions have to provide the following kinds of support: availability of funding; monitoring and evaluation of the work of specialists, identifying weaknesses and providing additional knowledge and skills to fill the gaps.

Such support would ensure further use of the knowledge and skills acquired in all regions – including those where the final evaluation did not identify clear evidence of sustainability. In its turn, the non-existence of support is a sustainability risk in any of the regions, since the implementing activities without any quality control may lead to curtailed further development.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

A. Lessons learned

Reaching the objectives

Cultural environment in Russia is characterized by centralized management and hierarchical structure of authority and power, therefore the involvement of local governments and federal institutions serves as a key to the recognition, implementation, achievements and reaching the objectives of a project.

Management and Partnership

A project, which unites so many partners, needs a high level management, as the needs of the different partners and the project possibilities must be coordinated. It is a challenge both for the project management, because in a comparatively short period of time it has to acquaint itself with many partners and different regions in the Russian Federation and to address various problems. The project manager's genuine interest in the project activities and the ability to be flexible allowed to implement the planned activities and to reach the objectives.

Committing time resources for relationship building broadens the range of achievements – the parties involved in the project trust one another and share their experience, thus learning not only from the project events (seminars, conferences, etc.), but also from the experience of others.

The different politics of the partner states for limiting drugs and experience can create unexpected obstacles in the course of project implementation, which hinder the process of project events. The flexibility and the mutual tolerance of the partners helped to decrease the impact of these factors.

Culture

In the opinion of the local government the project management implemented in the regions by UNODC RORB is perceived as “a guarantee of quality”; thus the name of the organisation facilitates the entry of projects and the institutionalisation of practice.

Because of the local culture, deviations from best practice can occur, with the society demanding programmes, which are “more convenient” to implement, but do not meet the quality criteria.

The obtaining of correct (or conforming to the criteria) data about the local situation might be hindered by the unconscious wish of various organisations to “help in achieving” the performance

indicators, consequently flexibly listing everything linked to the aspect under observation, but thus creating an inadequate impression about the events.

Project Design

The project design can make the project implementation more complicated, unless it contains a detailed needs assessment and/ or has resources allocated for needs assessment at the beginning of the project. The lack of such analysis can make the trainers' work more difficult and thus narrow the scope of achievements, which could be achieved if the needs assessment had been performed.

The different number of project activities envisaged in the project and of the regions make the project management more complicated. The project management has to define additional criteria for taking decisions whether specific activities should or should not be implemented. Since the taking of decisions needs time, this process makes the drafting of a schedule, which would conform both to the possibilities of the regions and the experts' interests, more complicated.

B. Best Practices

The implemented advocacy visits and the education of the local officials is one of the ways to promote and improving the prevention work on the regional level and to foster the cooperation between the NGOs and the local government, as well as other institutions, thus increasing the role of NGOs in the implementation of the prevention work.

It is important to involve in the project implementation both foreign and local experts. Highly qualified local experts, who rely also upon the experience of foreign partners, facilitate the development of culture sensitive seminars, which meet the local needs, thus, inter alia, also promoting the dissemination of the local experience.

The system for observing the seminars created in the project, the flexibility and responsiveness of the seminar leaders allowed identifying the weak points (insufficient support for the needs of the target audience, the situation) and to improve the future work. It is of special relevance in those cases, when the previous needs assessment had been incomplete.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

To UNODC and other donors, regional governments

1. The locally available resources for the prevention work (specialists, programmes, funding), also because of the economic crisis, are still limited. Additional support is needed for the implementation

of professional, evidence based prevention – experts’ involvement in work, programme improvement and assessment, development of new programs, projects, implementing the sharing of experience, with the help of these activities promoting the limiting of drug abuse among adolescents.

2. The NGO sector is still not sufficiently strong, the amount of attracted resources is not sufficient for the organisations in addition to the implementation of practical projects to develop themselves and thus – facilitate the improvement of the prevention work. Additional investments for the strengthening of the NGO sector and developing a dialogue with the state and the local governments are needed.

To project designers and managers

While designing the project or at the beginning of the project implementation to perform a detailed analysis of the specialists, organisations and the regions involved in the project, thus ensuring a focused use of the resources.

To link project activities in the project design with the needs of the region and the number of involved parties, since coordination makes the future management of the project easier.

To involve the representatives of the regions and the partners in designing the project, thus coordinating the needs, possibilities, responsibilities of the parties, and the resource investment.

To allocate resources for intercommunication among various partners, especially if the project is aimed at strengthening and expanding the NGO activities, as this is an investment into cooperation which promotes reaching the aims.

To avoid obstacles caused by politics and culture, a regular communication between the local and international partners is needed during the project development and implementation stages, by developing the programme content and form of the training jointly.

If the project envisages development of the specialists’ knowledge and skills, it is advisable to plan and allocate additional resources (*seed funding*) for practical application of skills acquired by the trainees during training sessions. The availability of such resources would have helped to plan work in a focused way and to monitor the work in progress, thus minimising the risk that the specialists allow deviations from the approach, and would help to find solutions to complex local situations.

If in the course of project monitoring an incompatibility between the planned and the implemented performance indicators are identified, the conformity of the collected data to the real situation must be verified.

To specialists and organisations (NGO, etc.), who use the resources obtained in the course of the project in their practical work

To look for creative solutions in situations, when society demands programs, which do not conform to the characteristics of best practice and are “more convenient” to implement, in order “to have one’s cake and eat it” or not to lose the contacts and ensure the conformity of the programme to all quality criteria.

To organise the supervision and assessment of the implemented work, thus identifying weaknesses. If necessary – allocate additional time for searching new resources, assessing needs, preventing difficulties.

To UNODC

When using own resources for the implementation of evidence based prevention programmes in Russia, special attention should be paid to projects of secondary prevention for the audience of adolescents, because work with adolescents, who are not drug users, is especially lacking.

VI. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The aims set for the project, thanks to interest, participation and professionalism of UNODC Office in the Russian Federation, partners, experts and specialists have been met. Even though the project achievements differ across the regions, the obtained project assessment data point to development in all locations, were the project was implemented.

By involving specialists from different structures in the project activities, a team of specialists, representing various fields and organisations, was created and strengthened, it was learning jointly, thus broadening the understanding of evidence based prevention work, development and significance of cooperation, acquiring skills useful both in working with clients and in prevention work. The NGOs have created or strengthened their position as an equal partner in the team.

In the course of project evaluation evidence was gained that the acquired knowledge, skills would be used also in the future – on the level of organisation – in working with clients, developing and managing programs (in all places of project implementation, on the regional level – by developing systemic prevention work (in some places of project implementation).

As the usage of evidence based practice has been confirmed, the planned outputs and outcomes have been achieved, it can be declared that the implementation of the project has made a basis for future impact.

Annexes

I. Terms of reference

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 The project TDGLOC54 “Establishing a global network of youth programmes for drug abuse prevention” was approved by the UNODC Executive Director on 25 June, 2007. The project actions were built upon two UNODC projects: the Global Initiative on Primary Prevention of Substance Abuse and the Global Youth Network. The project is executed under the Agreements of Regional and municipal administrations of seven regions of the Russian Federation: St. Petersburg (Leningrad Oblast), Veliky Novgorod, Novosibirsk, Yekaterinburg, Nizhny Novgorod, Irkutsk (Irkutsk Oblast), and Kazan (the Republic of Tatarstan). The operational activities under the project started in October 2007, but officially it was launched on 3 December 2007 at the Experts’ Group Meeting on development of drug abuse prevention materials on life skills education (St. Petersburg). It is expected that project activities will be completed by end of 2009. The total approved budget of the project is 762,532USD. The project is funded by the Institution Building Partnership Program (IBPP) of the Delegation of European Commission in the Russian Federation (80%) and UNODC (20%).

1.2 The overall project goal is to improve the drug abuse situation among youth, by mobilizing youth organizations to play more active role in drugs and alcohol prevention and assisting them in the identification and dissemination of up-to-date, culturally-sensitive and youth friendly drug abuse prevention approaches and improvement of a dialogue with local authorities.

1.3 The project strategy envisaged a greater involvement on youth NGOs in drug prevention activities specifically targeting vulnerable groups. The project aimed to equip NGOs with necessary skills and knowledge, and advocated for inclusion of NGO activities targeted towards the vulnerable groups in the local or federal level funded programs. Specifically the project was created to improve youth NGOs technical capacity in following areas:

- programming for life-skills based drug use prevention programs targeted to vulnerable young people;
- increased skills to use media as an advocacy tool;
- skills and practice in provision of psychosocial services to vulnerable young people.

1.4. The project has three main outputs, namely:

- Increase skills and knowledge of youth organizations to carry out effective and sustainable programs based on life-skills education principles through development of standardized peer-to-peer training programs, experience exchange, and training;
- Improve service provision to vulnerable young people through establishment of psycho-social support services in 8 cities of Russia on the basis of network organizations and through involvement of young people in the service provision;
- Increase understanding of local administrations and government institutions on youth NGO role in provision of effective programs aimed at drug and alcohol use prevention among young people in high risk groups.

Given the extent of the current problems associated with the abuse of psychoactive substances, benefits from interventions will accrue over the long term.

1.5. The project is implemented by UNODC Office for the Russian Federation with two main partners: the Russian NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Centre”, St. Petersburg and the Mentor Foundation UK. In June 2009 UNODC started collaboration with Norwegian Policy Network on Alcohol and Drugs (ACTIS). At the federal level the project main counterpart is the National Research Centre on Addictions (NSCA), Russian Ministry of Health and Social Development, Moscow. The agreement on cooperation in the field of evaluation of the project results and their implementation in the subjects of the Russian Federation was achieved with NSCA (letter N 168/7 dated 23 March 2009).

2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

2.1 This independent terminal evaluation of the Project TDGLOC54FRU has been initiated by the UNODC Office for Russian Federation, in line with UNODC policy to independently evaluate all projects with a budget of more than US\$500,000. This evaluation is included in the project work plan as well as foreseen in the agreement between UNODC and Donor.

2.2 The evaluation is being undertaken in order to independently assess:

- The quality of the original design, its relevance to the identified needs of the partner regions, and its continued relevance during project implementation.
- The efficiency of project implementation, including with respect to both UNODC and partner government mobilisation and management of resources (budget, inputs and activities).
- The effectiveness of the project in terms of achieving its planned objectives, including outputs delivered and contribution to outcomes.
- The likely overall impact of the project and the sustainability of benefits arising from the project; and
- Whether or not there were unanticipated results, either positive or negative, arising from project implementation.

Furthermore, the evaluation will identify key lessons learned relevant for future policy making and planning (both by UNODC and partner government/regional administrations) with respect to supporting cooperation of regional sites on drug use prevention issues. It will also provide specific recommendations regarding any follow-up actions required by UNODC and partner government/regional administrations to effectively sustain or improve support to the project's programs in the future.

The evaluation is being undertaken one month prior to the end of the project implementation period so that lessons learned and recommendations made can be factored into forward planning by Russian stakeholders.

The main stakeholders to be involved in the evaluation are:

- The Project Manager
- Senior officials from the National Research Centre on Addictions (NSCA), Russian Ministry of Health and Social Development
- Senior officials from each participating region involved in policy making, planning, and resource allocation decisions relevant to supporting implementation of the GLOC54FRU project
- Donors who have funded TDGLOC54FRU project
- UNODC staff at the Office for the Russian Federation, including current and previous project staff
- UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit
- UNODC staff at HQ (Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit, Health and Human Development Section).

A key purpose of the evaluation is to help all stakeholders ('core learning partners') reflect on what has worked well and what has not, and thus learn from the evaluation process.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation will cover the period June 2007, when the original project document and budget was formally approved, through to December 2009.

The geographic coverage of the evaluation is sub-regional, covering each of the eight participating cities/regions of the Russian Federation. However, evaluation field work will necessarily only cover a smaller sample of site locations. Proposed field visit arrangements are provided in section 6 of these TOR.

The key (guiding) questions to be answered by the evaluation are as follows:

3.1 Relevance and quality of design

Relevance:

- *Was the project design consistent with and supportive of relevant partner government priorities and policies?*
- *Was the project consistent with relevant UNODC strategic priorities and policies?*
- *Are the objectives of the project still relevant? Is the problem addressed still a major problem?*

Quality of design:

- *Were project objectives clear, realistic and appropriately documented (e.g. through a Logframe Matrix)?*
- *Were project stakeholders appropriately involved in project formulation/design?*
- *Did the project have adequately clear indicators (and targets), and were the proposed 'means of verification' (sources of information) appropriate and practical?*
- *Was there adequate/appropriate baseline data/information available, or plans made for its collection?*

3.2 Efficiency of implementation and quality of management

- *Were activities effectively planned, managed and monitored on an ongoing basis?*
- *Were sound financial management systems and practices used, which provided timely, accurate and transparent information on project expenditures and procurement?*
- *Was the pace of activity implementation satisfactory (or were there any significant delays)?*
- *Are stakeholders generally happy with the quality of project management?*
- *Has the project adequately documented, reported and disseminated information on what it is doing/has achieved?*

3.3 Effectiveness

- *Were project outputs delivered as planned?*
- *Was the quality of project outputs satisfactory, and was this appropriately monitored by the project?*
- *Have project outputs directly contributed to the achievement of desired/planned outcomes (immediate objectives), and what is the evidence?*
- *Is there any evidence of unplanned outputs or outcomes, either positive or negative?*
- *Has the project used resources cost effectively to maximize benefits?*
- *Where unforeseen challenges to the implementation of the project handled creatively and effectively?*

3.4 Impact and sustainability

- *What are the intended or un-intended (positive and negative) long-term effects of the project?*

- *Is there evidence of local commitment to continue project initiated activities, such as increased budget appropriations, commitment to maintenance of drug use prevention initiatives and management mechanisms, etc?*
- *What, if any, are the identified threats to sustainability of benefits, and have these being appropriately addressed/managed by the project?*
- *To what extent will the benefits generated through the project be sustained after the end of donor funding?*
- *Have the beneficiaries taken ownership of the objectives to be achieved by the project? Are they committed to continue working towards these objectives once the project has ended?*

3.5 Lessons learned

- *What lessons can be learned from the project implementation in order to improve performance?*
- *Have any significant lessons been learned in the process of implementing this project, for example with respect to project design, project management and coordination, including financing and monitoring/evaluation arrangements; promoting prospects for the sustainability of benefits, including promoting partner ownership and mobilizing partner resources?*
- *What best practices emerged from the project implementation?*

4. EVALUATION METHOD

The quality of the evaluation 'product' will depend very much on the methods used to collect and analyse data. 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 the final report. The consultant will consider comments received and will reflect them, as appropriate, without compromising his/her independence and impartiality. While the Project Manager is also part of the Core Learning Partners, his/her role is also to managing 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.

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

- Preliminary desk review of all relevant project documentation, as provided by UNODC and independently accessed by the evaluator (e.g. from the web or through other professional contacts/sources).
- Preparation of a short questionnaire that will be administered to all key informants and key players, implementing partners, senior officials from the Administrations/Governments of the project territories, selected NGOs, community based providers, and clients of the services).
- Ongoing email and phone communication with stakeholders as required, including with respect to confirming all field work arrangements, meetings, etc.
- Field visits to selected project regions; Face to face interviews with key project stakeholders, both individually and (as appropriate) in small groups. This would include an initial meeting with staff of UNODC Office for the Russian Federation.
- Review/inspection of relevant documents, administrative and financial records.
- Presentation of preliminary evaluation findings at a debriefing at the UNODC Office for the Russian Federation.
- Final reflection on and analysis of all available information, preparation of the draft evaluation report (based on UNODC Evaluation Report Guidelines and Format) and submission to UNODC; and
- Preparation of the final evaluation report, following feedback from UNODC on the first full draft.

Following acceptance of the final evaluation report, UNODC will then be responsible for disseminating the results of the evaluation to key stakeholders and for posting the evaluation on the UNODC internet. This is likely to include a specific presentation and 'workshop' event.

Key reference documents for the evaluation will include:

1. Project Document
2. Annual Project Reports (2007 -2009)
3. Inception and Intermediate Reports to EC (2008, 2009)
4. Project Progress Reports
5. Missions' reports. Consultants' reports on training events, project website
6. Evaluation Handbook and Evaluation Policy

5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

5.1. The project is to be evaluated by an independent external expert without his/her prior involvement in the project TDGLOC54FRU (ERU) "Establishing a global network of youth programmes for drug abuse prevention". Therefore, the evaluation team will comprise one suitable qualified consultant.

5.2. The evaluator will not act as representative of any party and should remain independent and impartial throughout the evaluation.

5.3. Required area of expertise of independent evaluation expert includes:

- university degree in social sciences, public health or related disciplines, with specialized training areas such as social statistics, qualitative research and analysis;
- 3-5 years progressive experience in research design methodology (qualitative and quantitative studies); prior experience in planning, designing, implementing, analyzing, and reporting results of qualitative and quantitative studies (survey design and implementation; social sciences research);
- Prior involvement in drug related project/program evaluation would be an asset;
- Personal skills: capability to work with diverse stakeholders; communication; strong drafting skills; analytical skills; negotiation skills;
- Fluency in the Russian and English languages.

The consultant must have had no direct involvement in the design or implementation of the Project.

The consultant will be selected by the UNODC Office for the Russian Federation through a competitive process in consultation with the Independent Evaluation Unit at HQ.

6. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 Management

The evaluation will be managed by the UNODC Office for the Russian Federation.

The Project Management Officer will:

- Oversee and support the whole evaluation process;
- Ensure that the evaluation consultant has timely access to all relevant project documentation, at least 2 weeks before start of the field work. This will include a list of key contacts (including names, position, agency and email addresses) of stakeholders, which should be included as the respondents for the proposed questionnaire;
- Provide a briefing to the consultant at the beginning of the consultancy on the expected final product (evaluation report format and content).

The Project Management Officer may join the evaluation consultant for some parts of the field work, although will not directly participate in interviews with stakeholders.

6.1 Logistical support

The Project Management Officer will arrange for logistical support for the evaluation consultant's program of meetings in each city/region visited. This will include making prior contact with key stakeholders to ensure they are aware of the purpose of the evaluation, and are willing and able to meet with the evaluation consultant.

UNODC administrative unit will provide necessary administrative support (booking travel and accommodation; getting entry visas to the Russian Federation, etc).

The evaluation consultant will travel first to Moscow, the Russian Federation (for a briefing with UNODC country office), then travel on to Veliky Novgorod, St. Petersburg, Kazan (the Republic of Tatarstan), and Irkutsk. Meetings will be held in each city with relevant senior officials involved in drug use prevention, officials of drug control agencies or other relevant agencies. UNODC office will provide logistical support as required, for example in facilitating meetings/contact with stakeholders in each selected project site, and helping with accommodation arrangements if required. At the end of the mission it is expected to have de-briefing meeting with the officials from the National Research Centre on Addictions (NSCA), Russian Ministry of Health and Social Development and UNODC country office staff.

The evaluation consultant will be fully responsible for providing his/her own lap-top computer, and for his/her communication and report production costs. Secretarial support will not be provided by the project.

6.3 Timeframe for the evaluation process

The evaluation will be undertaken over roughly a 6 week period, starting with the desk review of project documents and preparation of the questionnaire in late November 2009, and ending with the production and submission of the final evaluation report by December 30th 2009.

The evaluation consultant will provide up to a total of 23 days input over this time period, broken down roughly as follows.

When (Tentative dates)	Consultant (how many days)	What tasks	Outcomes	Where (location)
23 -27 November	5	Desk review	Draft inception report with detailed evaluation plan and methodology prepared; including draft evaluation tools (interview sheets; a questionnaire)	Home
30 November	1	Briefing of evaluator by Representative, Project coordinator, and UNODC CORUS relevant staff (Moscow; field visit).	Draft inception report finalized Methodology and evaluation plan agreed.	UNODC, Moscow
1 December	1	Field mission Interviews with identified stakeholders and survey of identified beneficiaries	Data from major stakeholders collected	Veliky Novgorod
2 December	1	Field mission Interviews with identified stakeholders and survey of identified beneficiaries	Data from major stakeholders collected	St. Petersburg
3 December	1	Field mission Interviews with identified stakeholders and survey of identified beneficiaries	Data from major stakeholders collected	Kazan
4 December	1	1) Meeting with the officials of the National Research Centre on Addictions (NSCA). 2) Debriefing session with the Project Coordinator and Representative	Exit minute is prepared and discussed	UNODC, Moscow
6-7 December	2	Field mission Interviews with identified stakeholders and survey of identified beneficiaries	Data from major stakeholders collected	Irkutsk
5 December, 8- 13 December	6	Data analysis and preparation of draft evaluation report	The first full draft of evaluation report is prepared and submitted to UNODC	Home
14-21 December	-	Commenting Evaluation Draft report	Round of comments among relevant stakeholders (UNODC and implementing partners)	
22-23 December	2	Incorporating comments	Finalization of the report	Home
24 -26 December	3	Finalization of the evaluation report	A final evaluation report submitted to UNODC	Home
Total working days	23			

It is understood that the evaluator would not hold the UNODC Regional Centre responsible for any unforeseen or untoward incident during the duration of the evaluation. It is recommended that the evaluator secure his/her own insurance coverage during the conduct of the evaluation.

6.5 Expected deliverables

The expected deliverables from the evaluation consultant will be:

1. Development of a sound methodological approach, including tools, templates, instruments, and sample size.
2. A documented set of preliminary evaluation findings for presentation at the debrief in Moscow at the end of the field work (either as a word document or as a set of power point slides)
3. A first full draft of the evaluation report (based on the *UNODC standard format and guidelines for evaluation reports, see an ANNEX 1*), which is to be shared for comments with all Core Learning Partners, including the Independent Evaluation Unit at HQ.
4. A final draft of the evaluation report, taking into account comments provided by UNODC on the first draft. An evaluator should fill in an evaluation assessment questionnaire.

7. PAYMENT

UNODC will issue a short-term consultancy contract to the successful candidate. The daily fee for services will be assigned according to UN salary scale for external consultants and will be based on the candidate's qualification and competency level. The total fee will be calculated based on the agreed number of working days allocated to perform the requested tasks.

The payment for services will be made in instalments upon certification of satisfactory performance at each phase:

- 1) The 1st installment, 30% will be paid upon submission of the methodology and evaluation plan and draft inception report;
- 2) The 2nd and the final instalment, 70% will be paid upon acceptance of the Final evaluation report by UNODC Office for the Russian Federation and by the IEU.

UNODC will cover the travel costs, including daily subsistence, terminal costs and round-trip travel to and from Moscow and in-country travel (economy class) according to UN Rules and regulations.

All payments to the consultant will be made by the bank transfer.

8. Application procedure

The application package must consist of Curriculum Vitae or Bio of the applicant, full list of publications for 5 years, application letter, names/contacts of three references. Candidates are invited to send their applications to UNODC CORUS with reference 'VA/09-30 International Consultant' by e-mail irina.kartseva@unodc.org or by fax +7 495 787 2129. The deadline for applications 13 November 2009.

9. Source of funds

Project: TDGLOC54, Activity: 3.7.1, BL16-00.

II. List of persons interviewed/consulted

Kazan

Name	Position	Organization
Ms. Anna Sineglazova	Deputy Director on Innovative Work	Republican Center on Youth, Innovative and Preventive Programs (RCYIPP)
Ms. Lilia Khalabuda	Director of NGO	NGO "Prevention and Initiative"
Ms. Razia Sadykova	Head of Coordination Department on Anti-drugs Work	Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Tatarstan
Ms. Elvira Chitalina	Methodist-Developer of the Programs	Republican Center on Youth, Innovative and Preventive Programs (RCYIPP)
Ms. Nadezhda Lukoyanova	Methodist-Developer of the Programs	Republican Center on Youth, Innovative and Preventive Programs (RCYIPP)
Ms. Alla Galimova	Trainer	Republican Center on Youth, Innovative and Preventive Programs (RCYIPP)
Ms. Alia Akhtyamova	Trainer	Republican Center on Youth, Innovative and Preventive Programs (RCYIPP)

Irkutsk

Name	Position	Organization
Ms. Marina Gorokhova	Head of Institution	Regional State Institution "Drug Abuse Prevention Center"
Mr. Igor Ivanov	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Physical Culture, Sport and Youth Policy of Irkutsk Oblast
Ms. Olesya Kalaberdina	Deputy Head of Institution	Regional State Institution "Drug Abuse

		Prevention Center”
Ms. Valentina Chervichenko	Director of NGO	NGO “Mothers Against Drugs”
Mr. Mikhail Chervichenko	Director of NGO	Regional State Institution Republican Center “Volya”
Mr. Vladimir Litvinov	Director of NGO	Socio-Psychological Center of Children and Adults Support
Ms. Natalia Korbolina	Trainer	Regional State Institution “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Ms. Kira Emelianova	Trainer	Regional State Institution “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Ms. Maria Berger	Volunteer	Regional State Institution “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Ms. Maria Alabugina	Volunteer	Regional State Institution “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Ms. Aleksandra Matveeva	Volunteer	Regional State Institution “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”

Moscow

Name	Position	Organization
Mr. Vladimir Ibragimov	Head of Office	UNODC Office in the Russian Federation
Ms. Svitlana Pkhidenko	Project Coordinator	UNODC Office in the Russian Federation
Ms Ilze Jekabsone	Regional Project Coordinator	UNODC Office in the Russian Federation
Suhrob Raupov	Finance Assistant	UNODC Office in the Russian Federation
Mr. Vladimir Yaltonsky	Head of Research Department	National Research Center for Addiction, Russian Ministry of Health and Social Development
Ms. Natalia Sirota	Head of Preventive Researches	National Research Center for Addiction, Moscow State University of Medicine and Dentistry
Ms. Tatiana Vorobieva	Research Worker	Department of Clinical Psychology, Moscow State University of Medicine and Dentistry
Ms. Aleksandra Yaltonskaya	Research Worker	National Research Center for Addiction

Saint-Petersburg

Name	Position	Organization
Mr. Andrey Nevsky	Project Coordinator	NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Mr. Grigory Latyshev	Director of NGO	NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Mr. Sergey Yatcyshin	Director of NGO	NGO “Healthy Generation on the Edge of 21 st Century”
Mr. Sergey Lasankin	Consultant of Social Bureau	NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Ms. Elena Kotova	Responsible Secretary	Anti-Drugs Commission, Administration of Primorsky District
Ms. Marina Orlova	Trainer	NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Ms. Violetta Shastina	Trainer	NGO “Drug Abuse Prevention Center”
Ms. Ekaterina Chizhova	Trainer	NGO “Healthy Generation”

Veliky Novgorod

Name	Position	Organization
Mr. Boris Spitsyn	Deputy Head	Administration of Veliky Novgorod
Ms. Olga Vasileva	Executive Director	NGO “Future Without Drugs”
Ms. Natalia Bogacheva	Social Worker	Novgorod Social-Rehabilitation Center for teenagers “Podrostok”

Ms. Nina Butova	Social Worker	Novgorod Social-Rehabilitation Center for teenagers "Podrostok"
Ms. Elena Petrova	Trainer	Russian Red Cross
Ms. Oksana Malysheva	Trainer	Youth Initiatives "SAM"
Ms. Tatiana Bychkova	Trainer	Novgorod Social-Rehabilitation Center for Under Ages "Podrostok"
Ms. Maria Korotkova	Volunteer	NGO "Future Without Drugs"

List of people interviewed by phone or e-mail

Name	Position	Organization
Mr. Eric Carlin	Director of NGO	NGO Mentor Foundation UK
Ms. Ruth Joyce	Expert	NGO Mentor Foundation UK
Ms. Katri Tala	Programme Officer/HQ Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Unit	UNODC Vienna, Health and Human Development Section
Ms. Olga Stepanova	Project Coordinator for Novosibirsk, Director of NGO "New Generation"	NGO "New Generation"
Mr. Aleksandr Ditkovsky	Project Coordinator for Tver, Director of NGO	NGO "Preodolenie"

III. Evaluations tools (1-5) (Data collection instruments)

Evaluation tool No 1 (T1)

Interview with senior officials from the Administrations/ Governments

1. To what extent does the project comply with the strategic priorities of the city / region / state?
2. Did the project help to promote problem solving topical for a particular locality?
3. Were you involved in the project planning process? How? How do you evaluate the cooperation with UNODC?
4. What was the significance of using evidence based strategies in the project?
What other factors raise the value of the project?
5. What was the role of the advocacy visit? Would you suggest to use such practice also in the future?
6. What was your cooperation with NGOs until the project? Has the cooperation between state and local government institutions and NGOs improved? What serves as a proof for that?
7. What do you think is the role of NGOs in preventing drug and alcohol abuse in the city/ region/ country ?
Have the situation changed during the project?
8. How do you evaluate the network cooperation among different level organizations promoted during the project? How could you encourage the continuation of this cooperation?
9. What do you think is the most precious, the biggest value from the project?

Give an example!

30. As the result of the project, the skills of the employees of my organization in the work with mass media have increased

1 2 3 4 5 6
Completely disagree Completely agree

Give an example!

31. We have used mass media as an advocacy tool.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Completely disagree Completely agree

Give an example!

32. Until now, we used the resources from the website www.eeyn.com in our work.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Completely disagree Completely agree

Give an example!

33. As the result of the project, we have obtained useful methodological materials.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Completely disagree Completely agree

34. The methodological materials are being used in daily work actively.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Completely disagree Completely agree

Give an example!

35. During the project, the cooperation between the specialists of NGO and municipal / governmental organizations have been promoted.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Completely disagree Completely agree

Give an example!

If you are a representative of an NGO, please, give your answers to the following questions:

36. The cooperation with the local government and state institutions, promoted during the project, helped my organization to provide the needed services for our customers more successfully.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Completely disagree Completely agree

Guidelines for analysis of the “life skills programme” component

Criteria for selection of representatives of programme:

Programme is developed and implemented after learning in the project

Programme has been developed and managed by those who have participated in the project

NGO is involved in the development and / or implementation

Programme is successful (It is a programme which the representatives of a particular organization would suggest using for others)

Interview with the author of the programme and / or the managers (group interview possible if they are not the same people)

2. Informative part:

What is the experience of the trainers / authors in work with the youth from risk groups and in Life skills programmes?

What seminars have you attended?

In the development and implementation of what prevention programmes for vulnerable youth have you participated? For how long?

3. Knowledge and skills:

Which knowledge, gained during the project, do you now consider the most important? What information / knowledge from the seminars do you use in your practical work?

What has remained unclear?

4. Process of the programmes (compliance with the criteria of good practice)

How is the involvement of participants accomplished?

Who supports the process of the programme?

Who is cooperated with? How?

How is the work self-evaluated? How is the trainers' work evaluated? Is that sufficient?

What are the main achievements of the programme? What has been a great success?

Present 3 factors, making difficulties during the process of the project?

How could the difficulties be solved?

Who and how could help solving them?

If you had to start your participation in the project over again, what would you change in your activities considering your current experience?