

February 2003

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

AD/RAS/96/B65 Development of drug control operational procedures of law enforcement agencies

Thematic area: suppression of illicit drug trafficking

AD/RAS/97/C46 Enhancement of capacity to gather and exchange information by law enforcement agencies

Thematic area: Policy support, legislation and advocacy

Evaluator:

Ian Oliver

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME

Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific

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.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
Reasons for Evaluation	3
Method of Evaluation	4
Project definitions (AD/RAS/96/B65)	4
Achievement Indicators	4
Expected end of project situation	5
Project Definitions (AD/RAS/97/C46)	6
Achievement Indicators	6
General Conclusions/observations	7
Project Planning/Administration	
Training	9
Operational Implications	11
Outcome/Results	12
Specific Conclusions	13
Positive Conclusions	16
Negative Aspects	17
Recommendations	21
Annex I List of Key People consulted	26
Annex II Terms of reference	28
Annex III Summary Assessment Questionnaire RAS/B65	34
Annex IV Summary Assessment Questionnaire RAS/C46	38

Introduction:

1. Both Projects commenced on 3rd January 1999 and ended on 31st December 2001. The Final Report of the Project Co-ordinator, Brion Duncan, OBE, QPM was submitted on 10th December 2001. I conducted a mid-term evaluation and submitted a report in October 2000. I was asked by Dr Sandro Calvani, Representative for East Asia and the Pacific – UNODC, through Senior Law Enforcement Adviser Yngve Danling, to conduct the terminal evaluation of these projects and did so between 20th January and 18th February 2003. The Projects were so closely related that the reports on them were submitted jointly in order to avoid unnecessary repetition, and I have followed a similar approach to the final evaluation.
2. The Drug Control Strategy for the sub-region has been clearly documented and is summarised in the Terms of Reference (TOR) for this evaluation. I have not reproduced it in this document as the two projects represent only a part of a comprehensive law enforcement improvement programme comprising six projects. Suffice to say that the purpose of the strategy was to strengthen the professional ability of the law enforcement agencies in the sub-region in order to reduce the availability of drugs and the level of trafficking from the sub-region to other locations.
3. The main purpose of the projects was to enhance the intelligence systems, and operational procedures in each of the 6 MoU countries (Cambodia, China Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, and Viet Nam). There was an additional aim of promoting greater co-operation and the exchange of information freely between each country for the purpose of interdicting and prosecuting high-level traffickers. It was the underlying intention of the projects that each country would, so far as possible, adopt compatible legislation and procedures which would facilitate international co-operation to a high degree.

Reasons for Evaluation

4. The purpose of this report is to evaluate how far the aims of the projects have been achieved, how successful the original objectives were in their design and assessment, and to identify any lessons learned to be considered when planning future projects. The specific requirements are set out in the Terms of Reference (TOR). These may be summarised as being an assessment of how far the original objectives of both projects

have been achieved and to what extent any achievement has contributed to improvement in the MoU countries' control of illicit drugs in the sub-region both independently and in international co-operation.

Method of Evaluation

5. Before commencing the evaluation I was able to review documents supplied which included: ~ the original Project Documents, the annual and semi-annual Project Progress Reports, various evaluation reports including the mid-term evaluation and the Terminal Report by the Project Coordinator. Thereafter I followed a schedule of visits to the MoU countries, which was prepared for me. I was able to visit all of the MoU countries. I was briefed, by the Senior Law Enforcement Adviser, Yngve Danling and I spent time with the Project Co-ordinator, Brion Duncan both before and after my country visits. I spoke with Dr Sandro Calvani and was given access to personnel and available documents as necessary. A list of key people seen/consulted is shown as Appendix 1 to this document.
6. The evaluation has been done in such a way as to consider the experience gained from these projects and to consider how future projects may benefit from any lessons learned.

Project definitions

7. **AD/RAS/96/B65 Development of Drug Control Operational Procedures of Law Enforcement Agencies** = This project is intended to develop national procedures including mutual legal assistance for sub-regional co-operation in the application and enforcement of drug control legislation. The procedures developed by countries will be complementary and permit the use of specialised law enforcement techniques to investigate, arrest, prosecute and where applicable, extradite drug traffickers. The lawful means to seize and confiscate illegal drugs, precursor chemicals, equipment and assets derived from trafficking will be detailed in procedures. Key elements of the project are national and sub-regional seminars and workshops organised for senior officials from the sub-region including international experts.

The immediate objective of the Project (B65) will be:

To develop agreements in and between sub-regional countries for the adoption of mechanisms and procedures to permit the lawful use of specialised enforcement

techniques described in the 1988 UN Convention and the effective prosecution of drug traffickers.

Output 1

Mutual understanding by national drug law enforcement and related organisations of the legal requirements for co-operating and conducting international drug investigations.

Output 2

Agreement by national law enforcement and related organisations to draft policy and procedures to be followed when undertaking international co-operation in investigations or enquiries.

Achievement indicators

- ☒ Approval of lawful processes, including mutual legal assistance treaties, authorising law enforcement agencies to co-operate in matters relating to drug investigations.
- ☒ Comparative annual statistics reported by countries concerning the number of cross border investigations and international traffickers investigated and prosecuted.

Expected end of project situation

- ☒ National Agencies responsible for the investigation and prosecution of drug traffickers will understand the legal and operational requirements necessary in each country to conduct cooperative drug investigations
- ☒ Legal mechanisms, including in some instances mutual legal assistance treaties, supported by operational procedures will have been established to permit the appropriate national agencies to cooperate when conducting joint investigations aimed at prosecuting those responsible for organising the trafficking of drugs and precursor chemicals within the subregion.
- ☒ Drug enforcement agencies will have increased capability to effect cross border investigations resulting in the exchange of information, evidence and the arrest of traffickers (this will depend on factors which are outside the scope of this project).

AD/RAS/97/C46 Enhancement of Capacity to Gather and Exchange Information by Law Enforcement Agencies = The project will facilitate an increased capacity for law enforcement agencies of the countries that are party to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on drug control and the Sub-regional Action Plan to reduce illicit

trafficking of narcotic drugs and controlled chemicals by gathering, analysing and exchanging drug law enforcement information in a systematic and complementary manner. The key components are workshops and specialised training to define and implement systems for the collection, analysis and distribution of drug enforcement intelligence to support major drug and precursor chemical investigations.

Output 1

- a) A drug enforcement information unit established within each country and staffed by trained personnel.
- b) A training programme for intelligence analysts developed and installed nationally to ensure the continued training of members assigned to the enforcement information unit.

Output 2

- a) An operational drug information database established and working in each drug enforcement information unit of the MoU countries.
- b) Training Manual and reporting forms produced for each MoU country to support ongoing exchange of information.

Achievement indicators

- Establishment of centrally located operational drug enforcement information unit serving the Narcotics Law Enforcement Agencies of each of the MoU countries
- Personnel assigned to the drug enforcement information gathering unit in each country trained in information collection and analysis.
- Forms developed in the language of each country to facilitate the exchange of information between law enforcement agencies and the completion of Part III of the annual CND questionnaire. Forms to be suitable to support other established information gathering systems (ICPO-Interpol and WCO) in the region and internationally.
- An established functioning electronic database to facilitate the collection and analysis of drug enforcement information provided to each MoU country. The database to be complementary to existing and planned international systems.
- An annual comparative assessment of the number of reports received and stored in the database including the number of offices submitting information.
- A comparison of the number of investigations involving more than one country.
- The number of training courses held nationally by staff trained under this project.

8. General Conclusions/observations

a) Project Planning/Administration:

- i. It has been very apparent that there was insufficient pre-project assessment of the professional abilities of law enforcement officers in each of the MoU countries. In addition the significant language, communication, cultural and professional differences, although recognized, were not addressed adequately. The assessment of project risks overlooked some important aspects and as a result the projects have been much less successful than might otherwise have been the case. The Project Co-ordinator was presented with the unnecessary task of assessing and addressing these problems at the outset. The basic concepts of the projects were sound, if over-ambitious, but delivery could have been substantially better had the needs analysis been conducted more fully before the Project Documents were drawn up.
- ii. The language/understanding difficulties and the lack of continuity of personnel attending the training sessions/workshops diminished the end results that could have been achieved. For example, the SODC Co-ordinator from Viet Nam remarked that it was apparent that not all participants understood the proceedings in the workshops and some difficulties with simultaneous translation had been reported. Other observations from Thailand, Cambodia and Myanmar were that some people were sent to the workshops because they could speak English and were not law enforcement trained. The obvious result of this, if true, is that these people would not have been able to pass on any lessons learned. Another observation was that the wrong people were being sent to the workshops for inappropriate reasons. I accept that UNODC had no control over who was sent, but in future project documents, UNODC expectations should be included and undertakings to comply with these should be required of each participating country. The Senior Law Enforcement Adviser stated that this problem has now been addressed
- iii. Clearly continuity of English speaking, professionally competent law enforcement personnel would have been most desirable. However, in the absence of this there should have been agreement with each MoU country that as far as possible, the same people would attend training for the duration of the projects to ensure maximum professional benefit. On this point it would also have been valuable to secure a commitment in the Project documents that each country would make financial

provision for additional equipment and personnel as their capacities developed. It seems that there is undue reliance on, and unreasonable expectations of, UNODC for the further provision of training, support and equipment when this is a clear responsibility of each country. In future projects language ability and good communications between participants and the respective countries is a vitally important consideration.

- iv. With the different personnel attending workshops/training sessions it would have been difficult to validate the lessons learned and to measure what benefits had been achieved by the different participants. Training sessions without validation procedures are not the most satisfactory way of ensuring professional development. Apart from the exercises carried out during the Basic and Advanced Intelligence Courses, provided by the Australian Federal Police, there was little documented validation of the workshops. Although the professional judgement of the Project Co-ordinator must be respected, failure to record and validate outcomes must be regarded as a weakness in the system. In future projects it may be useful to attach some kind of qualification, perhaps in the form of a certificate, awarded to those who complete defined stages of training and are satisfactorily tested on their knowledge. This would raise the value of the training and might help to ensure the necessary continuity of the right people attending the workshops/training sessions. It is important that full records should be kept throughout the projects.
- v. As mentioned in the mid-term evaluation there was a failure to keep Project diaries and this has undermined the ability to evaluate what was actually done and with what result. Similarly it would have been desirable for each country to keep its own record of what had occurred during the projects and how lessons learned and training received had been put into practice. Annual project reports from each MoU country would have made assessment/evaluation easier. Similarly, a pre-project assessment of levels of competence would have provided a clear baseline against which any progress could have been measured. I think that there should be much more involvement/consultation with the Country Representatives at every stage of the projects and they should have been involved in the assessments.
- vi. There should be clear lines of supervision and accountability in the management of all projects.

b) Training:

There were 22 strategy workshops over the 3-year period together with other training courses by the Australian Federal Police. These have resulted in each of the MOU countries having a clearer understanding of the importance of intelligence gathering and analysis in support of operational law enforcement. The importance of international co-operation has been recognized and implemented in some cases. Procedures have been explained and largely understood and there is evidence that the training given has resulted in intelligence driven operations. There is enhanced and informal networking in border areas. International co-operation in the interdiction of high-level traffickers is not common in all countries although there are strong relationships between some countries with particularly successful results from China, Thailand and Myanmar. Additional bilateral agreements have occurred. The seeds have been sown but will require careful nurturing before training is translated into effective operational policing on a regular and sustainable basis. I have no doubt that these projects were a valuable catalyst, which prompted the countries to give practical consideration to the benefits of sharing information and working in partnership towards a common, defined goal. In some instances this has been restricted to a glimpse into the future of what is possible and desirable.

- i. There was widespread enthusiasm and praise for the intelligence training, by the Australian Federal Police. Some comments were made about the basic course that there was an element of wasted time by teaching experienced officers much of what they knew already. The differences in professional ability between the participants made this inevitable. However, this observation reinforces the point about pre-project assessment of professional ability and training needs, and if true, the problem could have been anticipated and eliminated.
- ii. The reports by the AFP on the courses made some valid points, particularly about the need for continuation training and refresher courses to ensure that lessons learned were fully understood and successfully implemented in operational practice. The suggestion about annual simulation exercises is also highly relevant, and these are essential if the benefit from these projects is not to be lost. There has been agreement with Interpol to work with UNODC to further the purpose of these projects through an initiative called 24/7.

- iii. The training manuals/CDs were clearly regarded as beneficial and have been used as a basis for national training in some countries. However, it seems that there may be an undue reliance on these documents without adequate provision to ensure that trainers are professionally/operationally competent and have themselves, undergone the central training. I remain uncertain what steps, if any, have been taken to ensure this degree of competence in each country. I am also uncertain what steps have been taken to ensure the regular turnover of training/operational staff (mentioned in the project document). It may be that there is a need for a UNODC Inspectorate function to ensure that lessons learned from projects are properly implemented and appropriately updated. It would have been helpful if the manuals had been translated into the relevant languages rather than leaving each country to do this themselves. These are formidable documents and there is no way of knowing that they have been properly and appropriately translated.
 - iv. There is also a strong desire for more “train the trainers” courses and these are necessary if any benefits from the projects are to remain effective.
 - v. Several comments were made at various stages of the projects about the desirability of a central training facility for the sake of continuity in the sub-region. Although I was not asked to visit Kunming on this occasion, the recommendation (21) in the mid-term evaluation is one that should be pursued if possible. There is a clear global/international need for continuing training in the complicated field of illicit drugs. If UNODC were able to support such a facility at Kunming or elsewhere, there would be huge benefits that would extend beyond the sub-region. Such a centre of excellence would be of immense value to all, including the developed countries where experience has shown that those who most need to know more about the global drug problem (especially policy makers) are often not as well informed as is desirable. Such a centre might well be developed into a drug faculty of the UN University and could define the core knowledge desirable for all those who work within the drug field whether in education, health/treatment or law enforcement.
- c) **Operational implications:**
- i. The problems of illicit trafficking of drugs and precursor chemicals are increasing within the sub-region and the capacity for improved co-operation and the recognition of the importance of gathering and analyzing intelligence in the MoU countries has

also risen. Seizures of drugs and pre-cursor chemicals have increased as a direct result of lessons learned from these two projects. However, without further training and support from UNODC the good work begun with these projects is in danger of stagnating and the professional abilities of many of the MoU countries will remain at a much lower level than is necessary in terms of international co-operation. There is no room for complacency and without more continuous and determined effort from UNODC sustainability of the fragile lessons learned will be doubtful. Other sources indicate that good progress is being made in terms of seizures and the sharing of intelligence.

- ii. Operational contacts arising from these projects tend to be informal and mainly in the border areas rather than formal and universal. Although improved professional networks and trust may be attributed to these projects they remain fragile. There are good reports of co-operation between some countries, particularly between China, Myanmar and Thailand and mention has been made of the capture of a major trafficker in Myanmar who was deported to China as a result of this professional co-operation. Drug seizures and asset forfeiture are reported to have increased in both Thailand and China. Myanmar introduced legislation in 2002 re the forfeiture of assets. The seizures of pre-cursor chemicals have improved. Nevertheless, several countries have emphasized that co-operation has been on a “case by case” basis and tends to be reactive rather than as the result of analysis of intelligence and pro-active operations stemming from that. That kind of sophistication appears a long way from achievement. On reflection, it may have been better if a rolling programme of projects had been devised, which started with foundation work in professional competence upon which progress to international co-operation and the sharing of intelligence could have been built at a later stage. The attempt to involve all six countries was overly ambitious.
- iii. It was stressed that intelligence applies to all crime but of necessity, in these projects there has been emphasis on drugs. This issue should be revisited when drug intelligence systems are more advanced in the sub-region. The concept of sharing information must be emphasised in all disciplines and should not be restricted to law-enforcement thinking.
- iv. The Project Co-ordinator found it necessary to introduce an understanding of the importance of a respect for human rights in law enforcement although this was not

part of the UNODC mandate. Nevertheless, he was right to do this and it is important that this concept should form a principle requirement of all law enforcement training in future. There is strong evidence that an emphasis on a respect for human rights is not yet regarded as being universally important.

- v. Many other agencies/countries are following their own agenda in the sub-region – ILEA, DEA, WCO, Interpol, etc. There are regular meetings of the people involved with FANC. However, there does not seem to have been any attempt to define general aims and objectives in a way that would ensure that there is no unnecessary duplication of effort or any differences of opinion that might undermine the aims and objectives of UNODC and the MoU countries. It would be useful to attempt to specify common training aims and to share training programmes in a spirit of partnership. These could be included in the UNODC website for reference purposes.

d) **Outcome/Results:**

- i. Much remains to be done if the aims of these projects are to be regarded as having been worthwhile and successful. Lessons have been given but there has not been a thorough assessment of how far those lessons have been implemented. In terms of common documentation, that has not been achieved. Indeed the SODC Co-ordinator in Viet Nam expressed the opinion that this would be almost impossible because of “political, social and economic mechanisms”. Certainly, common documentation has not occurred between agencies within Viet Nam. If the Co-ordinator’s opinions are correct then that must be regarded as a major difficulty in terms of successful international co-operation and a significant failure of the project, which demands further examination and effort by UNODC to overcome the problem. It cannot be acceptable that leaders in MoU countries take a stance that such co-operation cannot be achieved. With the right approach, common documentation must be achievable and it is essential that more focus be given to this problem.
- ii. No formal monitoring of these projects occurred as recommended in the mid-term evaluation but UNODC is planning to follow up lessons learned by the use of surplus funds from other projects and in conjunction with Interpol.
- iii. There appears to have been little formal recording of outcomes and assessments of results are vague, which indicates that although the underlying messages have been projected to participants and they appear to have grasped the implications of the

training, there is little to show that training has been converted to informed practice in all of the countries. Some countries are much more advanced than others but there is not yet common operational co-ordination to a standard format. This must be addressed as a matter of great importance and urgency.

- iv. In the Final Report of the Project Co-ordinator, there was mention of the possible use of “mentors” – experienced officers working with officers in the less well-developed countries. This may be worthy of further examination. More must be done to raise the level of competence of each MoU country in the sub-region and to facilitate a wider international co-operation at a sufficiently professional level as envisaged by the 1988 Convention.

9. Specific Conclusions :

i. C46 Enhancing the capacity of countries to gather and exchange information

Results =

- o The immediate objective *to enhance the capacity of law enforcement agencies to gather, analyse and disseminate drug enforcement information nationally and where applicable sub-regionally in a systematic manner by trained personnel* has been understood and achieved to a degree but in some countries that achievement is fragile and there is a requirement for continuing assistance if long-term development and sustainability is to be maintained (See recommendations of Australian Federal Police).
- o The sharing of information nationally and internationally has been encouraged but in some of the less advanced countries that encouragement must be continued if the momentum is to be sustained long-term.
- o The intention that each country will use the same basic format for inputting and storing data has not been achieved. (Final Report page 10 para 26).
- o The overall law enforcement objective to increase the capacity of the 6 MoU countries to co-operate in the investigation and prosecution of major traffickers in the sub-region has been achieved in part and mainly in the border areas. Output 1a) has been achieved in each country – a Central Drugs Intelligence Unit (CDIU) has been set up. Output 1b) continuity training is said to have occurred in each country but the sustainability appears fragile in some cases (see recommendations of AFP and Project Co-ordinator’s Final Report page 12 at para 29j). Output 2a) Operational databases

have been set up but for example, Viet Nam still favours a paper record system and communication both nationally and internationally appears to remain difficult. 2b) Training manuals/CD have been distributed and used to good effect but reporting forms to a standard format have not been implemented (Final Report page 10 para 26 and 29k/l/q).

- There is no doubt that the message was imparted and discussed but in some of the less advanced countries there appears to be little confirmation that recommendations have been fully implemented. Sustainability remains questionable in some instances.

Specific Achievement Indicators (Project Doc. Para 4) =

- A CDIU exists in each MoU country
- Not all assigned personnel have been trained
- Forms – have not been developed in each MoU country
- Electronic Databases – these are not functioning in each MoU country
- Annual comparative assessments – I was offered no evidence of these.
- Comparison of international investigations – I was offered no evidence of these.
- Number of training courses held nationally – these have occurred in each country, but I was given no information about numbers.

ii. B65 – Improving operational procedures. Results =

The primary purpose of the project was achieved in part but that knowledge has not yet been fully extended in operational terms and it is too soon to expect a sophisticated system to be operating successfully in each country and throughout the region. The concept and the 4 essential elements defined at para 53 of the Project Co-ordinator's Final Report (Internal Co-ordination, International Co-operation, Professional Competence, and Personal Commitment) have been emphasised and recognised by all countries but performance remains fragmented and occasional rather than the operational norm. This was anticipated at the outset but also calls into question the original strategy of the projects.

- The immediate objective to develop agreements in and between sub-regional countries re specialised enforcement techniques described in the 1988 Convention has been recognised and partially carried forward. Output 1- Mutual Understanding may be described as being relatively successful by MoU countries. However, by

mutual agreement the Project Co-ordinator arranged for these matters to be dealt with by the Co-ordinator of C74. Output 2 – Draft policy procedures are in hand but not fully developed.

Expected end of project situation (Project Doc. Page 8 para. 2.7)

- It may be said that all three points have been achieved in part but there is room for significant development in these area and complacency would be inappropriate. The knowledge remains sparse in some areas and there is little evidence of regular joint investigations against major traffickers. Nevertheless the importance of these issues has been emphasised and there is gradual progress towards the interdiction of some major traffickers and some success with the interception of precursor chemicals. Informal co-operation has increased. There is some evidence of good formal co-operation between country capitals. Awareness of the importance of dealing with precursor chemicals has been realised. It is important that the different procedures/systems in each country should be documented and available as part of the training manuals or MoU information documents.

Specific achievement indicators (Project Doc page 14 para 4.2)

- There has been some approval of lawful processes authorising law enforcement agencies to co-operate but this is not yet universal across the sub-region.
- I was offered no comparative statistics about cross border investigations/prosecutions and these do not appear in the Final Report by the Project Co-ordinator, however, I was given evidence of some ‘major’ successes. The drug situation is worsening but the seizures and arrests are higher and give cause for satisfaction. More encouragement/training is necessary if improvements are to be expected to continue.

10. Positive Conclusions

- i. The projects have produced a degree of regional unity, which was unlikely to have occurred without this MoU initiative. There is networking, particularly in the border areas. Trust has developed amongst people/agencies, and there is certainly awareness, if not a complete application of many of the lessons learned from the workshops. Relationships and operational benefits tend to be informal rather than formal and some officers contact their counterparts in some other countries when the need arises

- with requests for mutual legal assistance, mostly on a “case by case” basis - (B65-Annual Project Progress Reports Jan-Dec 2001/Jan/Jun 2002).
- ii. The training/study tour, and experience offered by the Australian Federal Police was praised and appreciated by the participants.
 - iii. The AFP offered some very valuable suggestions that should be taken seriously and implemented if possible.
 - iv. The training/policy manuals were welcomed and have become a touchstone for knowledge and future national training.
 - v. There are indications that the programme (in conjunction with other initiatives) has had a positive effect in countering the illicit production and trafficking of drugs in the sub-region although the overall problem is increasing.
 - vi. Emphasis on Human Rights awareness was a proper addition to the Projects by the Project Co-ordinator and seems to have been recognised as being important by some countries.
 - vii. Intelligence officers have been appointed to many (but not all) field investigation units (APR Jan-Dec 2000).
 - viii. CDIUs have been established in each country
 - ix. Project concepts were ambitious but there appears to be widespread (if not all-embracing) awareness of the need to gather, analyse and share intelligence/information. This has not been fully translated into operational practice.
 - x. The need for international and inter-agency co-operation has been recognised and some progress in this respect has been made but more needs to be done if the MoU countries are to be able to play an effective part in addressing the global drug problem
 - xi. There are indications/reports that a greater professionalism and competence is emerging in some areas/agencies where they were seriously deficient before the start of these (and other) projects and influences (ILEA, Interpol, WCO and other country training inputs).
 - xii. Successes have been achieved against important criminals as a result of better international co-operation.
 - xiii. The importance of precursor chemicals has been established in the sub-region and there have been successes in identifying and closing some clandestine laboratories and preventing the diversion of some chemicals. Much more remains to be done.

- xiv. Progress has been made in recognising/implementing some of the recommended law enforcement activities defined in the 1988 Convention – in particular, asset seizure.
- xv. Liaison officers have been exchanged between Thailand and China.

11. Some negative aspects arising from this evaluation

- i. There was a great underestimation of the complexity of organising and managing sophisticated projects in 6 disparate countries such that the successful outcome was questionable from the outset.
- ii. The Projects could have been much better defined and some overlapping and duplication could have been avoided with better analysis of the needs/abilities of each MoU country before definition/implementation. The Country Representatives felt that they could and should have been better involved in these projects.
- iii. There was a failure to understand the totally different concepts of intelligence in each country in the original project document.
- iv. The equipment supplied has not been put to the best use. It was sometimes inappropriate and was supplied without adequate consultation. Sometimes there was insufficient instruction in its use; little back-up provision and inadequate arrangements for service/maintenance and technical support. There were insufficient checks to see that it was used as intended.
- v. In operational terms dogs would be very valuable in the search for drugs in the less well-developed countries and if they could be regarded as equipment then some should have been provided as an experiment in the sub-region. I understand that they are used successfully in Myanmar.
- vi. Some risks were identified but it is thought that in future projects thorough assessment and preparation should be done.
- vii. There is still an element of thinking that UNODC will be a permanent crutch to support all countries in areas where it is clear that each country has its own responsibility for action. There is a reliance/expectation that UNODC will continue to give training, equipment and general support to supplement deficiencies within each country and the sub-region. Thus it would have been highly beneficial if a commitment had been obtained from each country at the outset to guarantee (as far as possible/reasonable) that it would add the necessary equipment and staff as the needs arose and would make provision for continuous onward development. These could have been anticipated by a

more detailed pre-Project definition and included as an essential requirement for UNODC assistance.

- viii. Several countries commented on the need to remind the policy makers of the importance of these projects. It was said on numerous occasions that it is not enough merely to sign the MoU – there must be commitment to continuity and this should have been emphasised as a key requirement in the Project Documents. At paragraph 115 of his report the Project Co-ordinator records comments about “Political will” – this is important and needs to be emphasised as diplomatically as possible in the MOUs to ensure that not only are participating countries aware of what is required but that they agree to apply any lessons learned in an operational law enforcement context wherever possible.
- ix. It was stated on several occasions that inter-agency rivalry remains a problem in several countries. Unfortunately this is a common problem in law enforcement and it needs to be addressed.
- x. The different languages, procedures and professional abilities, together with substantial communications difficulties remain a significant impediment to the possibilities of achieving and maintaining high-level co-operation against major traffickers in the sub-region. The observations that were made in the mid-term evaluation report remain valid and must be addressed in future projects in order to avoid unnecessary work for the Project Co-ordinator who was labouring under these difficulties from the outset. In his final report (page 36) he states that it was impossible to ensure that all countries stood on an equal footing and I accept this but it should have been addressed pre-implementation. A possible way of addressing this problem would have been to divide the projects into 3 stages as follows: ~
 - ① **Year 1 - Foundation** could have been devoted to developing the law enforcement skills in each country so that a clearer understanding of the requirements was secured and levels of professional ability enhanced;
 - ② **Year 2 Co-operative development** could have been devoted to regional workshops for all, emphasising the importance of gathering and sharing intelligence for a common operational purpose;
 - ③ **Year 3 Consolidation** could have consolidated and built on lessons learned with simulation exercises and validation.

- xi. I am firmly of the opinion that work should have been done either pre-projects or in the early stages to bring each country to a level of understanding of the professional requirements implicit in these projects. Clearly, it was not possible that all countries would be at a similar level of ability but it may have been possible to improve the level of understanding of what was required and the relative shortcomings and strengths of participating countries could have been identified. It would also have been advantageous to have the Project Co-ordinator involved in the preparation of the Project Documents and any advanced preparation/planning.
- xii. There should have been a commitment required of each country that there would be the intention (so far as possible) to send the same people to the workshops/training sessions. (See para 16 page 37 of Project Co-ordinator's final report).
- xiii. Several countries made mentioned that there was not the desirable continuity of personnel and there was the strong suggestion that some participants were sent because they spoke English and not because they understood the principles and requirements of law enforcement. This raises the question as to what benefit was gained from the attendance of these people and what knowledge were they able to carry back to law enforcement agencies within their own countries? (Recommendation 16 mid-term evaluation see also the reports on each country by the AFP)
- xiv. Apart from the practical exercises given by AFP there appears to be no record of testing and validation of skills. Thus I am left with the impression that some of the participants did not benefit as much as they could have done and I am sure that much of the knowledge was either not fully understood or has evaporated. Workshops without proper assessment/validation of results are not the best way of achieving a successful outcome.
- xv. The Project Co-ordinator's final report recognises the dangers of "on-the-job" training, which might compound errors and encourage shortcuts. Without adequate training in country, staff members who were unable to attend UNODC workshops were in danger of this – this danger is compounded if the participants in training exercises are not tested on what they have learned. This is particularly so in cases of "train the trainers". There is a need for follow-up supervision by the country Co-ordinators and I am unsure of how far this was done (See para 83 Project Co-ordinator's final report).
- xvi. It is not safe to rely only on the training manuals/CDs – there must be a follow-up by UNODC. Perhaps there is a case for a UNODC Inspectorate function. I think that the

manuals could have been simplified and translated into the relevant languages before distribution.

- xvii. It must be insured that the trainers are both competent and operationally talented and therefore there must be a controlled interchange of training/operational staff. It was suggested that there is a clear need for continuation training and a suggestion that this might be achieved by the use of a mobile training team targeting the areas of weakness. If this proposal is viable then it could be considered as an option.
- xviii. The Annual/Semi Annual Project Progress Reports are inadequate documents from which to gain detailed information about the work undertaken and in the absence of the recommended Project Diaries (mid-term evaluation recommendation 9) it is difficult to assess what was done and how it was validated. Similarly there is a paucity of available records on pre-project assessments (mid-term evaluation recommendation 10).
- xix. Each country should have been encouraged to keep a record of progress and internal actions taken about the progress of the projects, with a note of any failures or difficulties encountered. These should have been to a defined UNODC format and should have been submitted on a regular basis for record and comparison purposes. The country situation reports in Annex F of the Project Co-ordinator's final report are interesting but do not meet the above needs. Failures and errors are valuable learning tools that should be shared, rather than concealed or ignored (Page 17 mid-term evaluation report).
- xx. The training needs analysis (para 92 Project Co-ordinator's final report) should have been done pre-project. The Co-ordinator was obliged to waste time doing this.

12. Recommendations:

- 1) In future thorough assessment and analysis of needs must be undertaken prior to the signing of any agreements and the final formulation of project documents. Recognition must be given to the need to strengthen domestic capacity and once this has been achieved there must be moves to develop international linkages. I am informed that progress has been made with subsequent project documents.
- 2) There must be more specific definition of project requirements for example in terms of appropriateness and continuity of personnel participating, agreement by each MoU country to supply necessary equipment and staff as the projects/professional skills develop in each participating country. Each country must recognise the financial and staffing commitments

implicit in the Project Documents and should undertake that it will fulfil those obligations. (This apparently is in hand e.g with Project F34).

- 3) Pre-project records should be maintained against which the measurement of project delivery could be measured.
- 4) Project diaries should be kept for each participating country by the Project Co-ordinator keeping accurate records of training, personnel involved, decisions, successes and failures together with any changes of plan with reasons, implementation of decisions etc. Following the mid-term evaluation it was possible to prepare a precise record of what had been done in the previous 2 years and a diary could have been kept for the remainder of the projects.
- 5) There should be a UN standard of project documentation to be adopted by each Co-ordinator.
- 6) Annual and semi-annual reports by the Project Co-ordinator should be improved with specific information instead of generalisations.
- 7) National Project Co-ordinators should submit regular reports of progress to a specified format. The country situation reports could be a valuable source of information for the benefit of other participants but these also should be submitted in a standard format.
- 8) Each country should submit an annual report on the progress of the projects from its own point of view and it should include information and full details on the following matters:
training to whom and about what, how validated and implemented
successful operations both within country and in collaboration with other countries and the results achieved
specific details of all co-operation with other MoU countries as a result of the projects
notable achievements/failures and lessons learned
assessment of further needs and developments.
- 9) All Country Representatives should be involved in the assessment of the projects and they should meet to discuss progress at least once each year, but preferably every six months.
- 10) The Project Co-ordinator should have had better support either by the provision of a deputy or with better use of the country co-ordinators.
- 11) All training should be tested and validated and the Project Co-ordinator should examine and report on the level of implementation in each country otherwise UNODC has no sure way of knowing what has been achieved and what additional training measures may be necessary.

- 12) Training should carry certification for those individuals who attend training sessions and then pass a test. This would have the effect of encouraging continuity of attendance of personnel and would give some professional pride in achieving a valid certificate from UNODC. This type of validation is not possible in workshops devoted to strategy/policy. A certificate of attendance at a workshop/training session is practically worthless.
- 13) The valuable assistance from other organisations and countries is acknowledged. There are regular, informal meetings with FANC and ILEA, Interpol, WCO, etc. If possible it would be useful to try to define common aims and objectives between UNODC and these other professional agencies with regard to training. Any significant differences in aims and objectives should be identified and addressed. It might be possible to enter this information on the UNODC computer database for information/comparison purposes of all interested parties.
- 14) The suggestion that a sub-regional training centre should be established has occurred on several occasions and from several sources. This ties in with the recommendation 21 in the mid-term evaluation. There are clear international benefits to be had from a recognised centre of excellence on the global problem of drugs and the UNODC might wish to consider establishing a faculty on drugs as part of a university either at Kunming or elsewhere.
- 15) The suggestions by the Australian Federal Police made in their reports after intelligence training courses in each country are sound and should be implemented viz: ~
That UNODC assisted continuation intelligence training be considered to ensure that lessons learnt are effectively implemented and utilised
That for future intelligence training law enforcement officials in each country consider identifying potential intelligence officers to attend such training, to gain maximum benefit at the tactical and operational levels.
That a co-ordinated training section be established at regional HQ Bangkok under UNODC sponsorship, to progress the professional development of law enforcement in each of the MoU countries
That consideration be given to establishing an on-line learning medium for MoU countries, with an emphasis on the development of law enforcement knowledge and skills possibly through the utilisation of an intranet/internet facility.(To an extent this replicates thoughts on Computer Based Training).

The purchase, training and implementation of link analysis software be considered to support and enhance criminal intelligence capacity in each country.

That a cross-border criminal intelligence simulation (exercise) be conducted, on a yearly basis, with adjoining countries, to increase mutual co-operation in the collection, analysis and dissemination of criminal intelligence products.

That a 3 day workshop be developed and presented to the respective MoU countries on presentation skills and briefing techniques, to enhance the delivery and credibility of verbal intelligence products.

- 16) I recommend two types of training for future projects; ~ a) Awareness training for senior personnel at policy making level to keep them abreast of what is required and what is being taught to subordinate staff and b) Functional/practical training for operational and training personnel in the necessary skills/techniques for the achievement of the aims of the projects.
- 17) There should be separate and specific courses for trainers, which must carry a high standard of validation and certification.
- 18) In addition to the idea of the exchange of liaison officers between MoU countries consideration should be given to short attachments of intelligence officers from each country to the CDIUs of other countries in order better to understand their problems and procedures (recommendation 4 mid-term evaluation).
- 19) Where interpreters are necessary to the training, they should be given specific law enforcement briefing in advance of any exercises to ensure that they are familiar with the technicalities of the subjects.
- 20) Where necessary English language training should be applied for course participants.
- 21) With the development of ACCORD+ and other projects, there is a recognition that law enforcement alone cannot achieve demand reduction. Nevertheless all law enforcement projects should include some information as to how it is intended that enforcement will combine with public health education and treatment to enhance the cause of the reduction of illicit drugs. This is an important aspect of winning public co-operation and support.
- 22) Similarly the global aspects of drug control activities should be given to officers who are unlikely to be aware of the enormity of the problem and the efforts being made elsewhere.
- 23) In operational matters there must be greater effort to ensure that each country uses a standard, agreed format for intelligence documentation, which complies with international standards.(I believe this is in hand).

- 24) A more formal approach to the involvement of country representatives in projects should be adopted with formal records/reporting to ensure that this occurs.
- 25) The concept of information sharing/intelligence gathering is not restricted to law enforcement issues and is relevant in most other disciplines. This point should be emphasised in all future projects.
- 26) Supervision of all projects and personnel is an important issue that should be addressed, perhaps by the creation of a UNODC Inspectorate. There is a constant need to ensure that projects are running according to plan and budgets and that personnel involved are consulted on a regular basis to ensure that they are able to function properly. A team of permanent Inspectors could assess selected projects, and to ensure that they are being conducted according to the requirements of the Project Documents and UNODC requirements.
- 27) It will have been a waste of the time, energy, resources and budgets if the underlying aims of these projects are not continued within the sub-region albeit that they may have been subsumed into the Accord + programmes.
- 28) Dogs should be more widely used within the sub-region and UNODC should facilitate/encourage their use for drug searches where appropriate.

List of Key People

UNODC Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific– Bangkok, Thailand: ~

Dr. Sandro Calvani- UNODC Representative
Mr. Yngve Danling – Senior Law Enforcement Adviser
Mr. Brion Duncan – Project Co-ordinator (AD/RAS/96/B65 & AD/RAS/97/C46)
Mr. John Irvin – Project Co-ordinator (AD/RAS/97/C51)

Thailand: ~

Office of Narcotics Control Board (ONCB) – 23.01.03
Ms Rachanikorn Sarasiri Acting Director/Foreign Affairs Divn.
Mr Norathep Putthipesat – Director Strategic Intelligent Division. Of Narcotics Law Enforcement Bureau
Ms Payear Chooart – Senior Law Enforcement Officer
Ms Arpakorn Wongsarawanee – Senior Law Enforcement Officer
Mr Kraivudh Maneeratana – Law Enforcement Officer.
Ms Kulaphan Rataroon - Senior. Foreign Affairs Officer
Ms Nawarat Limalai – Foreign Affairs Officer

Police Narcotics Suppression Bureau (PNSB)
Pol Lt Gen Chalermdej Jombunud – Commissioner
Pol Maj Gen Watcharapol Prasanrajkit – Deputy Commissioner
Pol Col Surachet Dhammadamrong – Deputy Commissioner

China

Mr. WEI Xiao Jun, Division Director, National Narcotics Control Commission
Mr. Wanchai Disates, Thai Liaison Officer in Beijing.

Vietnam

Ms. Doris Buddenberg, UNODC Representative of Hà Nội Office
Mr. Doan Thang Long – Division Deputy Chief Anti Smuggling and Deputy Gen Department, Customs
Police Col Dang Ngoc Hung - National Project Coordinator/ Deputy Chief International Co-operation Division SODC
Mr. Nguyen Dinh Son - Army Senior Colonel – Director Anti-Drug Dept Border Army
Pol. Col. Nguyen Trong Phu – Director Drug Control Faculty – Police Academy

Laos

Mr. Viloun Silaprany, Acting Director, LCDC
Mr. Halvor Johan Kolshus, UNODC Representative of Vientiane Office.

International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA)

Mr. Mark Lloyd – Programme Director

Myanmar

Pol. Col. Hkam Awng – Joint Secretary of CCDAC

Mr. Jean-Luc Lemahieu – UNODC Representative of Myanmar Office

Cambodia

Mr. Duong Sunnara – Deputy Director Law Enforcement Dept. Head of CDIU

Mr. Lay Kimly – National Project Coordinator, National Authority for Combating Drugs (NACD)

Mr. Khieu Sun An - Chief of Personnel Customs

Mr. Sam Pham - Deputy Chief

Mr. Bengt Juhlin – UNODC Head of Phnom Penh Office

Police Brigadier General Vann Noy - Director Anti- Drug Department.

Police Major Chiv-Phally – International Relations Division

Police Lt. Col. Sok Chour - National Police Anti-Drug Department

Mr. Ken Harding – Australian Federal Police Liaison Officer



UN Building, 14th Floor
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Telephone: + 662 288 2100
Fax: + 662 281 2129
Email: redcp@undcp.un.or.th
Website: <http://www.undcp.un.or.th>

Terminal Evaluation of projects B 65 and C 46

Terms of Reference

BACKGROUND

Drug production

The countries in the subregion continue to be the sources of illicit production for opium, heroin, cannabis and synthetic drugs. The report of the International Narcotics Control Board in 2001 indicates that the overall production of opium and heroin in the subregion has declined in recent years mainly because of lower yield due to unfavourable weather conditions but also due to strengthened suppression efforts by the governments in the region.

Despite the declining trend of opium and heroin production, Myanmar was the world second largest source of heroin and opium year 2002 with an estimated total production of raw opium of 830 tons.

On the other hand, there has been in the past few years a drastic increase in the manufacture of, trafficking in and abuse of amphetamine-type stimulants. Clandestine methamphetamine laboratories operate along the borders between Myanmar and Thailand and between Myanmar and China. In the production of methamphetamine, essential precursors, for example ephedrine, pseudoephedrine and other chemicals, are smuggled mainly from China, India and Thailand to the production sites. There is also a risk that the subregion may become a source of production for other new synthetic drugs, particularly ecstasy. China recently

reported significant production of ecstasy in the southern provinces. More than 75 % of the global seizures of ATS are taking place in East Asia.

Regarding cannabis cultivation, there is evidence that cannabis continues to be grown scattered in the northeast of Thailand and to a much smaller extent also in other parts of the subregion. It is also clear that Cambodia continues to be a major source of cannabis for world market.

Drug trafficking

Drug trafficking within and from the subregion continues at a large scale and the subregion still ranks as one of the major suppliers of heroin to the world market.

China has over the last years become the main transiting country for heroin from the Golden Triangle area but a significant part of the heroin produced in that area is still transited through Thailand although its relative importance has decreased. Over the past years Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia have increasingly been used as alternative transit routes for heroin in the region. Significant amount of heroin is today also shipped directly by sea out of Myanmar to countries like Australia and Thailand and over the border with India.

Amphetamine type stimulants produced in the Golden Triangle area are mainly trafficked to Thailand, which is the major consuming country, but also to China, Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia. Southern China has emerged as a major source for ATS mainly destined for the markets in Japan and the Philippines.

Precursor chemicals are essential for the production of heroin and other drugs. In some countries of the subregion precursors are presently not yet subject to sufficient control and although several countries have improved their legislation, organizational infrastructure and resources in this regard during the last years, further control efforts have to be made.

DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

A subregional strategy was endorsed by the Governments of China, Myanmar and Thailand through the signing of two joint narcotics control project agreements in June 1992. Since then these Governments have been collaborating in various drug control efforts including the holding of Ministerial Conferences on Drug Control and Cooperation by Laos, Myanmar and Thailand in March 1992 in Bangkok and in February 1994 in Yangon. At the Conferences, the Governments pledged to cooperate to deal with illicit drug production, trafficking and abuse and called on the international community for assistance. UN ODC subsequently pledged its assistance in general and specific terms for various cooperative efforts.

To further strengthen these collaborative efforts the Governments of China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and UN ODC signed MOU in New York on 26 October 1993. The Governments of Cambodia and Vietnam became parties to the 1993 Memorandum of Understanding at the first Ministerial Meeting among the MOU countries held in Beijing on 27 May 1995. At the same meeting the 1995-1998 Subregional Action Plan on Drug Control was approved.

The subregional action plan has a comprehensive subregional law enforcement programme comprising of six projects. The strategy of the law enforcement programme is to strengthen the law enforcement agencies in the subregion to reduce the availability of drugs and the level of trafficking from the subregion to other locations. The strategy will be implemented by the law enforcement projects, which are aimed to enhance the capacity of the law enforcement agencies and to strengthen the judicial and prosecutorial sectors. The activities mainly comprise of training aimed to improve technical skills and establishment of structures for co-operation both nationally and regionally.

REASONS FOR EVALUATION

UN ODC has adopted an evaluation policy, which aims to support results-based management (RBM). Evaluations of performance at the project level are seen as a key component of RBM which will allow an assessment of the impact of the projects.

In particular, the evaluation of the two projects should assess:

1. The results achieved by the projects as a whole, in particular the outcomes and impact, in relation to the explicit or implicit objective(s) of the programme.
2. The strategies and approaches applied.
3. The magnitude, scope and strategy of the projects in relation to the problem.
4. The extent to which the programme has contributed to the improvement of institutional and interdiction capacities to combat illicit drug trafficking in South East Asia.
5. The synergy among the two projects.
6. The inter-relation of the project with other activities of the governments concerned as well as with assistance from bi-lateral donors;
7. The extent to which the assistance provided to separate countries contributes to improvement of drug control in the region as a whole;
8. The continued relevance of the main objectives when considering overall development of the drug problem.
9. The sustainability of results.
10. Unintended impacts of the programme, both positive and negative.
11. The effectiveness of project management and quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping of the projects by all parties concerned.
12. The roles and responsibilities of the various parties: the countries of Southeast

Asia; other countries, including donor countries; UN ODC; other parties.

The evaluator should make such recommendations he deems necessary. The evaluator should also identify lessons learned of both technical and strategic nature of importance to international drug control. Finally, the evaluator should provide recommendations on how to strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems at the project levels in the context of a results-based management approach.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A study of relevant documents (completed programme evaluation report; reports of relevant meetings; reports of missions by UN ODC and donors; government assessments and reports; reports produced by outside experts).
2. Initial briefing by responsible UN ODC staff at the Regional Center for East Asia and the Pacific.
3. Interviews with national officials, experts and other knowledgeable parties in the region.

Following the completion of the fact-finding and analysis phase, a draft evaluation report will be prepared and presented to UN ODC. Inputs from UN ODC should be recorded and taken into account by the evaluation as relevant and appropriate.

Qualifications of the evaluator:

- international drug law enforcement experience at a senior level
- experience in conducting independent evaluations
- familiarity with the drug control situation and issues in Southeast Asia
- knowledge of bilateral/multilateral technical cooperation, particularly in institution building and drug control policies
- extensive management level experience in law enforcement
- fluent in the English language and excellent writing skills

BRIEFING, CONSULTATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The evaluator will be briefed and debriefed at the UN ODC Regional Centre in Bangkok. The Regional Centre shall elaborate and inform the evaluator of the projects and provide necessary substantive and administrative support.

EVALUATION REPORT AND FOLLOW-UP

The draft evaluation report should be discussed with UN ODC. The evaluator, while considering the comments provided on the draft, uses his independent judgment in preparing the final report.

The evaluator will submit the final report to the UN ODC Regional Centre not later than 21 March 2003. The report will contain findings, conclusions and recommendations as well as a recording of the lessons learned during the programme implementation.

The final report should be submitted to UN ODC no later than six weeks upon completion of the mission. The report should not be longer than 25 pages, excluding annexes and the executive summary. The report will be distributed by UN ODC as required to the governmental authorities and respective donors, and will be discussed at the Senior Officials Meeting Annual Meeting of the MOU on Drug Control planned to take place at Hanoi in May 2003.

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMME COMPONENTS

The programme consists of the following projects:

AD/RAS/00/F34 Precursor Control in East Asia (phase 2)

The project is aimed at curtailing the rampant diversion and trafficking of precursors in East Asia as the means to reduce manufacture of heroin and ATS in the region. It intends to achieve that goal by continuing to strengthen precursor control in Cambodia, China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam, where diversion and trafficking of precursors is most serious, improve control of licit trade in precursors in Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines to prevent further development of ATS manufacture in these countries, and to enhance regional cooperation between countries in East Asia to address the regional problem.

AD/RAS/97/C74 Strengthening of Judicial and Prosecutorial Capacity

The project will strengthen the judicial and prosecutorial capacity of Cambodia, China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam to administer national drug control legislation and support subregional cooperation. A programme of in-country legal training for drug control by national institutions to meet the specific needs of each of the countries and a mechanism for developing and implementing Mutual Legal Assistance Agreements and other initiatives to facilitate subregional cooperation will be established.

AD/RAS/96/B65 Development of Drug Control Operational Procedures of Law Enforcement Agencies

This project is intended to develop national procedures including mutual legal assistance for subregional cooperation in the application and enforcement of drug control legislation. The procedures developed by countries will be complementary and permit the use of specialized law enforcement techniques to investigate, arrest, prosecute and, where applicable, extradite drug traffickers. The lawful means to seize and confiscate illicit drugs, precursor chemicals, equipment and assets derived from trafficking will be detailed in the procedures. Key elements of the project are national and subregional seminars and workshops organized for senior officials from the subregion including international experts.

AD/RAS/97/C46 Enhancement of Capacity to Gather and Exchange Information by Law Enforcement Agencies

The project will facilitate an increased capacity for law enforcement agencies of the countries that are party to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on drug control and the Subregional Action Plan to reduce illicit trafficking of narcotic drugs and controlled chemicals by gathering, analyzing and exchanging drug law enforcement information in a systematic and complementary manner. The key components are workshops and specialized training to define and implement systems for the collection, analysis and distribution of drug enforcement intelligence to support major drug and precursor chemical investigations.

AD/RAS/97/C51 Enhancement of Drug Law Enforcement Training

The objective of the project is to provide a training Programme which informs and empowers trainees through a standardized, simulated problem-solving approach to the issues confronting drug enforcement officers. This project is designed to develop a computer based interactive multimedia drug law enforcement training Programme for customs, police and specialist drug law enforcement officers in Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam. Training will be in the language of each of the six countries and will incorporate their respective cultural, legal and procedural requirements.

AD/RAS/99/D91 Development of Cross-border Law Enforcement Cooperation in South East Asia

This phased project will progressively develop and expand in order of priorities the operational effectiveness of law enforcement agencies across and along the borders of countries which are party to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the Subregional Action Plan on Drug Control. The project will be implemented in two phases with the China-Laos, China-Myanmar and China-Vietnam borders to

be covered by the first phase. The second phase will address identified needs at the Cambodia-Thailand, Cambodia-Vietnam, Laos-Thailand, Laos-Vietnam, Myanmar-Laos and Myanmar-Thailand borders. Activities will mainly entail building national and bilateral cooperation and enabling cross-border personnel to work as a team. The key components will be workshops and specialised on the job training to develop skills and knowledge of drug control, initiatives to engender trust and confidence, and structures which favour close liaison. Enforcement activities conducive to practical and daily collaboration will be identified and encouraged.

AD/RAS/99/D82 Support to Drug Law Enforcement in East Asia

The main objective of this project is to increase the capacity of drug law enforcement agencies in East Asia and the Pacific to develop and implement effective drug control programmes. Strategic, operational and technical advice provided to governments of the region will aid the development, implementation and evaluation of programmes / projects in the fields of law enforcement and criminal justice at national and subregional levels. In addition, the project will monitor, analyze and report on drug control issues, cultivation, production and trafficking trends. The main input will be services of a Regional Law Enforcement Adviser posted to UN ODC Regional Centre, Bangkok, Thailand.

WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE

Tentative work plan and timetable of the evaluation mission:

Evaluation mission planned for January-February 2003

Work plan for the evaluator: (22 working days)

3 days review of documents and discussions at the UN ODC Regional Centre in Bangkok

2 days for meetings in Bangkok with national counterparts, embassy officials etc.

2 days mission to Beijing

2 days mission to Yangon

2 days mission to Hanoi

2 days mission to Phnom Penh

2 days mission to Vientiane

3 days preparation of summary report in Bangkok

4 days preparation of final report in Bangkok or at home station

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

**Project evaluation
Summary assessment questionnaire**

This questionnaire is to be filled out by the evaluator or evaluation team and to be submitted to backstopping office. A copy should be provided to the Senior Evaluation Officer, Division for Operations and Analysis. A separate questionnaire should be filled out for each project encompassed by the evaluation. The information provided must be fully congruent with the contents of the evaluation report.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to provide information for ODCCP's evaluation database. The information will be used to establish evaluation profiles which should give a quick and correct overview of the evaluation of individual projects and programmes. It will also be used for the purpose of analyzing results across project evaluations to obtain a systematic picture of the overall performance of the Programme.

I. NUMBER AND TITLE OF PROJECT:

AD/...RAS/96..... "B65....."

II. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT:

1. Please provide an assessment for all categories listed (including categories constituting headings) by ticking one of the boxes ranging from 0 to 5. The ratings from 0 to 5 are based on the following standard favor-to-disfavor scale:

- 5 - Outstanding, highly appropriate, much more than planned/expected, certain to materialize
- 4 - Very good, very appropriate, more than planned/expected, highly likely to materialize
- 3 - Good, appropriate, as planned/expected, likely to materialize
- 2 - Fair, less appropriate, less than planned/expected, less likely to materialize
- 1 - Unsatisfactory, not appropriate, far below plans/expectations, unlikely to materialize
- 0 - Cannot determine, not applicable

2. If a category has been significant (as a cause or effect) in relation to the overall quality and/or performance of the project please tick the “S” column (if significant) or the “H” column (if highly significant).

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
OVERALL QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT:								
I. PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN:					x			
1. Project document (overall clarity, logic and coherence).					x			
2. Identification/analysis of problem addressed by project:					x			
3. Project strategy (overall assessment):					x			
4. Drug control objective (s) (Appropriateness, obtainability):					x			
5. Immediate objective(s) (appropriateness, Obtainability):						x		
6. Achievement indicators:					x			
7. Base-line study/arrangements for base-line study:			x					
8. Outputs (compared to cost effective alternatives):					x			
9. Activities (compare to cost effective alternatives):					x			
10. Inputs (compared to cost effective alternatives):					x			
11. Executing modality and managerial arrangements:					x			
12. Identification and assessment of risks					x			
13. Prior obligations and prerequisites:			x					
14. Workplan/planned project duration:					x			
15. Budget:					x			

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
II. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:								
1. Quality and timeliness of ODCCP inputs:						x		
2. Quality and timelines of Government inputs:					x			
3. Quality and timeliness of inputs by third parties:						x		
4. Equipment: *inappropriate in the sense of being premature and generous					x			
5. Advisory/training services:			x					
6. Project personnel:						x		
7. Sub-contracting:			x					
8. Management of project:					x			
9. Project workplans:					x			
10. Implementation of activities:					x			
11. Monitoring and backstopping by ODCCP HQ:					x			
12. Monitoring and backstopping by ODCCP field Office:					x			
13. Monitoring and backstopping by Executing Agency:			x					
14. Monitoring and backstopping by Government:					x			
15. Government fulfilment of prerequisites:			x					
III. PROJECT RESULTS:								
1. Timeliness of produced outputs;						x		
2. Quantity of produced outputs:					x			
3. Quality of produced outputs:					x			
4. Outcomes: achievement/likely achievement of immediate objective(s):					x			
5. Drug control impact achieved:					x			

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Drug control impact to be expected					x			
7. Likely sustainability of project results:					x			

3. If external factors had an impact on project performance please tick the appropriate boxes: external factors impeded:_____/ promoted:_____ project performance. The effect on project performance of this influence was significant:_____/ highly significant:_____. Please provide a short description of the nature of the external factor(s):

4. Did the evaluation recommend to:

- a) _____ abandon the project
- b) _____ continue/extend the project without modifications
- c) _____ continue/extend the project with minor modifications
- d) _____ continue/extend the project with some modifications
- e) _____ continue/extend the project with extensive modification
- f) x terminate the projects, as planned

(please tick the relevant category).

5. If a modification of the project was recommended did the evaluation recommend a revision of: the drug control objective(s): _____, the immediate objective(s): _____, the outputs: _____, the activities: _____ or the inputs: _____. Please tick as appropriate.

It is recommended that the project be redesigned into a new project.

6. If the evaluation recommended that the project or significant elements of it be replicate please tick as appropriate: yes:_____/ no: _____

Silvia E. Levissianos
 Evaluation Assistant
 Division for Operations and Analysis
 P.O. Box 500
 A-1400 Vienna, Austria
 Tel. + 43 1 26060 426250
 Fax. + 43 1 26060 5896
silvia.levissianos@ODCCP.org

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

**Project evaluation
Summary assessment questionnaire**

This questionnaire is to be filled out by the evaluator or evaluation team and to be submitted to backstopping office. A copy should be provided to the Senior Evaluation Officer, Division for Operations and Analysis. A separate questionnaire should be filled out for each project encompassed by the evaluation. The information provided must be fully congruent with the contents of the evaluation report.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to provide information for ODCCP's evaluation database. The information will be used to establish evaluation profiles which should give a quick and correct overview of the evaluation of individual projects and programmes. It will also be used for the purpose of analyzing results across project evaluations to obtain a systematic picture of the overall performance of the Programme.

I. NUMBER AND TITLE OF PROJECT:

AD/.RAS/97/ "C46....."

II. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT:

1. Please provide an assessment for all categories listed (including categories constituting headings) by ticking one of the boxes ranging from 0 to 5. The ratings from 0 to 5 are based on the following standard favor-to-disfavor scale:

- 5 - Outstanding, highly appropriate, much more than planned/expected, certain to materialize
- 4 - Very good, very appropriate, more than planned/expected, highly likely to materialize
- 3 - Good, appropriate, as planned/expected, likely to materialize
- 2 - Fair, less appropriate, less than planned/expected, less likely to materialize
- 1 - Unsatisfactory, not appropriate, far below plans/expectations, unlikely to materialize
- 0 - Cannot determine, not applicable

2. If a category has been significant (as a cause or effect) in relation to the overall quality and/or performance of the project please tick the “S” column (if significant) or the “H” column (if highly significant).

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
OVERALL QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT:								
I. PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN:								
1. Project document (overall clarity, logic and coherence).					X			
2. Identification/analysis of problem addressed by project:						X		
3. Project strategy (overall assessment):					X			
4. Drug control objective (s) (Appropriateness, obtainability):					X			
5. Immediate objective(s) (appropriateness, Obtainability):					X			
6. Achievement indicators:					X			
7. Base-line study/arrangements for base-line study:			X					
8. Outputs (compared to cost effective alternatives):					X			
9. Activities (compare to cost effective alternatives):					X			
10. Inputs (compared to cost effective alternatives):					X			
11. Executing modality and managerial arrangements:					X			
12. Identification and assessment of risks					X			
13. Prior obligations and prerequisites:			X					
14. Workplan/planned project duration:					X			
15. Budget:			X					

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
II. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:								
1. Quality and timeliness of ODCCP inputs:					x			
2. Quality and timelines of Government inputs:			x					
3. Quality and timeliness of inputs by third parties:						x		
4. Equipment: *inappropriate in the sense of being premature and generous					x			
5. Advisory/training services:			x					
6. Project personnel:						x		
7. Sub-contracting:			x					
8. Management of project:					x			
9. Project workplans:					x			
10. Implementation of activities:					x			
11. Monitoring and backstopping by ODCCP HQ:					x			
12. Monitoring and backstopping by ODCCP field Office:					x			
13. Monitoring and backstopping by Executing Agency:			x					
14. Monitoring and backstopping by Government:			x					
15. Government fulfilment of prerequisites:					x			
III. PROJECT RESULTS:								
1. Timeliness of produced outputs;					x			
2. Quantity of produced outputs:					x			
3. Quality of produced outputs:					x			
4. Outcomes: achievement/likely achievement of immediate objective(s):					x			
5. Drug control impact achieved:					x			

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Drug control impact to be expected					x			
7. Likely sustainability of project results:					x			

3. If external factors had an impact on project performance please tick the appropriate boxes: external factors impeded: ___/ promoted: ___ project performance. The effect on project performance of this influence was significant: ___/ highly significant: _____. Please provide a short description of the nature of the external factor(s):

4. Did the evaluation recommend to:

- a) _____ abandon the project
- b) _____ continue/extend the project without modifications
- c) _____ continue/extend the project with minor modifications
- d) _____ continue/extend the project with some modifications
- e) _____ continue/extend the project with extensive modification
- f) ___x___ terminate the projects, as planned

(please tick the relevant category).

5. If a modification of the project was recommended did the evaluation recommend a revision of: the drug control objective(s): _____, the immediate objective(s): _____, the outputs: _____, the activities: _____ or the inputs: _____. Please tick as appropriate.

It is recommended that the project be redesigned into a new project.

6. If the evaluation recommended that the project or significant elements of it be replicate please tick as appropriate: yes: ___x___/ no: _____

Silvia E. Levissianos
 Evaluation Assistant
 Division for Operations and Analysis
 P.O. Box 500
 A-1400 Vienna, Austria
 Tel. + 43 1 26060 426250
 Fax. + 43 1 26060 5896
sily.levissianos@ODCCP.org