



UNITED NATIONS
Office on Drugs and Crime

Date: December 2003

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Project Number: AD/CAM/99/D43

Project title: Strengthening of forensic laboratory services in the countries in Central America and Mexico

Thematic area: Forensic laboratories, drugs of abuse testing

Countries: Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama

Report of the Evaluation team

Rafael de la Torre, DPharm, PhD

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME

VIENNA

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS		2-3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		4-5
INTRODUCTION		6-7
<u>Chapter</u>		
I. PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN		
A. Overall assessment		8-9
B. Problem analysis, objectives and achievement indicators		9-11
C. Outputs, activities and inputs		12
D. Executing modality and managerial arrangements		12
II. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION		
A. Overall assessment		13
B. Delivery of inputs		14
C. Management and implementation of activities		14
D. Monitoring and backstopping		15
E. Circumstances affecting the project (Prerequisites)		15
III. PROJECT RESULTS		
A. Outputs		16-19
B. Immediate objective(s) (outcomes)		19-20
C. Drug control objective		20
D. Other results		21

E. Sustainability	21-22
IV. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS	22
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	
A. Issues resolved during evaluation	23
B. Actions/decisions recommended	23-24
C. Project revisions	25
VI. LESSONS LEARNED	25-26
 <u>Annexes</u>	
1. Terms of reference	31-37
2. Organizations and places visited and persons met	38-51
3. Summary assessment questionnaire	52-54

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.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project Strengthening of forensic laboratory services in the countries in Central America and Mexico (ref. Nr AD/CAM/99/D43) started as a response to priorities identified in a Workshop organized in 1997 in Mexico City. The workshop was developed in the context of a Memorandum of Understanding signed in 1996 between UNODC and the Governments of Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama to enhance the technical capacity of their national drug control authorities and or strengthening laboratory services in Central America.

The main objective of the project was to develop and enhance expertise in drug testing in support of national and regional activities aimed at reducing illicit drug trafficking and abuse in and through the region as well as to establish and promote intra- and inter-state collaboration, harmonization and standardization in drug testing methods within an organized network of laboratories. The specific objectives of the project were the following: (i) Enhancement of operational capacities and capabilities of national drug testing laboratories and law enforcement agencies by providing laboratory supplies; (ii) Development of expertise and human resources in drug testing in support of services engaged in drug control activities by providing training to laboratory personnel; (iii) Improvement of performance of national drug testing laboratories: by promoting the adoption of Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) and establishment of quality systems; (iv) Enhancement of sub-regional/international cooperation and development of regional cooperation by promoting integrating activities at sub-regional level and networking laboratories through a telematic platform.

The project had a duration of 4 years (it benefited from an extension of one extra year), from May 1999 to December 2003. UNODC, Laboratory and Scientific Section (LSS), has been responsible for overall management and implementation of this project, in collaboration with UNODC Regional Office (RO) in Mexico in particular during the last year of the project.

The terminal evaluation of the project included briefings at the UNODC-LSS in Vienna and at the UNODC-RO in Mexico, as well as on-site evaluations in four countries (Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Guatemala) as well as phone contact with responsible staff of laboratory facilities in three additional countries (Belize, Honduras and Nicaragua).

The project is well designed and clearly described as far as immediate objectives, related outputs and activities are concerned. Nevertheless nothing is said about potential limitations of the

project as well as a time schedule describing when different planned activities will be implemented. The project was over ambitious and a mid-term assessment of the project with clear definitions on how the project would be discontinued or re-oriented in terms of the real objectives achievable within the time frame of the project is missing.

A global evaluation would be as follows:

- The project has succeeded in enhancing the operational capacity and capabilities of several laboratories by providing equipment and materials and by training several analysts. Nevertheless, many laboratories are not sustainable, despite a sustained support for international organizations/donor countries.
- The project has succeeded in helping laboratories in identifying the benefits of improving quality control procedures. Nevertheless, laboratories are not in a position to work following accepted international quality standards.
- The project has succeeded in networking laboratories, through several initiatives like the development of workshops organized by countries at regional level and the development of a telematic platform that should further foster the collaboration of laboratories

There are several factors that contributed to not fulfill all planned objectives: (i) the management of the project and its follow-up too centralized at UNODC-LSS; (ii) differences in priorities among laboratories (i.e. from survival to implementation of the highest international quality standards); (iii) an underestimation of the time needed to allow laboratories to know each other before a real collaboration between them might be started; (iv) lack of involvement in the project and lack commitment of several beneficiary countries to guarantee the sustainability of investments made.

All countries would benefit for some further support in the area of quality control that may be the basis for further fostering collaboration activities between countries a. It is foreseen that without this extra support, most of the efforts invested in the project will be wasted.

INTRODUCTION

The project Strengthening of forensic laboratory services in the countries in Central America and Mexico (ref. Nr AD/CAM/99/D43) started as a response to priorities identified in a Workshop organized in 1997 in Mexico City. The workshop was developed in the context of a Memorandum of Understanding signed in 1996 between UNODC and the Governments of Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama to enhance the technical capacity of their national drug control authorities and or strengthening laboratory services in Central America.

The main objective of the project was to develop and enhance expertise in drug testing in support of national and regional activities aimed at reducing illicit drug trafficking and abuse in and through the region as well as to establish and promote intra- and inter-state collaboration, harmonization and standardization in drug testing methods within an organized network of laboratories.

The specific objectives of the project were the following:

- A) Enhancement of operational capacities and capabilities of national drug testing laboratories and law enforcement agencies;
- B) Development of expertise and human resources in drug testing in support of services engaged in drug control activities (i.e. law enforcement, judiciary and health);
- C) Improvement of performance of national drug testing laboratories: adoption of Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) and establishment of quality systems by as wide a number of laboratories assisted as possible;
- D) Enhancement of sub-regional/international cooperation and development of regional cooperation in drug testing, harmonization of sample handling, testing and reporting procedures in the region.

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

The project had four years duration (May 1999 to September 2003). Initially the project had an estimated duration of 36 months but benefited from an extension until September 2003.

The budget allocated were 1.042.500 US\$ and donor countries contributing to the project were the United States of America and Spain.

UNODC, Laboratory and Scientific Section (LSS), has been responsible for overall management and implementation of this project, in collaboration with UNODC Regional Office (RO) in Mexico in particular during the last year of the project.

In November 2003, the UNODC, Laboratory and Scientific Section contacted Dr. Rafael de la Torre, DPharm, and PhD for its nomination as evaluator of the aforementioned project.

CHAPTER I.

PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN

A. Overall assessment

Make a short, succinct assessment of the overall project concept and design including an assessment of the project strategy, the planned time and resource availability and the clarity, logic and coherence of the project document.

The project was organized in 5 immediate objectives with their corresponding related outputs and activities. A brief summary of objectives and main outputs is as follows:

1. Development of expertise and human resources in drug testing in support of services engaged in drug control activities. This objective was foreseen to be accomplished by: training of selected drug analysts, the organization of training courses at Sub-regional level, establishing and strengthening regional training centers
2. Enhancement of operational capacity and capabilities of national drug testing laboratories and law enforcement agencies. This objective was foreseen to be accomplished by providing equipment and materials to laboratories, by training analysts (objective 1) and by organizing periodical workshops/meetings with the participation of heads of laboratories
3. Improvement of performance of national drug testing laboratories: adoption of Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) and establishment of quality systems by as wide a number of laboratories assisted as possible. This objective was foreseen to be accomplished by the participation of laboratories (n=10) within the International Collaborative Exercises (ICE) run by UNODC, by the adoption of Good Laboratory Practices as a quality standard and the establishment of internal quality control procedures, by identifying and nominating a focal point laboratory for the Regional Quality Assurance Programme and by developing a regional version of UNODC's International Collaborative Exercises (ICE).

4. Enhancement of sub-regional/international cooperation and development of regional cooperation in drug testing, harmonization of sample handling, testing and reporting procedures in the region. This objective was foreseen to be accomplished by the establishment procedures of regional communication, collaboration and cooperation.
5. Establishment of a networking chain of laboratories to provide support to national drug testing laboratories for the systematic collection, exchange and dissemination of information and data at national, sub-regional and international levels. This objective was foreseen to be accomplished by creating a networking system among laboratories including a telematic platform that should help in the exchange of information.

The project is well designed and clearly described as far as immediate objectives, related outputs and activities are concerned. Nevertheless nothing is said about potential limitations of the project as well as a time schedule describing when different planned activities will be implemented. For several reasons that will be discussed in depth across the evaluation report, the project was over ambitious and a mid-term assessment of the project with clear definitions on how the project would be discontinued or re-oriented in terms of the real objectives achievable within the time frame of the project is missing.

Problematic areas

1. Project design did not include potential limitations/constraints
2. Project design did not include time schedule of planned activities
3. Project too ambitious in attaining achievements
4. Mid-term assessment with clear definition of discontinuing or re-orienting the project on real achievable objectives was missing

B. Problem analysis, objectives and achievement indicators

Provide a succinct assessment of:

a) The analysis of the problem addressed by the project. This should consider whether, under the given circumstances, the problem was adequately analyzed and whether it was identified in a manner, which could enable development of an effective project strategy.

The problem addressed by the project was correctly analyzed but the strategy followed to succeed was not the correct one as the project tries to address two different problems:

- To enhance operational capacity and capabilities of national drug testing laboratories by training personnel and investing in equipment and materials in laboratories with wide differences in their capabilities of performing drug testing activities and their integration in law enforcement policies at national level
- To network laboratories for exchanging data and for developing common protocols on drug analysis methods and quality assurance procedures. A minimum level of operation capacity among laboratories should be required before considering the possibility of networking them. Laboratories did not fulfill this prerequisite when the project was designed and has not been accomplished along the project.

Thus these two problems would be better addressed sequentially and in separate projects and not in a single one taking into account the tight time frame where these two problems should be solved.

Problematic areas

1. Strategy followed was not correct: two different problems addressed at the same time:
 - Enhance capacity of labs with wide differences in their capabilities and their integration in law enforcement policies;
 - Networking of labs for exchange of data, when a minimum operational capacity is still required to be put in place.

Solutions

1. Address the two areas:
 - Consequently (different phases of a project)
 - Two separate projects
 - Longer timeframe of implementation

b) The appropriateness of the drug control objective and the extent, to which it provides a logical rationale for the project, is attainable, given activities beyond the project and is stated so that progress towards it can be verified.

The drug control objective is appropriate but not attainable within the time frame of the project.

c) The appropriateness of the immediate objective(s) in relation to the problem addressed by the project and the drug control objective. The extent to which beneficiaries have been clearly identified, and the immediate objective(s) is/are obtainable within the limits of time and resources available to the project, and is/are stated so that achievement can be verified.

As stated earlier the project was over ambitious in terms of the immediate objectives to be accomplished.

Beneficiaries were not correctly identified in some countries. As a result some of the laboratories that benefited from help provided by the project are no longer active as samples of drugs to be tested have been redirected to other laboratories/institutions (i.e. Guatemala and El Salvador). In addition the follow-up of the project was not able to detect changes in the management of laboratories as well as changes in national authorities that should allow undertaking corrective actions during the project.

d) The relevance and (in mid-term evaluations) continuing relevance and significance of the objectives in the light of current and projected drug sector problems and needs.

Problems addressed by the project continue today being of relevance.

e) The quality, appropriateness and cost effectiveness of achievement indicators identified to measure progress towards attainment of objectives and of base-line studies or arrangements made for such studies.

The definition of achievement indicators is not sufficient. One of the most clear indicators, the participation of laboratories in the UNODC's International Collaborative Exercises (ICE) and their performance in this external quality assessment scheme (EQAS) as an indicator of the enhancement of operational capacity and capabilities of national drug testing laboratories has not been accomplished within the project as most laboratories are still pending of registering in the EQAS.

C. Outputs, activities and inputs

Provide a succinct assessment of:

- a) The extent to which the planned outputs (as compared to cost effective alternatives) are appropriate in relation to (will lead to achievement of) the immediate objective(s) and can be produced within the limits of time and resources available to the project.
- b) The extent to which the planned activities (as compared to cost effective alternatives) are appropriate in relation to (will lead to production of) the outputs and can be carried out within the limits of time and resources available to the project.
- c) The extent to which the planned inputs (as compared to cost effective alternatives) are appropriate in relation to the activities and outputs and can be provided within the limits of time and resources available to the project.

In general terms planned output, activities and inputs were appropriate but not all of them can be produced/carried out/provided within the limits of time and resources available to the project.

D. Executing modality and managerial arrangements

Provide a short, succinct assessment of the appropriateness of the executing modality and managerial arrangements.

As stated earlier the Laboratory Section of UNODC took full responsibility for project execution and the projects technical aspects. The project would in general terms benefited from a larger involvement in the management of the project of the Regional Office (RO) of UNODC in Mexico City. A deeper involvement of the RO in the last year of the project has been to the advantage of the project.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The evaluation of project implementation should be presented in a succinct, synthesized form. To ensure a sufficient level of synthesis it may at times (especially in mid-term evaluations) be necessary to provide a more detailed account of project progress in an annex to the evaluation report.

A. Overall assessment

Make a short, overall assessment of project implementation and the main factors which have influenced this. A distinction should be made between factors related to project design and other factors. If design elements are identified as having played a role, cross-reference may be made to Chapter I Project concept and design, above, rather than repeating information provided in that chapter.

The project was in general terms well designed but partially failed in the mechanisms of follow-up and management.

In addition there have been several factors some of them attributable to UNODC and others to countries that benefited from the project that limited the achievement of objectives proposed:
UNODC

- Management and follow-up of the project
- Some technical decisions taken remotely at the UNODC headquarters like the provider of analytical instruments that do not fit with the local support that this provider can supply in terms of training and maintenance. These decisions will limit somewhat the investments made.

Governments

- Lack of commitment in supporting laboratory facilities that received training and supplies from UNODC

B. Delivery of inputs

Make a short, succinct analysis of the quality, quantity and timeliness of inputs provided by UNODC, the government or third parties. Explain the reason for significant deviations from plan.

There are a number of periodical progress reports made by UNODC officials of good quality in general terms. However a problem (i.e. lack of participation of laboratories in ICE exercises) has been identified in several consecutive reports but corrective actions were not taken or at least are not traceable. There are not inputs available from governments available to the evaluator.

C. Management and implementation of activities

Make a succinct analysis of:

a) The effectiveness of the management of the project explaining the reasons for pertinent shortcomings or successes. If relevant, reference should be made to the section on Executing modality and managerial arrangements under chapter I. Project concept and design.

The management of the project was too much centralized at the UNODC headquarters. Several activities like the provision of materials; training of scientists in specialized centers or the organization of meetings can be arranged/provided following these schemes. Nevertheless, some aspects like the installation of equipments, the day-to-day management of the project (including the early detection of potential problems associated with changes in local technical/political managers of laboratory facilities that may require a direct contact to explain the project) are better managed at the regional level, an aspect not covered initially in the project design. The project did not include the participation of governments in the management of the project (i.e. formal periodical meetings with UNODC officials and/or a preparation of progress reports), an issue to be considered in future projects.

D. Monitoring and backstopping

Make a succinct analysis of the monitoring and backstopping of the project by UNODC headquarters, UNODC field office, the executing agency and the host Government - to the extent this has been relevant for the overall performance of the project. Identify causal factors, as necessary.

As stated in other sections of the evaluation report, the project has improved once UNODC Regional Office in Mexico had a deeper involvement in the monitoring and management in of the project. A general recommendation for future projects would be that the involvement of UNODC regional offices results in an overall improvement of them.

E. Circumstances affecting the project (prerequisites)

Make a succinct analysis of the fulfillment of prerequisites stated in the project document, if relevant, estimating the effect on project performance. Identify causal factors, as necessary.

The governments of countries involved in the project agreed in 1997 on the general objectives of the project. Nevertheless in many cases governments acted as passive receptors of help provided by UNODC, Decisions taken by some of them many times are in contradiction with this agreement as they have been giving support to laboratories other than those receptors of the help provided by UNODC. As noted before, mechanisms of follow-up to detect this situations and particularly corrective actions to be implemented have not been addressed adequately in the overall design of the project.

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation
CHAPTER III.

PROJECT RESULTS

A. Outputs

Assess the extent to which outputs have been or are being produced in the quantity and quality planned and (for ongoing projects) the prospects for producing outputs in the time and dimensions stipulated. Identify factors which have influenced, are influencing or are likely to influence the production of outputs, as necessary, with cross references to other parts of the report or to annexes, rather than repeating information.

Outputs	Degree of accomplishment	Deliverables
Objective 1		
Development of expertise and human resources in drug testing in support of services engaged in drug control activities		Overall achieved
1. - Selected drug analysts nominated for fellowships evaluated and placed in appropriate course/institutions	Achieved	7 analysts trained (4 seizures analysis + 3 biological specimens)
2. -Training courses organized and conducted -Regional level -Study tours	Achieved	Regional 31 + 6 analysts (regional) Study tours 8 analysts (regional) + 2 (international)
3. - Regional training centers established and strengthened	Partially achieved	El Salvador (biological specimens), Costa Rica (quality assurance), Mexico

| (seizures)??

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

Objective 2		
Enhancement of operational capacity and capabilities of national drug testing laboratories and law enforcement agencies		Overall partially achieved
1. - Laboratory missions reports and recommendations	Achieved	Several
2. - National drug testing laboratories strengthened with equipment/material	Partially achieved	Still the installation of some equipment is pending, training provided by equipment suppliers of very poor quality
3. - Selected drug analysts trained	Achieved	See Objective 1
4. - Heads of laboratories participated in periodical workshops/meetings	Partially achieved	Heads of laboratories have not been meeting formally on a regular basis
5. - Improved knowledge and drug interdiction operations of law enforcement officers through the use of UNODC's drug/precursor identification kits and participation in workshops/seminars	Achieved	512 kits provided within the framework of the project
Objective 3		
Improvement of performance of national drug testing laboratories: adoption of Good Laboratory Practices (GLP) and establishment of quality systems by as wide a number of		Overall not achieved

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

laboratories assisted as possible		
1. - Approximately 10 drug testing laboratories participating in the ICE	Not achieved	Still most laboratories do not participated in ICE
2. - GLP adopted and the establishment of internal quality control initiated in a number of countries	Not achieved	Only in Mexico and Costa Rica
3. -Focal point laboratory for the Regional Quality Assurance Program identified and designated	Achieved	Costa Rica
4. - Regional version of UNODC's ICE developed and initiated	Not achieved	Nothing has been done in this area

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

Objective 4		
Enhancement of sub-regional/ international cooperation and development of regional cooperation in drug testing, harmonization of sample handling, testing and reporting procedures in the region		Overall not achieved
1. - Regional communications, collaboration and coordination established	Partially achieved	A telematic platform is available since the last months of the project, still not used by members of the network
2. - Operational drug control information and experience exchanged	Partially achieved /Not achieved	Laboratories are just at the beginning of exploring which type of data should be exchanged
3. - Drug interdiction capacities in the region improved	Partially achieved	Not for all countries concerned
4. - Level of competence/expertise of participants increased	Achieved	Overall
5. - Harmonized laboratory methods for drug handling, testing and reporting procedures adopted and facilitated through the regional co-operation	Not achieved	Nothing has been done in this area
Objective 5		
Establishment of a networking chain of laboratories to provide support to national drug testing		Overall not achieved

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

laboratories for the systematic collection, exchange and dissemination of information and data at national, sub-regional and international levels		
1. - A networking system of laboratories in a number of countries established	Partially achieved	The concept is more theoretical than practical
2. - An operational drug information data base created	Partially achieved	See objective 3
3. -Appropriate equipment and training provided	Partially achieved	Some equipment has been provided, the quality of internet connections is quite poor
4. - Improved communication between the laboratories through a regional newsletter distributed amongst participating laboratories	Not achieved	A newsletter was distributed one year latter than expected, no more have been produced because the lack of information provided by laboratories for its preparation

B. Immediate objective(s) (Outcomes)

Based on the assessment of outputs, above, assess the extent to which the outputs have led to or will likely lead to achievement of the immediate objective(s). At times, UNODC projects might be pursuing immediate objectives not directly related to drug control. Achievement of those objectives should also be assessed, but the emphasis of the overall assessment should be on the direct link to drug control. Include or make reference to evidence that the change(s) sought (outcomes) are beginning to materialize or explain why this is not yet occurring or should not yet be expected. Identify factors which have influenced, are influencing or are likely to influence the

achievement of the immediate objective(s), as necessary, with cross references to other parts of the report or to annexes, rather than repeating information.

The previous Table integrates, Objectives, outcomes and deliverables of the project. A global evaluation would be that objectives concerning the improvement of personnel skills and the enhancement of laboratories capacity and capabilities have been achieved, while those more related with the integration of laboratories at a regional level and the implementation of quality standards have not been achieved. Properly it cannot be said that the project failed. There are several factors that contributed to this situation like the management of the project and its follow-up, differences in priorities among laboratories (i.e. implementation of quality standards), and an underestimation of the time needed to allow laboratories to know each other before a real collaboration between them might be started. Last objectives become to develop at the end of the project and as discussed in other parts of the report it is foreseen that without any further action from UNODC fostering what has been just initiated, little progress is expected.

Factors contributed to “not achievement” of goals

- Management of project and its follow up
- Differences in priorities among laboratories (e.g. implementation of quality standards)
- Differences in the level of capacity and skills of laboratories
- Differences in the support given by Governments to laboratories
- Underestimation of time needed to allow laboratories to get know each other before collaboration can start
- Underestimation of time needed to allow laboratories to reach certain level of basic operational capacity

The sustainability of many laboratories, despite a sustained support for international organizations/donor countries is doubtful because:

- The lack of a running costs budget from national authorities
- The lack of a policy of equipment maintenance and depreciation

- The lack of clear organization chart (in some countries) describing which laboratories are in charge of drug testing activities

C. Drug control objective

Based on the assessment of the achievement of the immediate objective(s), and any other information of relevance, assess the extent to which this/these will contribute to obtaining the drug control objective. If possible, include or make reference to evidence that the change(s) sought are beginning to materialize. Identify factors which have influenced, are influencing or are likely to influence the achievement of the drug control objective, as necessary, with cross references to other parts of the report or to annexes, rather than repeating information.

The drug control objective has not been fully fulfilled. The basis for its fulfillment has been created but without further support it is foreseen that it will not be accomplished in the near future.

Problematic areas

1. Drug control objective not fully fulfilled within the time and resources available
2. It is foreseen that drug control objective will not be fulfilled without provision of further support/assistance

D. Other results

Identify any other results of the project, including those not planned or anticipated, both positive and negative.

None

E. Sustainability

Make a succinct analysis of the likely sustainability of the actual or expected project results. Assess the institutional, social, political, managerial and financial viability and stability of the

most important agents of change involved. Identify requirements during the remainder of project operations and after project completion to sustain the intended impact.

The sustainability of many laboratories, despite a sustained support for international organizations/donor countries is doubtful because:

- The lack of a running costs budget from national authorities
- The lack of a policy of equipment maintenance and depreciation
- The lack of clear organization chart (in some countries) describing which laboratories are in charge of drug testing activities

Laboratories are not in a position to work following accepted international quality standards because:

- Laboratories belong usually to forensic science services that develop other activities in the fight against drug trafficking and crime and the management has not a clear policy towards improving the quality of services provided
- Forensic science services lack the budgetary resources needed to implement a quality policy
- They need external support (consultancy) to implement quality policies

The sustainability of networking laboratories is doubtful because:

- Most collaboration activities developed in the last year of the project (the one year extension) and laboratories are just starting to learn the potential benefits of the exchange of information and know-how
- The differences in the operation capacity and capabilities of laboratories are still excessive and priorities of laboratories range from survival to the application of an accreditation from the highest quality standards in testing laboratories.

CHAPTER IV.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings of the evaluation and any other factors deemed appropriate, a concise evaluation statement should be provided. The statement should not be a summary of the findings, which would be presented in the executive summary, but should aim at capturing the essence of the evaluation at a higher level of synthesis.

- The project has succeeded in enhancing the operational capacity and capabilities of several laboratories by providing equipment and materials and by training several analysts. Nevertheless, many laboratories are not sustainable, despite a sustained support for international organizations/donor countries.
- The project has succeeded in helping laboratories in identifying the benefits of improving quality control procedures. Nevertheless, laboratories are not in a position to work following accepted international quality standards.
- The project has succeeded in networking laboratories, through several initiatives like the development of workshops organized by countries at regional level and the development of a telematic platform that should further foster the collaboration of laboratories.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Issues resolved during evaluation

Often a range of issues are resolved and decisions are taken locally as a result of the evaluation. In the follow-up process subsequent to the evaluation, it is important to know which issues have already been resolved and to keep those issues separate from the ones which need to be discussed and decided on by the parties. Therefore, issues resolved and decisions taken locally should be described here and should not be included under the heading below.

Not applicable to this final Evaluation Report

B. Actions/decisions recommended

At the formal review meeting (such as TPR) between the parties to the project and in the subsequent follow-up process, there must be clarity as to the decisions made. Actions or decisions proposed under this heading should therefore have a concrete and pragmatic character, should be numbered and should identify the actor who should implement them. If changes of the project design are proposed these should be presented under the heading below.

Theoretically this section is not applicable to this final Evaluation Report. Nevertheless the following suggestions are made:

Objectives 3 to 5 started to work in the extra year granted to the project. Most integrating activities at the sub-regional level were performed during this period. With the exception of Guatemala, where some political problems concerning the laboratory that should perform drug-testing activities have to be solved, all countries would benefit for some further support in the area of quality control that may be the basis for further fostering collaboration activities between countries. It is foreseen that without this extra support, most of the efforts invested in the project will be wasted. The following recommendations are made, that may be the basis for the

development of a new project continuation of AD/CAM/99/D43.

- Laboratories are in a position of developing a number of activities, which in a three years time period may end in their accreditation following the highest quality standard for testing laboratories the ISO17025. As ISO17025 accreditation is accorded to procedures but not to laboratories, it is foreseeable that some laboratories like Costa Rica and Mexico are in a better position to accredit a larger number of procedures than other laboratories. However if all laboratories succeed in accrediting a minimum repertory of procedures, the starting point for future extensions of the scope of accreditation will be established.
- This objective is attainable in this time period if the following pre-requisites are met:
 - Extensive support from external consultants specialized in this area and training provided to responsible of the quality assurance units in each laboratory
 - While accreditation should be obtained at national level, the project should develop in an integrated way at the sub-regional level, to speed-up the process of accreditation (i.e. by periodical meetings of responsible of Quality Assurance Units of laboratories for the exchange of experiences, by developing common protocols like analytical method's validation, estimation of uncertainty or more specifically the analysis of a given drug following a specific analytical methodology)
 - Governments should provide resources to laboratories not only to guarantee the sustainability of laboratories but also commit a specific budget for these accreditation activities and the sustainability of the accreditation once obtained.
 - The management of the forensic science services should be committed to the objective of succeeding in the accreditation and understand that this is a first step in the accreditation of the whole forensic services
 - The registration of laboratories in the ICE run by UNODC, until an external quality control is developed at the sub-regional level.

If ever this project would be considered of interest, further details may be provided by this consultant to draw up it.

C. Project revisions

Mid-term evaluations might recommend a revision of the project document. To the extent this is proposed, current design elements contained in the project document and proposed revisions should be indicated under this heading.

Not applicable to this final Evaluation Report

CHAPTER VI.

LESSONS LEARNED

The evaluation should give high priority to identifying important lessons that can be drawn from the experience of the project in relation to design, implementation or other aspects. In particular, the evaluation should record anything that worked well and that can be applied to other projects and anything that worked badly and should be avoided in future.

The lessons identified will subsequently be recorded in UNODC's evaluation database to be retrieved for purposes, such as, designing and implementing projects. The aim is to ensure systematic feedback of information from evaluations to assist the Programme in improving its performance beyond the project under evaluation.

A lesson should be recorded in the form of one short paragraph and should contain a reference to those parts of the evaluation report on which it is based. It should be formulated as a general statement, if possible, defining the relevant terms under which the lesson would apply.

Projects dedicated only to drug testing activities, without more global links to law enforcement activities of the beneficiary nation do not make any longer sense. Nations that benefit from UNODC programs have to commit themselves to the sustainability of the investments made not only in budgetary terms, but also integrating them in the organization chart of national law enforcement activities. This commitment should be accountable and further support should be conditioned to its fulfillment.

There is always a time lag between the design of the project, rising funding and starting its implementation. The preparation phase of the project has to be included in the overall project design and mechanisms to verify that when the project is ready to be implemented the framework within it was designed is unchanged (i.e. no major political changes that may affect priorities of new governments, local key personnel to carry out the project in place...) have to be incorporated.

PROJECT EVALUATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project title:	Strengthening of forensic laboratory services in the countries in Central America and Mexico
Project number:	AD/CAM/99/D43
Duration:	May 1999 to September 2003
Executing agency:	UNODC
Cooperating agencies:	National drug control commissions, national drug forensic and legal medicine laboratories of Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama
Total budget:	US\$ 1,042,500
Donors:	Spain and the United States of America

I. BACKGROUND

Based on a sub-regional Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed in 1996 by UNODC and the Governments of Belize, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama, UNODC convened a sub-regional Workshop of Heads of

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

National Drug Forensic Laboratories, in October 1997, to identify shared sub-regional needs and formulate a technical cooperation programme to address those needs.

The Project started as a response to priorities identified at the Workshop, and to the need to assist MOU Governments to enhance the technical capacity of their national drug control authorities and for strengthening laboratory services in Central America. The main objective of the project was to develop and enhance expertise in drug testing in support of national and regional activities aimed at reducing illicit drug trafficking and abuse in and through the region, as well as to establish and promote intra- and inter-state collaboration, harmonization and standardization in drug testing methods within an organized network of laboratories. Specific objectives have been the:

- Enhancement of operational capacity and capabilities of national drug testing laboratories and law enforcement agencies;
- Development of expertise and human resources in drug testing in support of services engaged in drug control activities (i.e. law enforcement, judiciary and health);
- Improvement of performance of national drug testing laboratories: adoption of Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) and establishment of quality systems by as wide a number of laboratories assisted as possible;
- Enhancement of sub-regional / international cooperation and development of regional cooperation in drug testing, harmonization of sample handling, testing and reporting procedures in the region.

UNODC, Laboratory and Scientific Section (LSS), has been responsible for overall management and implementation of this project, in close collaboration with UNODC Regional Office (RO), Mexico. The respective Governments have been responsible for the designation of competent counterpart laboratories under this project and for facilitating and maintaining adequate premises, personnel and links between laboratories and other competent authorities and services for drug issues. LSS has provided services in substantive areas of the project and, with the RO in Mexico and UNIDO, for procurement and accounting services for project implementation.

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE

This final evaluation has always been foreseen as part of project activities in order to assess the overall impact of the project and the various achievements on strengthening of laboratory services. To that end the purpose of the evaluation is to gather information on the activities undertaken, and to provide findings and conclusions on: project results, relevance and impact; project implementation; and project design, strategy and approach.

In line with these terms of reference and the established format for the evaluation report, the evaluator will assess and analyze the different project components taking into consideration the elements highlighted below, report on observations and findings, and make recommendations of practical relevance to UNODC operation and its technical cooperation activities:

Project concept and design

- The relevance of the long-term objective of the project to the strengthening of drug control capacity in the countries in the sub-region and the neighbouring regions;
- The manner in which the project addressed the problem and its approach to tackle it;
- The appropriateness of the immediate objectives to achieve the long-term objective of the project;
- The relevance of the outputs to achieving the objectives;
- The consistency and clarity of the project design;
- Whether the strategy and approach of the project have been optimal (best possible) or whether other approaches could have improved the results;
- The effectiveness of any deviation, and its rationale, from the approaches contained in the project;
- The relationship and complementarities of the project with other similar projects / activities at the national level and in the region, and activities of national and international agencies other than UNODC.

Project implementation

- Whether the project strategy has been implemented as planned in the project document or it has been revised during the course of implementation, including the reasons for the project revision;
- The activities undertaken to achieve each of the outputs;
- The efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out;
- The quality and timeliness of outputs provided, as well as of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project;
- The obstacles encountered and measures taken to overcome them;
- The effectiveness and efficiency of the management and administrative arrangements of the project, and utilization of resources for their intended purpose;
- The fulfillment of agreed prerequisites by participating Governments/laboratories.

Among other things the evaluator will carry out on-site evaluation of the following:

- Resource allocation by the recipient country (facilities, infrastructure available as foreseen);
- Delivery, installation and functioning of equipment and supplies?
- Personnel situation (number and qualifications) and adequacy of training provided;
- Productivity / utilization of facilities, equipment and staff (workload);
- Collaboration of laboratories, law enforcement and other drug control agencies / authorities

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

- The achievement of the immediate objective(s) of the project and the contribution to attaining the drug control objective;
- The outputs and outcomes achieved or expected to be achieved by the project, and their impact;
- The sustainability of project results, wherever applicable;
- The extent to which the project has contributed to the strengthening of laboratory

capacity and capabilities in drug analysis;

- The contribution of the project to support law enforcement capacity in drug testing;
- The factors that facilitated the achievements of the project objective(s), as well as the factors that have impeded their fulfillment;
- Extraneous factors which have had, or may have had, an impact on project success.

Recommendations and lessons learned

The evaluation shall make recommendations and proposals for concrete action to extend, improve or rectify outcomes, and resolve any problem, as appropriate, and in that connection, make recommendations for any necessary further assistance. Finally, the evaluation will also identify lessons learned through project implementation, which are valid beyond the project itself, and can be applied in a wider context. The report itself will include objective indicators of achievements as justification of the conclusions and recommendations.

III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent expert, identified by UNODC, Headquarters (HQ), Vienna, and recruited by UNODC RO for Central America, Mexico. The evaluation will be based on the study of documents and interviews with key persons. The evaluator will study the relevant documents, meet staff of drug testing laboratories and relevant authorities, conduct on-site visit to selected laboratories that received assistance under the project, make telephone interviews and have discussions with relevant counterparts in the project countries, as appropriate. On-site assessments will be based on a list of core questions prepared by the evaluator. Interviews will be based on a wider range of core questions taking into consideration observations on on-site visits, and will be planned by the parties to the project. During the course of the evaluation, it might be necessary to add or remove interviews, if the evaluator deems it necessary. UNODC HQ, Vienna, will work in close collaboration with the RO, Mexico.

IV: DOCUMENTATION

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

Prior to the evaluation, copies of the project document, and annual and semi-annual monitoring reports will be made available to the evaluator for review. Mission and meetings reports shall also be provided.

V. PERSONS FOR EVALUATION

The evaluator should have extended professional expertise and practical experience in the drug laboratory sector, and be familiar with international drug control activities in this area. An advanced degree in chemistry, pharmacy or related science, and knowledge of the two UN official languages, Spanish and English, are essential.

VI. BRIEFINGS, CONSULTATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The evaluator will be briefed by LSS, UNODC, Vienna, and UNODC RO, Mexico. She/he will consult also with concerned staff at UNODC HQ and RO, as appropriate. One week to ten days will be used for field visits and assessment of the project, and two weeks for report writing. The RO in Mexico will make the travel arrangements for the evaluator and provide necessary technical and administrative support. Arrangements to visit selected laboratories assisted under the project, and for meetings with relevant staff, will be made by the RO in Mexico.

VII. EVALUATION REPORT AND FOLLOW-UP

The evaluator should submit a comprehensive report on evaluation results and recommendations, to be easily considered by all counterparts in planning of future activities at national and regional level. It should also facilitate UNODC's efforts in identifying and developing best practices, and ensure their integration into future projects and programmes.

The evaluation report should be submitted in the standard format, within two weeks after the mission of the evaluator is completed. Copies of the UNODC standard format and guidelines for the preparation of project evaluation report and summary assessment questionnaire are attached. The evaluator should follow the prescribed format while preparing

his report. Before the submission of the final evaluation report to the UNODC, the evaluator will prepare and discuss the draft evaluation report with the relevant UNODC offices. Although the evaluator should take the views expressed by the concerned parties into account, she/he should use his independent judgment in finalizing the report.

The final evaluation report should be sent to the Evaluation Unit electronically (in Word format preferably) together with the Evaluation summary and the Questionnaire.

VIII. TIMETABLE

10 November 2003: recruitment of evaluator

27–28 November 2003: travel to Vienna and briefing by UNODC, HQ

29 November to 7 December 2003: travel to Mexico, briefing by RO Mexico, UNODC, travel to selected project countries, visit to drug testing laboratories assisted under the project, interviews and discussions with relevant counterparts (visiting countries: Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala; Panama, optional)

7- 20 December 2003: debriefing on the findings of the mission and preparation of draft evaluation report

22 December 2003: submission of final report of the project evaluation

The exact timetable of travel arrangements shall be decided as soon as the evaluator is appointed, and further specified by RO Mexico.

Organizations and places visited and persons met

The evaluation process included briefings by LSS, UNODC, Vienna and UNODC RO, Mexico, the evaluation of all countries that benefited from support provided by the project either through visits to selected ones or through phone contact for those countries no visited.

Place visited/contacted	Dates	Purpose
LSS UNODC, Vienna	28/11/03	Briefing, revision of documents
UNODC RO, Mexico	1/12/03	Briefing, revision of documents
Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala	2-5/12/03	On-site evaluation
Honduras, Nicaragua, Belice*	5/12/03	Evaluation through phone contact

*It was not possible to contact Panama because the unavailability of the technical responsible of the laboratory

Briefing LSS UNODC, Vienna

Attendees: Iphigenia Naidis, Howard Stead

A complete set of documents concerning the project were provided and reviewed. There was also the opportunity of discussing in depth different aspects of the project.

Briefing in UNODC RO, Mexico

Attendees: Regnar Kristensen

There was the opportunity of discussing in depth different aspects of the project as well as specific aspects concerning the countries to be visited. There was also the opportunity of reviewing the extranet developed at UNODC RO Mexico (extranet.onudd.org.mx, by Simone Luccatello) within the framework of the project to connect all laboratories participating in the project. There is an administrator identified in each country that acts as managers. The extranet was finished the 15th November 2003, still pending of connecting all countries in terms of day-to-day work. Officially the sponsorship of UNODC should finish the 31st of December, pending of identifying the centre that will take care of the extranet. The transfer should not produce additional costs (if server is left at Mexico DF).

Visit to the Laboratorio Nacional de Servicios Criminalísticos, Mexico

During the visit to Mexico, there was the possibility of visiting the Laboratorio Nacional de Servicios Criminalísticos. Laboratory facilities are well equipped with state of the art instrumentation and well staffed. It is apparent that Mexico has not been properly involved in the project despite receiving some help in terms of training and some laboratory supplies (UNODC kits). Several political changes in the Mexican government during the project (current authorities were not aware of the existence of the project and commitments made by former authorities) and the lack of an adequate follow-up of the project by UNODC (that did not detect these political changes and priorities of new authorities) are responsible for this situation.

Enclosed there is a short summary country by country of information collected through the evaluation exercise.

NICARAGUA

Evaluation through phone conversation (at UNODC Mexico, 5/12/03). Contacted person Javier Carrillo (Sub Comisionado, Laboratorio de Criminalística, Policía Nacional de Nicaragua)

Statistics

- Number of cases with analysis of drugs in the last year: 1500
- Number of biological samples analysed in the last year: 500

Staff

- 7 chemist in the central laboratory
- 7 chemists in peripheral laboratories (600 samples analysed in the last year)

Instruments

- 1 GC/FID (Shimadzu) instrument donated by UNODC in the framework of the project still pending of its definitive installation (some parts were missing when the instrument was provided. A computer, later provided by UNODC Mexico, pending of the training)
- 1 IR (Perkin Elmer) donated by the US Government, available in the lab since September 2003) pending of its installation chemists in peripheral laboratories (600 samples analysed in the last year)

Analytical Approach Currently Applied

- Colorimetric reactions
- Follow UNODC recommended methods

Evaluation of activities by the recipient of help provided within the framework of the project

- Positive evaluation of training received (meeting on Quality Assurance in Costa Rica and on Biological Specimens in El Salvador)

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

- Very critical with the selection of Shimadzu as instrument provider because the poor service provided by representatives in the area

Comments of the evaluator

- Analytical approach followed very limited
- Should improve the overall quality of the laboratory by the implementation of GC/FID and IR techniques
- Laboratory activity is large enough to guarantee the sustainability of the laboratory if a budget covering running costs was allocated
- Doubts about the sustainability of the laboratory once new analytical techniques are incorporated
- Help requested for method's validation Æ overall training of people is needed

Training*	Instruments	Reagents & consumables	Bibliography	UNODC kits***
Study Tour CA** (1)	GC/FID	YES	YES	40 (27/13)
Biological Specimens (1)				
Quality Assurance (1)				

* In brackets Nr of attendees, ** CA= Central America Tour, *** refers in brackets Nr of drug and precursors testing kits respectively

HONDURAS

Evaluation through phone conversation (at UNODC Mexico, 5/12/03). Contacted person Dr. Mildred Alvarenga (Jefe del Departamento de los Laboratorios Criminalísticos y Ciencias Forenses)

Statistics

- Number of cases with analysis of drugs in the last year: 200
- Number of biological samples analysed in the last year: 600-700

Staff

- 6 chemist in the Toxicology Section

Instruments

- 1 GC/FID (Shimadzu) instrument donated by UNODC in the framework of the project
- 1 IR
- Immunoassays (FPIA, TDx and immunochromatographic tests)

Analytical Approach Currently Applied

- Colorimetric reactions + GC/FID + IR for drug seizures
- Follow UNODC Recommended Methods
- Immunoassays but not confirmation for biological samples

Evaluation of activities by the recipient of help provided within the framework of the project

- Positive evaluation of training received (meeting on Quality Assurance in Costa Rica and on Biological Specimens in El Salvador) and of the overall project
- Very critical with the selection of Shimadzu as instrument provider because the poor service provided by representatives in the area
- Help requested for method's validation and quality assurance

Comments of the evaluator

- Analytical approach followed for drug seizures is adequate, very limited for the analysis of biological specimens
- Laboratory activity is too low enough to guarantee the sustainability of the laboratory but in principle there are no other competing laboratories
- Help requested for method's validation Æ overall training of people is needed

Training*	Instrument s	Reagents & consumables	Bibliography	UNODC kits***
Study Tour CA** (1) Biological Specimens (1) Quality Assurance (1)	GC/FID	YES	YES	58 (36/22)

* In brackets Nr of attendees, ** CA= Central America Tour, *** refers in brackets Nr of drug and precursors testing kits respectively

BELIZE

Evaluation through phone conversation (at UNODC Mexico, 5/12/03). Contacted person Dr. Genoveva Jovita Marin (Chief Analyst, National Forensic Services)

Statistics

- Number of cases with analysis of drugs in the last year: 1500-2000
- Number of biological samples analysed in the last year: NA

Staff

- 1 chemist in the Toxicology Section

Instruments

- 1 GC/FID (Shimadzu) instrument donated by UNODC (not within the framework of the project)

Analytical Approach Currently Applied

- Colorimetric reactions + GC/FID
- Follow UNODC Recommended Methods

Evaluation of activities by the recipient of help provided within the framework of the project

- Positive evaluation of training received (meeting on Quality Assurance in Costa Rica) and of the overall project
- Help requested for method's validation and quality assurance

Comments of the evaluator

- Analytical approach followed for drug seizures is adequate
- Laboratory activity is high enough to guarantee the sustainability of the laboratory
- Help requested for method's validation Æ overall training of people maybe needed

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

Training*	Instrument s	Reagents & consumables	Bibliography	UNODC kits***
Study Tour CA** (1) Biological Specimens (1) Quality Assurance (1)	NO	NO	YES	15 (10/5)

* In brackets Nr of attendees, ** CA= Central America Tour, *** refers in brackets Nr of drug and precursors testing kits respectively

GUATEMALA

Evaluation through field visit (4/12/03). Contacted persons: Comisario Edgar Eduardo Tobias Montufar and Mrs. Evelyn Roxana Chún Hó responsible for Toxicological Analysis (Gabinete Criminalístico, Policia Nacional Civil)

Statistics

- Number of cases with analysis of drugs in the last year: 5
- Number of biological samples analysed in the last year: none

Staff

- 1 chemist in the Toxicology Section (overall 3 scientists in the Gabinete Criminalístico for Toxicology, Serology and DNA analysis)

Instruments

- 2 GC/FID (Hewlett Packard) instrument donated by the US Government not installed

Analytical Approach Currently Applied

- Colorimetric reactions + TLC (still pending of its full implementation)

Evaluation of activities by the recipient of help provided within the framework of the project

- Positive evaluation of training received (meeting on Quality Assurance in Costa Rica and on Biological Specimens in El Salvador) and of the overall project

Comments of the evaluator

- There is a conflict with an alternative laboratory created by the Ministerio Publico for all activities related with forensic sciences that has reduced the number of samples to a level that question the existence of the laboratory

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

- The budget of the Policia Nacional Civil has been cut severely in the last years.
- The laboratory does not have a running budget.
- The evaluator has tried to suggest some approaches to re-start laboratory activities
- The Policia Nacional Civil is the owner of a laboratory building (pending of its finalization) that maybe the basis for the creation of a unified centre of forensic sciences in Guatemala (not before 2 years)

Training*	Instrument s	Reagents & consumables	Bibliography	UNODC kits***
Study Tour CA** (1)	NO	YES	YES	60 (30/30)
Biological Specimens (1)				
Quality Assurance (1)				

* In brackets Nr of attendees, ** CA= Central America Tour, *** refers in brackets Nr of drug and precursors testing kits respectively

EL SALVADOR

Evaluation through field visit (3/12/03). Contacted persons: Mrs. Aminta de Bolaños responsible for Toxicological Analysis (Policia Nacional Civil)

Statistics

- Number of cases with analysis of drugs in the last year: 500
- Number of biological samples analysed in the last year: 150

Staff

- 4 chemist in the Toxicology Section (biological specimens)
- 4 chemists in the Seizures Section

Instruments

- 1 GC/FID (Shimadzu) instrument donated by UNODC in the framework of the project
- 1 HPLC (Shimadzu) instrument donated by UNODC in the framework of the project
- 2 GC/FID (already available before the project started)
- 1 IR
- 1 GC/MS

Analytical Approach Currently Applied

- Colorimetric reactions + GC/FID + IR for drug seizures + GC/MS
- Follow UNODC Recommended Methods
- TLC for biological samples and GC/MS

Evaluation of activities by the recipient of help provided within the framework of the project

- Positive evaluation of training received (meeting on Quality Assurance in Costa Rica and of the overall project)

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

- Organised a workshop on biological samples analysis, overall well evaluated by participants
- Help requested for method's validation and quality assurance

Comments of the evaluator

- Analytical approach followed for drug seizures and biological specimens is adequate
- Laboratory activity in the biological specimens is too low to guarantee its sustainability. A competing Legal Medicine laboratory has draw out most of specimens and the program of controlling policeman for drugs of abuse has been severely cut this year
- Help requested for method's validation Æ overall training of people is needed

Training*	Instrument s	Reagents & consumables	Bibliography	UNODC kits***
Study Tour CA** (1)	GC/FID	YES	YES	45 (21/24)
Biological Specimens ****	HPLC			
Quality Assurance (1)				

* In brackets Nr of attendees, ** CA= Central America Tour, *** refers in brackets Nr of drug and precursors testing kits respectively, ****organisers

COSTA RICA

Evaluation through field visit (2/12/03). Contacted persons: Mr. Marvin J Salas Zuñiga (Head of Laboratorios de Ciencias Forenses)

Statistics

- Number of cases with analysis of drugs in the last year: NA
- Number of biological samples analysed in the last year: NA

NA=not available but sufficient to guarantee the sustainability of the laboratory

Staff

- 3 chemist in the Toxicology Section (biological specimens)
- 5 chemists in the Seizures Section

Instruments

- 2 GC/FID
- 1 FTIR (Shimadzu) instrument donated by UNODC in the framework of the project
- 2 GC/MS
- 1 LC/MS
- Immunoassays (FPIA, ADx)

Analytical Approach Currently Applied

- Colorimetric reactions + GC/FID + IR for drug seizures + GC/MS + LC/MS
- Follow UNODC Recommended Methods (no)
- Immunoassays for biological samples and GC/MS

Evaluation of activities by the recipient of help provided within the framework of the project

- Positive evaluation of training received (meeting on Quality Assurance in Costa Rica and of the overall project)

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

- Organised a workshop on quality assurance, overall well evaluated by participants
- Help requested for method's validation and quality assurance

Comments of the evaluator

- Analytical approach followed for drug seizures and biological specimens is adequate
- Laboratory activity in the biological specimens and seizures is high enough to guarantee its sustainability.
- Help requested for method's validation Æ overall training of people is needed

Training*	Instrument s	Reagents & consumables	Bibliography	UNODC kits***
Study Tour CA** (1) Biological Specimens **** Quality Assurance (1)	FTIR	YES	YES	61 (38/23)

* In brackets Nr of attendees, ** CA= Central America Tour, *** refers in brackets Nr of drug and precursors testing kits respectively, ****organisers

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 UNODC'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/CAM/99/D43 Strengthening of forensic laboratory services in the countries in Central America and Mexico

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

AD/CAM/99/D43 Terminal Evaluation

2

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	X		
12. Identification and assessment of risks				X				
13. Prior obligations and prerequisites:					X			
14. Workplan/planned project duration:					X			
15. Budget:							X	

3

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
II. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:								
1. Quality and timeliness of UNODC 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	X			
9. Project workplans:						X		
10. Implementation of activities:						X		
11. Monitoring and backstopping by UNODC HQ:					X	X		
12. Monitoring and backstopping by UNODC field Office:						X		
13. Monitoring and backstopping by Executing Agency:			X					
14. Monitoring and backstopping by Government:				X				
15. Government fulfillment 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	X	

4

	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: x / 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):

Political changes in beneficiary countries

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 a new project should be developed on the basis of outputs from this project to guarantee the sustainability of the investments made.

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