



UNITED NATIONS
Office on Drugs and Crime

June 20, 2005

2004

Annual Evaluation Report

of the

Independent Evaluation Unit

The present Annual Evaluation Report was prepared by Teame Tewolde-Berhan, Consultant, Backson Sibanda, Chief, Independent Evaluation Unit, Roger Miranda, Evaluation Officer and Fumika Ouchi, Evaluation Specialist.

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

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 500
1400 Vienna
Austria

Telephone: +(43) (1) 26060-4433
Telefax: +(43) (1) 26060-6724
E-mail: ieu@unodc.org
Website: www.unodc.org

Disclaimer

This report has been reproduced without formal editing.

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vi
Summary Matrix IEU Activities in 2004.....	viii
Summary Table of Major Findings, Supporting Evidence and Recommendations derived from Evaluations Conducted in 2004.....	ix
I. INTRODUCTION	
A. Independent Evaluation Unit in 2004.....	1
1. Policy development.....	1
2. Evaluations.....	2
B. Challenges.....	3
C. Structure of the Report.....	3
D. Methodology of Report.....	4
E. Constraints.....	5
II. ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION FINDINGS	
A. Summary of Thematic Evaluations.....	6
1. Evaluation of the Global Programme against Money-Laundering.....	6
2. Evaluation of tools and toolkits as a modality of programme delivery by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.....	6
3. Evaluation of the Development Account Component of the National Drug Control System (NDS).....	6
4. Evaluation of the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings	7
B. Assessment of Outcomes, Impact, and Sustainability	7
1. Outcome.....	7
2. Impact.....	8
3. Sustainability.....	8
C. Policy and programmatic issues.....	9
1. UNODC strategic plan and planning process.....	9
2. Funding mechanism.....	12
3. Project design.....	14
D. Delivery mechanisms.....	16
1. Tool and toolkits.....	16
2. Mentoring.....	17
3. Partnerships.....	18
4. Field Offices.....	19
E. Knowledge management: a cross-cutting enabling theme.....	20
III. BEST PRACTICES	
A. Capacity Building.....	23
B. Provision of information for policy development and action.....	24
C. Enhancing tools and toolkits.....	24
D. Outreach and awareness.....	24
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	
A. Strategic plan	25
B. Funding mechanism.....	25
C. Project design.....	26
D. Tools and toolkits.....	28
E. Field offices.....	28
F. Knowledge management: a cross-cutting enabling theme	29
G. Project evaluations	29
V. CONCLUSION	
 <u>Annexes</u>	
Annex I	Summary Matrix GPML
Annex II	Summary Matrix Tools and Toolkits
Annex III	Summary Matrix NDS
Annex IV	Summary Matrix GPAT
Annex V	Terms of Reference
Annex VI	List of Thematic and Project Evaluations

Foreword

Evaluations by their nature are high-profile activities that tend to cause anxiety to programme implementers or those whose work is being evaluated. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is learning how to use evaluation as a management tool and not a fault-finding exercise. The present Annual Evaluation Report captures UNODC's new understanding of the evaluation function and process, which is evolving towards independence, accountability, learning and knowledge management. The report examines strategic and operational issues that have an impact or have the potential to have an impact on UNODC as a whole.

The Annual Evaluation Report challenges old notions about programme/project performance, expressing linkages between evaluation, decision-making and strategic planning and management. Further, the report aims at sharing information on UNODC achievements, results and impacts being created by its initiatives. It also identifies constraints and weaknesses that have an impact on programme delivery. It addresses fundamental issues that are raised by the individual evaluations. These issues emanate from a long history of deficient programme/project planning and design processes at UNODC.

UNODC has demonstrated its leadership by developing intellectual and knowledge products in the form of, for example, flagship publications and regular reports on illicit drugs and crime trends, tools, toolkits, guidelines, policy instruments that are critical in the control of illicit drugs and combating organized crime and terrorism. UNODC global obligations, commitments and challenges are clear. The demand for UNODC assistance to Member States is growing and the Office is increasingly being called upon to provide services and technical expertise to deal with issues of illicit drugs and crime. Earmarked resources are increasing, however the core funds are not and funding remains unpredictable and unstable, making it impossible for the Office to meet all obligations and demands for its assistance.

The present report, therefore, offers UNODC senior management, governing bodies, donors and partners an overview of some of the major issues raised by evaluations undertaken in 2004 that are considered to have a bearing on the work of the Office. It challenges donors to provide predictable and stable funding in order to match its programme with its resources. It discerns strategic policy and programmatic issues that UNODC must address in order to perform its functions more effectively and efficiently.

I am pleased to present this report that summarises the activities of the Independent Evaluation Unit and provides a glimpse of the major evaluation findings in 2004.

Backson Sibanda
Chief
Independent Evaluation Unit

Acknowledgements

The preparation of the Annual Evaluation Report requires considerable effort and the involvement of different consultants, staff members and institutions. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the Independent Evaluation Unit, which coordinates this work, would like to acknowledge the efforts of the following independent consultants for their contribution to the preparation of the 2004 Annual Evaluation Report: Teame Tewolde-Berhan, Thandiwe Mavunga, Thomas E. Brown, Thomas R. Hansen, Andrew Blezzard, Paul Williams, G.P.H.L. Silva, Diyanath Samarasinghe, Osita Eze and Cesar Krieger.

Acknowledgement also goes to the staff of the Independent Evaluation Unit who actively participated in the preparation of all the evaluations carried out in 2004 and the Annual Evaluation Report. The following staff were on board in 2004: Backson Sibanda, Chief, Roger Miranda, Evaluation Officer, Fumika Ouchi, Evaluation Specialist, Silvia Levisianos, Evaluation Assistant, Wanda Mendiola, Assistant/Secretary and Maria Woels, Secretary.

Acknowledgement also goes to the following interns who participated in the work of the Unit in 2004: Lucia Kosmova and Christine Holzer.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Annual Evaluation Report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) for 2004 is the first report produced by the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in its present revitalized form. The present report is an analysis and synthesis of four in-depth thematic evaluations and 10 project evaluations conducted during the year. The findings, conclusions and recommendations in this report are therefore based ONLY on those UNODC activities that were evaluated during the year 2004. The Report is not a comprehensive review of all the activities carried out by UNODC in 2004. The analysis of the evaluation findings indicates that, overall, UNODC programmes and projects achieve their intended outputs and outcomes and have an impact on and contribute to the implementation of UNODC mandates and mission.

This report discusses fundamental issues that go beyond the scope of the individual evaluations carried out in 2004. These fundamental issues emanate from a long history of programme and project development at UNODC. The creation of IEU as a result of the reform process facilitates the analysis of these topics.

Based on the evaluations undertaken in 2004, IEU has established that UNODC programmes develop, utilize and disseminate high-quality and effective products and implementation modalities, including tools and toolkits, strategic partnerships, knowledge products, such as databases, networks, websites, research reports and publications, to enhance policy consensus, mobilize action and advance knowledge on substantive and policy issues related to its mandates at the international, regional and national levels.

UNODC is making progress in improving the capacities of Member States by providing effective packages of technical assistance that address issues such as awareness-raising, the adaptation of existing or development of new legislations to conform with international conventions and protocols and implementation of policy instruments and capacity-building.

UNODC also forges beneficial linkages and partnerships with United Nations bodies, regional and sub regional organizations, regional and international financial and development agencies and non-governmental organizations active in the UNODC mandated fields. These linkages contribute to the attainment of UNODC goals by cooperating at various levels, including in joint research initiatives, the development and design of tools, and joint funding of programmes and projects. Based on the evaluations conducted in 2004, IEU has, however, concluded that UNODC faces a number of internal institutional and programmatic challenges that threaten the sustainability of its leadership role in the coordination of global policy consensus and action on the control of illicit drugs and the prevention of organized crime as mandated by the United Nations. Those strategic weaknesses pertain to a lack of an overarching organizational strategy and the existing unstable and unpredictable funding mechanism. The programmatic issues relate to lack of a project cycle management system and of comprehensive and formal project design guidelines, and lack of clear understanding on the role of the regional and country offices. IEU contends that such weaknesses prevent UNODC from attaining its full potential in the implementation of its mandate.

UNODC is implementing technical assistance programmes in order to help Member States to actively participate in efforts to control drugs and crime, and to comply with the requirements of pertinent international conventions, standards and norms. The achievements that were identified through evaluations were attained despite the interacting funding weaknesses and the lack of an organizational strategic plan to guide its programmes in an integrated manner. Further, the Commissions and donors need to take note and urgently address those issues identified in this report (in particular those which are beyond the powers of UNODC management) that pose a threat to UNODC's ability to deliver its programmes and projects effectively and efficiently.

IEU has presented recommendations that address the above issues consistent with senior management's vision, and some actions have already been taken within the context of the reform process, which started in early 2003. Further, evaluation has identified the need for UNODC to develop a unified cross-cutting knowledge management strategy in order to ensure its intellectual leadership in the advancement of knowledge on substantive and policy issues relating to its mandates.

IEU underlines in particular the need for Member States to begin to address the two most strategic and interacting issues facing UNODC, namely, the provision of adequate, stable and predictable funding and the creation of an enabling policy environment for the institutionalization of a strategic planning process. An organizational strategic plan would provide coherent guidance, focus and direction to UNODC programmes. In addition, an improved funding mechanism would help Member States benefit from the sustainable commitment of UNODC programmes.

IEU presents the 2004 Annual Evaluation Report with its recommendations to UNODC senior management and the Executive Committee for their consideration and action.

Summary Matrix of IEU Activities in 2004

Thematic/Global In-depth Evaluations

Title of Thematic Evaluation	Status
Global Programme against Money Laundering	Evaluation completed and the report distributed. Report discussed by Excom
Tools and Toolkits as Modality of Programme Delivery	Evaluation completed and the report distributed. To be discussed by Excom
National Drug Control System (originally not included in work plan)	Evaluation completed and the report distributed to both Member States and New York (UNDESA). Report discussed with ED. Action to be taken on recommendation for a wider NDS evaluation
Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings	Evaluation completed and the report distributed. To be discussed by ExCom
Alternative Development	Evaluation started in 2004 and continuing in 2005. Evaluation to be completed in 2005

Other Activities

Title of Activity	Status	Comments
Backstopping and Support to Project Evaluations	A total of 26 project evaluations backstopped as per request in 2004	Evaluation terms of reference (TOR), draft evaluation reports and evaluator candidates reviewed, commented on and advise provided.
Review of Myanmar 2003 Evaluation Report	Evaluation report reviewed; Findings and comments presented to ED for review; New project document reviewed for compliance with past evaluation recommendations	New project document approved by PPC, and the project ongoing
Project Cycle Management	Project designed, presentations made to Funding Partners; Background materials prepared and consultancy TORs prepared	Project being implemented (ongoing in 2005).
Evaluation of Project Cycle at UNODC	Evaluation completed and report used for designing PCM project	The conclusions of the report being used for decision making
Evaluation Strategic Framework	Document completed, presented to CND and adopted by management	Document serving as the foundation of the work of IEU
Evaluation Guidelines (multiple)	Procedural guidelines prepared for policy and various types of evaluation and posted on the website	Guidelines being used by Field Offices and HQ operations staff
Evaluation Plans	IEU workplan completed and implemented	Evaluation plans fully implemented
Evaluation Management Instructions	Completed, adopted by Excom and being used	Official UN document
Independent Evaluation Unit TORs	Completed and adopted by Excom	Currently in effect

**Summary table of major findings, supporting evidence and recommendations
derived from evaluations conducted in 2004**

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
1. Strategy related frameworks have been developed at various levels for UNODC but these are not guided by a unified/overarching strategy. UNODC needs to articulate a strategy (<i>a plan designed to achieve a long-term aim</i>) that translates its priorities into programmes and projects in an integrated manner.	Numerous internal documents (e.g. Operational Priorities, Strategic Programme Frameworks, etc) exist in UNODC but there is no unified strategy that guides the whole.	There is a need for UNODC to develop an overarching strategy as an instrument that operationalizes conventions, and unifies strategic objectives, strategic frameworks and global programmes in line with resource availability.
2. UNODC does not have an adequate, stable and predictable funding mechanism. This is hampering the effective implementation of programmes and projects, thereby limiting the impact and sustainability of UNODC programmes.	Earmarked voluntary contributions represent over 75% of UNODC funding. The inadequate and unpredictable funding leads to disruptions and abandonment of activities and projects. Projects are launched without prospects of adequate funding. In response to this shortcoming DPA/CPS have developed proposals on "Sustainable Funding for UNODC's infrastructure and Core Programmes" and these are currently being discussed.	It is recommended that the Commissions and the Funding Partners examine and increase allocations and contributions to the general-purpose fund, as well as commit to providing stable funding for UNODC.
3. Present project design guidelines are weak, design tools are inadequate and inappropriate (no baseline data and no needs assessment). There is no comprehensive system in place that subjects project documents to a rigorous planning, design, review and approval process and as a result projects suffer from a series of design weaknesses that affect the quality, performance and impacts of projects.	UNODC lacks a coherent and comprehensive project cycle system that would guide the planning, design, approval, implementation and monitoring of projects. This increases the likelihood of project documents being of poor quality resulting in vague objectives, outputs and associated performance indicators.	It is recommended that UNODC continue with its Project Cycle Management initiative in order to institutionalise project design guidelines and use the logical framework as a tool for project design.
4. Tools and toolkits, as instruments of delivering technical cooperation, are appropriate and effective modalities. However, UNODC has not taken full advantage of the mechanism such that it is fully and properly utilized.	UNODC lacks a strategy and mechanism for production, dissemination and use of tools. No system for consultation or of sharing information, no guidelines on design principles and no standards for quality control. Lack of an institutional knowledge management system.	UNODC should establish policy guidelines to inform the entire process of tool and toolkit development and dissemination. As part of sharing information and knowledge management, a central website, which registers all information on tools, should be developed at headquarters.
5. Regional and country offices often carry out their own donor-led projects with little systematic interaction and formal communication on policy and programmatic issues with pertinent substantive units at headquarters. Global programmes at HQ also develop field level activities without adequate participation from the field.	There is a lack of clarity on the respective roles and responsibilities between HQ and FO relating to issues of decentralisation and delegation of authority. Some Global programmes were developed without adequate input from the field and some field projects were developed and implemented without receiving sufficient input from substantive HQ staff.	The role and responsibilities of regional and country offices should be reviewed in order to mitigate the above-mentioned gaps and gear their structure and resources to implement the new UNODC priorities and impending strategic plan.
6. UNODC generates high-quality knowledge products such as guidelines, tools, toolkits and databases among others. However, UNODC lacks a comprehensive knowledge management and dissemination strategy.	Databases and websites developed by UNODC are considered useful, but there is no systematic feedback from users on these. The Office lacks a mechanism for strengthening the management of these knowledge products.	UNODC launch a comprehensive review of its current "knowledge management system" in order to consolidate existing knowledge products and create the conditions for becoming a centre of excellence
7. A number of project evaluations were postponed or abandoned either due to delayed implementation or lack of money. The projects status at evaluation planning stage is usually unknown	42 project evaluations were planned by programme managers in 2004, of which 20 were completed, and 22 were either postponed to 2005 or were not conducted.	Senior management should provide support to the Division for Operations and IEU to take immediate measures to clear the backlog of evaluations not conducted in 2004. (specific steps listed in the report)

I. Introduction

1. The UNODC Annual Evaluation Report for 2004 is the first produced by the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). The report has been prepared with the view of meeting UNODC compliance with accountability requirements of its governing bodies. It also serves as a vital management tool by providing strategic and operational management information to UNODC senior management. It attempts to assess the effectiveness of UNODC activities by focusing on the main issues arising from independent evaluations conducted in 2004.
2. The report highlights the principal activities of IEU as well as analyzes and synthesizes the evaluations conducted in 2004.

A. Independent Evaluation Unit in 2004

3. The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), under the Policy Analysis and Research Branch of the Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs of UNODC, is responsible for planning and coordinating the evaluation activities of UNODC. Reflecting the need to strengthen the internal evaluation capacity as recognized in the *UNODC Operational Priorities*, IEU was constituted with a stronger and clearer mandate in the context of the restructuring of UNODC. IEU is a small unit with five staff (three Professionals and two Support Staff), all funded from extra budgetary resources. Following the recruitment of Chief of the Unit and professional staff during 2004, IEU conducted four in-depth thematic evaluations in 2004 as planned.

1. Policy development

4. During 2004, IEU developed and formulated four vital documents that form the necessary foundation for institutionalizing a revitalized evaluation function within UNODC. IEU has the responsibility to make it possible for UNODC both to satisfy compliance with the accountability requirements of the governing bodies, and its role as a vital management tool for senior management and programme/project managers. IEU policy documents prepared and disseminated to pertinent parties are:

(a) **Guiding principles for evaluation at UNODC.** The document provides a set of guidelines that evaluators of the activities of UNODC should uphold in practice. Some of the important principles are independence and impartiality, integrity and honesty, systematic inquiry, professional objectivity and accountability;

(b) **Independent evaluation function: a strategic framework.** The purpose of such a framework document is to create a common understanding among UNODC management, staff, partners and Member States about what evaluation is and its role in the strategic management of UNODC mandates;

(c) **Standard format and guidelines for project evaluation report.** The document is designed to assist evaluators to prepare a standard project evaluation report by providing an outline of information to be collected and assessed and

(d) **Guidelines for project self-evaluation.** The guidelines and self-evaluation template assist programme managers, programme officers and field representatives charged with the responsibility of carrying out or supervising self-evaluations. The self-evaluation system is available online under ProFi and is accessible to all users.

5. IEU has introduced a new system of feeding back evaluation findings and recommendations to future programme planning. The system works as follows: once an evaluation is completed, it is

distributed to Member States and the senior management of the organization for action. IEU and the substantive office prepare an implementation plan jointly. The plan is submitted to the UNODC Executive Committee and an agreement is reached between the Executive Committee and the substantive office on the recommendations that can be implemented. Once a decision is made on which recommendations are implementable, the plan is then signed by the Executive Director and the Programme Manager. The substantive office then implements the plan and provides a progress report every six months to Excom. The programme manager monitors the implementation of the recommendations and reports to Excom. That system was adopted in UNODC in 2004, therefore, its initial effect and potential contribution to a strengthened knowledge management system will be assessed at the end of 2005.

2. Evaluations

6. The IEU 2004 work plan included four major in-depth thematic evaluations: Global Programme against Money-Laundering; Tools and Toolkits as a Modality of Programme Delivery; Alternative Development and the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings. Also included in the work plan were 42 project evaluations. IEU was fully responsible for the planning and execution of the four thematic evaluations. Backstopping support for individual project evaluations was provided by IEU to project managers, and in total, facilitated 26 project evaluations. The responsibility for the delivery of project evaluations lies with the programme and project managers.

7. The evaluations undertaken in 2004 (4 thematic and 10 project) have raised critical issues that need to be addressed in this report, even though they go beyond the scope of these evaluations. These issues are discussed in the recommendations section of this report given their strategic nature and the pivotal role they play in UNODC's reform process. While these issues are raised in this report, the problems themselves emanate from a long history of programme and project development deficiencies. These issues have been identified due to the reform process at UNODC that included the creation of the Independent Evaluation Unit.

8. During the course of 2004, three ad hoc assignments were given to IEU: the evaluation of the National Drug Control System; review of the Myanmar 2003 evaluation report and the new project document and the initiation of the new UNODC Project Cycle Management system. Three thematic evaluations that were part of the 2004 work plan were completed and are included in this Annual Evaluation Report. The additional evaluation of the National Drug Control System was also completed and is part of this report. The review of the Myanmar evaluation report and the new project document were completed and the new project was approved. The Alternative Development evaluation was not yet finalized at the time of going to press and, therefore, will not be included in this report. The completion of this evaluation was influenced by the three additional assignments. This evaluation will be completed and distributed to Member States during 2005 and will then be included in the 2005 Annual Evaluation Report.

9. Overall, IEU has accomplished its 2004 planned activities successfully. IEU has implemented 75 per cent of its plans for the evaluation of in-depth thematic evaluations. The report on the status of the implementation of the IEU work plan for 2004 as of 15th April 2005 indicates that out of 42 planned project evaluations: 4 (10 per cent) were either aborted, or had no funds to be implemented; 14 (33 per cent) terms of reference were reviewed, but the evaluations have been postponed to 2005 or to 2006; 4 (10 per cent) are under preparation and 20 (47 per cent) have been submitted. The additional 10 project evaluations were received after the cut-off date and hence were not included in the analysis.

10. These figures are indicative of the challenge UNODC faces. One of the reasons for this is the fact that project evaluations originally listed were merely developed from reviewing project documents but without carefully assessing the project implementation status.

11. It is clear that the present system of planning and provisioning of backstopping services on evaluations to programme and project managers will need improvement both in terms of increased resources and establishing efficient communication between programme/project managers and IEU. IEU should get involved more in the planning and follow-up of project evaluations, especially in the light of the need to ensure that a project evaluation plan is not just a wish list and that the quality of evaluations is not compromised. Further, project/programme managers should carefully monitor the timing of an evaluation, based on the status of project implementation, and develop the project evaluation plan accordingly.

B. Challenges

12. Year 2004 marked the start of IEU operations in a newly restructured UNODC. IEU delivered thematic evaluations, which produced a series of recommendations. However, sustainability of the IEU contribution can only be ensured if the challenges facing the Unit can be overcome.

13. IEU's challenges emanate from the past evaluation practices in UNODC, where the inception, development, implementation and evaluation of UNODC projects, by and large, started and ended in the Division for Operations. One of the major challenges is the creation of a culture of evaluation and learning in UNODC. Another major challenge is how to execute required evaluations, given the small number of staff of the Unit and the limited and unpredictable evaluation budget. The difficulties of limited staff and funding have an impact on the ability of the Unit to guarantee independent project evaluation. The full implementation of the major evaluations is also threatened by those challenges.

14. It is hoped that the introduction of the new IEU policy documents outlined earlier will create a common understanding, by clearing misperceptions and allaying fears, in some quarters, about the functions and purposes of independent evaluation. IEU realizes that perceptions and work habits are difficult to change. Consequently, the Unit is conscious that, in practice, creating an enabling environment for independent evaluations demands more than introducing policies and passing instructions. It is, however, encouraging to note that some perceptions have begun to change and the value of evaluation is appreciated as demonstrated by how well the major evaluations have been received by the substantive units. Additionally the Unit has received a number of requests either to evaluate or to lend support to project evaluations.

15. IEU has worked to build confidence and cooperation from programme managers by:

- (a) Requiring evaluators to strictly adhere to the principles and guidelines;
- (b) Promoting an effective recruitment system for technically competent, independent evaluators and
- (c) Ensuring, in the course of evaluations, that evaluators listen, consider and properly record stakeholders' explanations, comments and opinions; and that feedback is given to project managers to guide them in implementing follow-up activities and the evaluation recommendations. IEU promotes a participatory, transparent and independent evaluation practice.

16. Another important factor is maintaining continued senior management commitment in support of IEU's relevance to the strategic management of UNODC. IEU is encouraged by the senior management's support of its ideas and programmes; and hopes the funding of IEU staff and activities will also be reviewed. Funding part of IEU staff and activities from earmarked extra budgetary resources cannot offer stability and sustainability of evaluation functions in the long term. The Commissions and senior management will have to consider reviewing current funding arrangements and creating more stable and predictable funding if the function is to succeed. The following are some of the issues to be considered:

(a) Funding for the evaluation function (e.g. staff salaries and related costs) should be provided for from the UNODC revised regular and/or core budget if the integrity of the independent evaluation function is to be preserved;

(b) Evaluations carried out by IEU, including in-depth thematic evaluations, programme evaluations and special studies to be funded from UNODC regular budget (core funding) and the general-purpose fund and

(c) Backstopping, training support and other policy support that IEU provides to field offices and projects should be covered through prior allocation made during the appraisal of projects.

17. According to the 2004 Evaluation Plan approved by the Executive Committee all Thematic/Global evaluation reports were to be presented to the Excom as soon as they had been distributed to Member States. Excom was supposed to discuss each evaluation report as well as agree on the recommendations to be adopted. The substantive office would then prepare a plan for the implementation of the adopted recommendations. All the four (4) thematic evaluations reports completed in 2004 were distributed to the Member States and Excom, however, none of the reports have as yet been discussed. As a result Excom has not yet taken any decision on any of the recommendations made. The fact that these reports have not been discussed in a timely manner has created a major challenge to the work of IEU. Therefore the present Annual Evaluation Report has to be understood within this context.

C. Structure of the report

18. The summary of the report includes an Executive Summary, a table showing the IEU activities in 2004 and a summary table of major findings, supporting evidence and recommendations. IEU considered it appropriate to bring the two summary tables to the front, in particular the latter, in order to highlight the fundamental issues raised in this report as well as to stress the strategic nature of the recommendations.

19. Chapter I has so far covered the activities of IEU in 2004 and also covers the methodology used in the preparation of this report. Chapter II is devoted to the analysis of evaluation findings reported in the thematic, in-depth programme evaluations and project evaluations. The chapter provides brief summaries for each thematic evaluation and broadly assesses the overall effectiveness of outcome, impact and sustainability from the evidence obtained through them. Moreover, it analyses and discerns issues raised in evaluation reports with system-wide implications in terms of their impact on the overall delivery of UNODC mandates. Those issues include the strategic planning process and the strategic plan; UNODC funding mechanism; project design; delivery mechanisms, including tools and toolkits, mentoring, strategic partnership and field offices. The UNODC knowledge management system, as an enabling cross-cutting theme, is also discussed in detail. Chapter III presents a number of best practices observed in the current programmes and projects that were evaluated.

20. Chapter IV is devoted to recommendations. This chapter summarizes the fundamental issues highlighted in the 2004 evaluations as evaluation findings and presents corresponding recommendations. Conclusions are found in Chapter V.

D. Methodology of Report

21. The Annual Evaluation Report is an analysis and synthesis of four in-depth thematic and programme evaluations and 10 project evaluations (see Annex VI). It is important to note that 20 project evaluations had been completed by April 2005, but only 10 were available to the authors of the report on January 20th, the cut-off date for the report. The analysis conforms to the terms of reference (see Annex V). On the basis of the findings and issues raised by independent evaluations, the report has

raised major issues of strategic significance with respect to the way UNODC programme delivery should be managed in the future.

22. IEU has received twelve self-evaluation fact sheets submitted by projects. Only three were of acceptable quality, and these were examined for the analysis on project design weaknesses in Chapter II.

23. The report has also reviewed relevant UNODC documents and independent assessments. They include “Operational priorities: guidelines for the medium term”, “Putting UNODC’s funding on a more sound, predictable and stable footing”, prepared by a consultant in July 2003, and “Evaluation of the UNODC project cycle” prepared by IEU in January 2004.

E. Constraints

24. This Annual Evaluation Report, being the first one, did not benefit from historical records from past reports to allow a wider perspective on current evaluation results and the extent of their potential impact in the future. A greater number of evaluations would have helped for this Annual Evaluation Report to glean more common issues, best practices or constraints with organization-wide implications for analysis.

25. Further, there were no agreed guidelines on the process of preparing, managing and distributing the report. These guidelines were only prepared by IEU and adopted by the Executive Committee a month after the report was circulated to the Excom in preparation for distribution. This process caused enormous delays as the report was then subjected to a review and commentary process that had initially not been anticipated. The report could not therefore be distributed in March/April 2005 as originally planned.

26. It is important to note that the Annual Evaluation Report reflects the views of the Independent Evaluation Unit.

27. Many of the project evaluations were poorly structured and unfocused. Some evaluation reports that were presented combined two evaluation reports in one. This creates even more confusion, as more than one person, using different structures and styles, prepared the reports. This finding starkly demonstrates the challenges IEU faces in its efforts to institutionalize good professional evaluation practice in UNODC.

II. Analysis of Evaluation Findings

28. In 2004 IEU carried out four thematic evaluations. A summary of each follows:

A. Summary of Thematic Evaluations

1. Evaluation of the Global Programme against Money-Laundering

29. The evaluation concludes that technical assistance has been provided to some Member States in Asia, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean. The Anti-Money-Laundering Unit of UNODC has developed and maintained strategic relationships and conducted many joint projects in partnership with international organizations and donors working to counter money-laundering. The Global Programme is the only source of technical cooperation with a global mandate to deal with all aspects of the fight against money-laundering and the financing of terrorism. Each year, comprehensive work plans have been prepared that incorporate new issues and ideas. Specific initiatives are built around raising awareness, building institutions and training. Key stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation agreed that the mentor programme was one of the most effective methods of delivering long-term, sustainable technical assistance. However, the funding circumstances of the Programme have not permitted long-range planning beyond a period of one year. As a result, it has not been practicable to develop existing activities into a longer-term programme that is guided by a long-term strategy. The core funding of the Programme should be increased to allow for operations to be planned and commitments to be made over longer periods of time. The Programme needs to diversify its funding sources. Management should refrain from imposing new initiatives and activities if no additional resources are assigned to new efforts. Any new initiatives should be guided by the strategic plan to be produced by the Anti-Money-Laundering Unit. The fact that mentors are not always properly supported under current UNOPS arrangements should be addressed.

2. Evaluation of tools and toolkits as a modality of programme delivery by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

30. The production of various types of tools and toolkits as a means of programme delivery within UNODC has been a standard practice since the genesis of the Office. There was a perception that tools and toolkits were the fundamental delivery mechanism of technical cooperation that UNODC possesses. Overall, the tools sampled are of high quality, prepared by subject experts. This applies to tools in the areas of both crime and drugs. Nevertheless, the insufficient knowledge and information on best practices in poor developing countries make these tools of less operational relevance in poor countries, where prescriptions based on the experience of developed countries cannot be applied, for the most part because of resource constraints. Another important shortcoming with regard to many tools produced at headquarters is that there is no considered strategy for dissemination. There appears to be a disconnection between tools produced at the field level and those produced at headquarters. There are deficiencies in the flow of information between headquarters and the field about the tools. Therefore it is recommended that the design of tools needs to be improved, making them more user-friendly and relevant to operational purposes, in particular in addressing clearly identified needs. Provision should be made to facilitate the adaptation of tools at the country level and the experience of the International Trade Centre should be examined. It was also recommended that mechanisms should be established to improve the channels of communication between headquarters and the field level, in particular with regard to quality control of field-level tools.

3. Evaluation of the Development Account Component of the National Drug Control System (NDS)

31. The National Drug Control System was designed to facilitate the electronic reporting by Member States to UNODC on the import and export of licit drugs and controlled substances. The project set out to develop a comprehensive computer database system, i.e. the National Drug Control System (NDS).

Overall, a majority of the Member States interviewed reported that they were satisfied with the system. The evaluation concluded that the development account funds had been used in designing and installing the system in 18 Member States. However, the “project document” stated that the system had already been installed in 25 countries and yet the pilot phase had not succeeded in successfully installing and running the system in any country. The “project document” was nothing more than a three-page project proposal that listed only some general objectives and three expected outputs. This was the sole basis for the execution of \$1.1 million dollars. In order to provide an accurate overview, the evaluation recommended that a complete project evaluation of NDS should be conducted. Further recommendations included an audit of the Development Account component of NDS the commissioning of an independent inquiry regarding the circumstances culminating in misleading information appearing in the project proposal. The inquiry would also show how the project subsequently dealt with the situation it encountered. Finally, it was recommended that UNODC should continue the development and implementation of International Drug Control System (IDS) to ensure systems compatibility with INCB so that the ultimate goal of electronic reporting by Member States is realised.

4. Evaluation of the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings

32. The Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings (GPAT) has been active in numerous Member States, including those in Asia, Europe, Latin America and Africa. The Programme attempts to assist the Member States to better respond to the problem of human trafficking by conducting data collection and assessment and providing technical assistance. The Programme has produced a number of studies, training manuals and toolkits on various aspects of human trafficking, and developed a database on trafficking flows and a website dedicated to the problem. The evaluation reported highly positive achievements observed in some beneficiary countries, including: (a) national action plans on human trafficking being developed; (b) legislation to combat human trafficking being introduced/passed in the countries; and (c) the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children supplementing the United Nations Convention against Organized Crime being ratified. The Programme was initially intended to be time-limited, and developed without a global strategic plan. It is now viewed by UNODC as an enduring programme. The evaluation identified several critical issues that have not been sufficiently addressed by the current Programme, such as the issue of smuggling of migrants, trafficking for labour exploitation or for organ removal, and trafficking incidence and prevalence data. At the same time, the report highlighted lack of adequate and predictable resources for the Programme, and recommended that the staffing level and structure of the Program unit be reviewed and enhanced to ensure the sustainability of the Programme.

B. Assessment of Outcomes, Impact and Sustainability

1. Outcome

33. UNODC global programmes and projects have provided successful technical assistance to beneficiary States in dealing with problems on drugs and crime. The assistance mainly involves human and institutional capacity development.

34. Both the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings and the Global Programme against Money-Laundering produce tools and mechanisms that enable the transfer of skills to beneficiary States. The tools include seminars, workshops, model legislation, databases and information networks.

35. In the crime-related global programmes, the technical assistance usually covers: (a) sensitizing key players such as judges, prosecutors and law enforcement officers by workshops on, for example, problems and their impact on victims, communities and nations and the security of the international community; (b) helping States identify gaps in their legislation in order to comply with the relevant international conventions; (c) supporting States develop national strategies and action plans; and

(d) assisting States in the strengthening or establishment of appropriate national institutions (financial intelligence units, for example).

36. UNODC programmes have produced intended outputs/outcomes, such as training of personnel by means of workshops, seminars and computer-based training; assisting a number of States to pass relevant legislation to combat money-laundering or human trafficking; building the capacity of the judiciary, the prosecutors and law enforcement officers; establishing relevant institutions, such as financial investigation units to combat money-laundering; and formulating national plans of action.

37. The tools and toolkits as delivery mechanisms developed by UNODC programmes are effective in the development of policy consensus and mobilizing action on international crimes and drug abuse at the international, regional and national level.

38. Although various constraints such as inadequate funding exist, weak project design and implementation arrangements cause disruptions and are likely to undermine the quality of outputs.

2. Impact

39. Many programmes and projects do not define their objectives properly in their design, nor do they collect the baseline data to measure impact. Many of the achievements reported in the evaluations are in fact often outputs. The impact of most UNODC programmes and projects evaluated could not therefore be determined.

40. In the case of the Global Programme against Money-Laundering, there are strong indications that its capacity-building activities and tools are having impact. Some examples of accomplishments are the removal of six Caribbean States as well as the Marshall Islands from the international black list; and in Mauritius, four cases of money-laundering are now under prosecution. There are also cases of work to combat money-laundering, which resulted in seizure by the State concerned of significant assets and proceeds of crime, including money, vehicles and other property.

41. In the case of the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings, impact can be measured by the extent to which the Programme has contributed to a reduction in persons trafficked and/or an increase in the number of traffickers prosecuted. This, however, has not yet been assessed, owing mainly to the lack of a system for collecting information on the prevalence and incidence of trafficking in human beings.

42. While evidence is not available to determine the impact of most UNODC interventions evaluated, its programmes have developed and implemented projects and activities that have produced positive results. UNODC should attempt to identify and define impact indicators in every programme and project, and collect the corresponding baseline data to allow for measuring impacts in the future.

3. Sustainability

43. Sustainability (continued effectiveness over time) of programme and project processes, outputs and results is achieved when the presence of an enabling policy environment, institutional capacity and financial resources is assured. UNODC programmes have, to varying degrees, assisted Member States to acquire those elements. Depending on the priorities applied to public funds, it is primarily the responsibility of the States to ensure continued availability of the required resources to sustain the process initiated by UNODC.

44. UNODC programmes have assisted Member States to establish their own institutions, including some regional and sub regional cooperative arrangements that have been created to develop common strategies, for example, to combat money-laundering and theft of state assets and other related

international crimes. UNODC seeks to enhance opportunities for the sustainability of processes it helped create and results achieved.

45. The Global Programme against Money-Laundering has contributed to developing the capacity of a number of States, which are now assisting other States in their respective regions to combat money-laundering. The United Arab Emirates now assists its neighbours; Barbados is now a hub providing assistance to other countries in the Caribbean; and South Africa, now a member of the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, is providing support to Eastern and South African Anti Money Laundering Group (ESAAMLG) Member States in their efforts to deal with money-laundering problems. The availability of expertise and cooperative arrangements at the regional level thus has enhanced sustainability of results and outcomes of projects assisted by the Global Programme against Money-Laundering.

46. In Eastern and Southern Africa, the Global Programme against Money-Laundering has also assisted ESAAMLG to enable all of the 14 States in the region to join the regional body, sign the associated memorandum of understanding, participate in activities to combat money-laundering and contribute resources to fund the secretariat.

47. The sustainability of UNODC implemented programmes and projects refers to a future situation where the continuity of a programme and project activity or use of project output by a beneficiary community, Government or organization, is assured, independent of the project input. The real value of UNODC investment should be determined by the extent to which the project or activity will continue to attain the intended objectives of reducing incidence and prevalence of drugs and crime and their effects on the long-term security of communities and nations.

48. The responsibility of UNODC, along with its partners, United Nations bodies, Governments and other stakeholders is to consider and embed sustainability-enabling provisions (such as training the trainers, inclusion of materials in professional curricula as implemented in some of the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings projects) in the course of developing national strategies and programmes and projects. The sustainability of programmes and projects will depend on the availability of resources, as well as the commitment by all stakeholders involved.

C. Policy and programmatic issues

49. Based on the evaluations carried out in 2004, UNODC has, to a large extent, delivered on its mandate. However, the present report has also discerned the following policy and programmatic issues that require consolidation, refinement and improvement in order for UNODC to attain its full potential.

1. UNODC Strategic plan and planning process

50. UNODC needs to articulate and institutionalize a strategic planning process, that would enable it to accomplish its mandates in an integrated manner. This structural weakness limits UNODC capacity to mobilize, allocate and utilize resources effectively; to develop and continuously refine appropriate delivery mechanisms; and to ensure the relevance of programmes and projects to UNODC priorities. This fact should prompt UNODC to effectively explore its capabilities and potential strengths to catalyse and enhance delivery.

51. UNODC's mandates would inform its strategic plan and thereby lead to the adjustment of current programmes. The adjustments should be guided by appraising their relevance vis-à-vis UNODC's mission and taking into account the current context and future trends in drugs and crime. The Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings evaluation, for example, noted that all the elements of the Programme menu of assistance are being addressed as discrete modules by other agencies and

entities, including sister United Nations entities, and donors are funding those elements outside the Global Programme. The evaluation stressed the need for UNODC to find its comparative advantage.

52. UNODC has, since 2004, launched the preparation of strategic programme frameworks at the country and regional levels. It is a welcome development and the experience that will be gained from the preparation of such frameworks will contribute to institutionalizing the planning and development of UNODC strategy. It is the overarching UNODC strategy that should guide the development of strategic frameworks at the country and regional levels.

53. The basis for individual global programmes is the relevant UNODC mandate. The issue, however, is that while the mandates are clear, there is no unifying overarching organizational strategy that translates those mandates so as to provide guidance to programmes operating in prevailing and dynamic global, regional and sub-regional contexts and UNODC's capabilities. IEU has established that, in their present structure, the global programmes are in fact a collection of activities implemented at the global level without an overall strategy.

54. The Unit has established that, to a large extent, the evaluated global programmes are a collection of planned short-term activities developed on a yearly basis, and not truly global programmes. As to how the required synergy between the various global programmes (in reality short-term activities) is ensured is also not clear. In some cases, UNODC accepts to be involved in projects that some multilateral and regional organizations initiate without prior adequate and timely consultation at the design stage with the Office. UNODC accepts such proposals without due regard as to whether or not the project falls within its priorities or if the Office has the capacity to participate. A clear example is the Asia-Europe Meeting, a three-year project to combat money-laundering funded by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the European Union.

55. The identification of a project concept or idea, according to existing administrative instructions, is supposed to be guided by the UNODC mandate, its core functions, priorities and objectives. In practice, however, evaluation findings have established that many projects are in fact donor-driven and some obtain clearance for further development because of secured funding, even when it is known they do not fall within the set priority. Such a practice could have the potential of skewing UNODC priorities.

56. Until early 2003, projects had been largely conceptualized, developed, approved and implemented within the Division for Operations. There are management instructions regarding clearance and approval of project ideas and documents, but they do not give sufficient guidelines or standards to ensure the consistency.

57. The Programme and Project Committee (PPC) reviews project documents for technical soundness and quality of design and availability or potential for securing the necessary funds. The PPC, as the final decision-making body in the current approval process, should in fact review programme and project documents primarily for consistency with UNODC strategy and priorities. The fact that most UNODC projects are funded by earmarked contributions calls for even more stringent guidelines at every level of the approval process in the programme/project life cycle in order to ensure that programmes and project objectives fall within the UNODC strategy and contribute to UNODC priorities and strategic objectives.

58. The UNODC priority review exercise carried out in late 2002 revealed that there had been uneven progress made in carrying out UNODC's mandates. While substantial progress has been achieved in the control and management of illicit drugs at the international and regional levels, efforts in tackling organized crime seems to have lagged behind. Notwithstanding the prevailing perception regarding the relative risks associated with illicit drugs in relation to organized crime, the lack of a strategic plan and an institutionalised system of programme development and management only leads

to the continuity of such uneven progress to the detriment of the advantages that could be gained from an integrated approach to the implementation of UNODC mandates.

59. Since 2002, in the advent of change of leadership, UNODC has been under a continuous reform process. So far, the reform has introduced some fundamental changes, such as the formulation of Operational Priorities for the current and the biennium 2006-2007. That, in turn, has facilitated the delivery of the newly identified Operational Priorities. They are positive steps in enhancing UNODC's capacity to deliver, but UNODC realizes that the priorities will have to be regularly reviewed and will need to be translated into the UNODC strategic plan, programme strategies and regional and national strategies with embedded hierarchical linkages.

60. UNODC Strategy should be developed through its Strategic Planning Unit (SPU). SPU should facilitate the planning process that encourages the participation of internal and external stakeholders in order to ensure feasibility, relevance, appropriateness and scope of the strategic plan. Inputs should, therefore, be solicited externally from interested national and regional institutions, regional and sub-regional organizations and associations that jointly cooperate in the advancement of UNODC mandates.

61. UNODC strategy could also be informed by a comprehensive strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis of internal and external factors that could influence its performance in delivering its mandate. The SWOT analysis should result in the objective assessment or identification of:

- (a) UNODC's comparative advantages in the implementation of its mandate, taking into account what other organizations are doing;
- (b) Useful experience gained (best practices) in the course of the implementation of specific programmes;
- (c) Leadership in cutting-edge knowledge on substantive and policy-related issues within its mandates and how it can better use it to improve delivery;
- (d) UNODC's ability to raise funds and the availability of a system that ensures optimum utilization;
- (e) UNODC's ability to evaluate performance of its programmes and activities, and learn from its experience;
- (f) Emerging issues and new challenges related to all UNODC mandates and how they could interact;
- (g) Capacity to catalyse global consensus on drug and international crime-related policies and actions and
- (h) Effectiveness of delivery mechanisms, for example, how UNODC can effectively collaborate with United Nations bodies, working in similar fields.

62. Linked to poor strategic planning is the lack of a coherent and comprehensive project cycle management that would guide projects from the planning, formulation, design and implementation stages to monitoring and evaluation. UNODC has recognized this deficiency and IEU is currently charged with the facilitation of project AD/GLO/03/H12, Project Cycle Management: Skills Development Programme. The introduction of a project cycle management system would clarify the roles and responsibilities of involved units and the requirements that have to be verified at each stage of the project cycle.

2. Funding mechanism

63. Evaluations conducted in 2004 show that UNODC programmes and projects currently are not planned and implemented in a sound, predictable and stable funding environment. Consequently, UNODC has not been able to lead and coordinate its activities in an effective manner. Compounded by lack of a strategic plan, as a cause and effect of unpredictable funding, it has become difficult for UNODC to determine whether the programmes and projects will in the long-term contribute to the accomplishment of its mandates. At the operational level, uncertainty of funding has created threats to the integrity and credibility of UNODC programmes to deliver.

64. UNODC employs the following funding mechanisms to implement its programmes: the United Nations regular budget for its core functions; and voluntary contributions made by Member States, comprising those which are earmarked for specific projects and with specific conditions attached to them and others that are untied or general-purpose contributions. UNODC also encourages assisted countries to make contributions in kind or cash.

65. These mechanisms vary in their purposes, relative volume, degree of flexibility and predictability. The regular budget is meant to finance core functions of UNODC mandate. The amount from the regular budget is not keeping pace with the ever-increasing mandates, so there is a mismatch between what is expected of UNODC and what it can actually deliver. For example, for the Global Programme against Money-Laundering, one of UNODC's supposed core functions, the core budget is very limited, supporting only one official at headquarters. The rest of the staff of the Anti-Money-Laundering Unit and its activities are financed from earmarked voluntary contributions on a short-term basis. Consequently, this Programme is activity-oriented and its plans are developed on a yearly basis, dependent on donors' contributions. Insufficient resources do not allow for long-term planning or to develop an effective global programme to implement its mandates.

66. The regular budget currently finances close to 100 per cent of normative activities, but only 26 per cent of core activities. It is encouraging to know that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs as well as Secretary General's report entitled "In Larger Freedom" (2005) recognizes that the regular budget resources are insufficient for the mandates of UNODC and supports the Office's efforts to raise its resources to a level commensurate with the relevant requirements of its programme. Member States need to make a decision on the level of regular budget compatible with UNODC mandates.

67. Of the 2004-2005 programme budget (base scenario), 14 per cent (\$25.2 million) will be funded from the regular budget, while 86 per cent (\$155.2 million) will come from voluntary contributions. Given the apparent significance of voluntary contributions in the UNODC funding structure, its level of delivery seems to depend to a great extent on donors' ability to honour their commitments. General-purpose funds are untied voluntary contributions required to fund the support budget, and some core activities, to provide programme flexibility by financing those priority areas not attracting special-purpose (earmarked) contributions. The volume of the fund, however, is only a very small fraction of the total voluntary contributions. The gap in volume between special-purpose and general-purpose funds has been widening in favour of the former between 2002 and 2003. UNODC has been concerned about that situation.

68. The earmarked (special-purpose) funds, the large part of voluntary contributions, which currently finance most of the field-based projects, are very rigid. Therefore, the fact that over 80 per cent of UNODC activities are financed by such earmarked contributions and that UNODC has only marginal influence over their allocation, should warrant a thorough re-examination of current practice. UNODC should undertake a study in order to improve donor contribution towards the general-purpose fund so that UNODC could better plan and implement longer-term activities compatible with its mandate and consistent with the nature of its core functions.

69. UNODC also raises funds for its projects through cost-sharing with assisted countries and fund-raising for jointly developed, implemented or managed projects. The volume of such contributions is encouraging. Assisted countries, for example, accounted for 26 per cent of total estimated expenditure in 2002-2003. In its efforts to broaden its donor base, UNODC should develop an appropriate strategy by identifying innovative arrangements whereby assisted countries could be encouraged to make counterpart contributions - provision of office facilities and cash contributions, for example.

70. There is a lack of a coordinated approach to fund mobilization in UNODC. In practice, fund mobilization is the responsibility of project managers. The degree of success usually depends on the experience, drive and initiative of the individuals concerned. Mobilization efforts may or may not be communicated to the Partnership in Development Branch and the Co-financing Section at headquarters. There are no standard organizational procedures as to who should approach which donor(s) and at which stage of the project life cycle.

71. In most cases, solicitation of funds proceeds before senior management approves the development of project documents. That system clearly does not allow for an effective allocation of funds to projects according to UNODC mandate and priorities. It is not uncommon for donors to be approached simultaneously by several units with competing priorities for scarce funds. It is, therefore, clear that current UNODC fund-raising cannot project clarity of priorities for action to its donors. This could, in turn, explain the obvious reluctance of donors to commit much less to the general-purpose funds than they do to earmarked contributions.

72. In the present weak funding structure, when over 75 per cent of activities are financed by the voluntary contribution of donors, it is clear that the Office risks losing control over the direction of its programmes.

73. Notwithstanding the various reasons (including donors' interests and threat perceptions) for the continuing budgetary imbalance in favour of drug programmes, institutionalization of a clear funds allocation procedure would help to begin to achieve the UNODC priority of keeping a balance and integrating its various mandates (activities) at the planning, development and implementation stages. Regional imbalances in the progress of meeting international obligations emanating from relevant conventions and protocols could also be mitigated through such a mechanism. The review to be conducted by the project cycle management exercise should identify the appropriate body that is to allocate funds among programmes and projects.

74. The other challenge should be to develop a strategy on how to increase the current level of general-purpose contributions. As projects financed by earmarked donations are largely donor-driven, although they support actions within UNODC mandates, those activities may not necessarily fall within the UNODC priorities. IEU contends that, while it is clear that earmarked contributions are making a contribution to the accomplishment of UNODC mandates, their impact would be enhanced even more if their utilization were to be aligned with a UNODC strategy. Further, while evaluations of global programmes conclude that such activities are successful, it is surprising that the majority of those global programmes still do not attract sufficient funding from donors.

75. In the light of the above findings, the UNODC funding mechanism is one of the constraining factors as regards scope, effectiveness and impact of its programmes. The findings point to obvious causes, including the following: (a) limited regular budget; (b) donors' appropriate voluntary earmarked contributions outweighing general-purpose contributions; (c) lack of strategic plans in the development and implementation of its programmes that would help in the effective utilization of available funds in the implementation of its mandates; (d) inadequate governance mechanisms, such as independent evaluation of programmes and projects that would enhance UNODC's substantive compliance and credibility; and (e) lack of a coherent resource mobilization strategy and associated guidelines.

76. UNODC should, therefore, address those interrelated issues in order to enhance its capacity to implement its mandate, essentially working with traditional donors and assisted Member States towards more stable, adequate and predictable funding. Moreover, UNODC should attempt to broaden its donor base by taking measures such as further drawing on good practices and innovations pioneered by initiatives of the Global Compact.

3. Project design

77. IEU contends that there is a lack of a functioning, comprehensive and formal UNODC project design and formulation guideline that informs project formulation with sound conceptual and practical principles that enable projects to deliver effectively. Project design guidelines would complement the benefits that UNODC would accrue from the institutionalization of strategic plans and a project cycle management system.

78. Due to the lack of project design guidelines, UNODC projects currently suffer from a series of design weaknesses. Major design gaps identified included failure to undertake comprehensive needs assessment exercises and baseline data collection in the development of projects; vague project objectives and outputs and associated performance indicators; imprecise financial and time frame assessments for the completion of project; inadequate participation of and consultation with project partners and stakeholders in the development and preparation of project implementation; failure to stipulate appropriate milestones in order to allow review while project is in progress; and failure to appreciate the complexity of projects, in particular in regional projects.

79. The design weaknesses observed have caused delays in the commencement of project activities, lower than expected quality of outputs, delays in the project completion, postponement and/or abandonment of certain components of some projects. Further it has resulted in delays in the extension of project duration, inconsistency in the rigour and format of project documents and difficulty in the objective evaluation and assessment of project performance and impact.

80. IEU has observed the foregoing design weaknesses and their constraining impact on project effectiveness and efficiency, to varying degrees, in the following projects: project AD/RAS/97/C74, "Strengthening of judicial and prosecutorial drug control capacity in East Asia"; terminal evaluation for projects AD/IRA99/E51, "Combined united interdiction strategy for the Islamic Republic of Iran (CIRUS)", AD/RER/02/C38, "Strengthening the Drug Control Coordination Unit (DCCU) at the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) secretariat"; and evaluation for the demand reduction projects, including project AD/IRA/99/E52, "Drug abuse research and intervention unified strategy for the Islamic Republic of Iran (DARIUS)", AB/GL/96/C09, "National drug control system (NDS Ver 5.1)", AD/IRA/99/E54, "Participatory experiences empowering local initiatives (PERSEPOLIS)", AD/MOZ/97/C47, "Capacity-building in drug control for the Government of Mozambique", AD/EGY/01/F53 and AD/JOR/01/F49, "Strengthening the treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abusers in Egypt and Jordan", and RAFC86, "Self-evaluation, rapid assessment of the drug abuse situation for the West African sub region".

81. The Unit has determined that failure of programmes and projects to undertake comprehensive needs assessment exercises and collection of baseline data, as one of the first steps in programme and project formulation, lead to weak project design and project implementation. Baseline data should be available to be used as a benchmark against which results and the impact of project processes and outputs can be measured.

82. Fundamentally, this failure denied those programmes and projects the critical building blocks necessary to establish the necessary hierarchical link between needs (long-term objectives), results, outputs and activities on the one hand, and the horizontal link between the foregoing elements and measurable indicators, and risks and assumptions on the other. Evaluations have revealed that the combination of those failures have, to a certain degree, resulted, in some project objectives and

achievement indicators, being too broad or vague. In some cases, prescribed activities do not contribute to results as expected. For example, although there are some data on seizures and arrests, it has been difficult for the evaluations to establish a clear causal link between drug seizures and the outputs and impact, in the case of the project entitled “Capacity-building in drug control for the Government of Mozambique”. In some cases, the absence of logical consistency in project formulation has resulted in unstructured and scattered activities, leading to projects that lack clear strategy and direction (e.g. the DARIUS and PERSEPOLIS projects, to some degree) and affecting the quality of some of their outputs and results.

83. Providing for distinct milestones and appropriate review mechanisms in the project document would allow the project to benefit from timely revision and for project managers not to be forced to organize one in a rush late in the planned life of the project. In the absence of such a mechanism, in the case of the project “Strengthening of judicial and prosecutorial drug control capacity in East Asia”, for example, a project revision was filed only five months before the planned termination of the project when the following decisions were taken: to extend the project by three months to allow completion of activities; to drop an important component of project output (judicial and prosecutorial training system). This undermined the enduring usefulness of some activities carried out during the extended period as they could not be followed up. Those measures clearly affected the overall result of project activities and outputs.

84. IEU has also discerned that failure of some projects to allow reasonable time for the participation and consultation with beneficiaries and partners before project implementation, and the use of imprecise assessment tools have resulted in incorrect estimates of the time frame for project/output completion, insufficient provision of resources required to carry out activities to produce a specified output; and not fully considering the policy environment (relevant to project implementation) of beneficiaries and partners in formulating the project implementation plan. Project CIRUS, for instance, encountered a shortfall of \$1.6 million, which resulted in the abandoning of the acquisition of technical equipment anticipated in the project document. In the case of the project “Strengthening of judicial and prosecutorial drug control capacity in East Asia”, for example, substantive activities only started in the fourth quarter of the second year. The national counterparts of the participating six countries also pointed out that the absence of concrete, practical training programmes utilizing case studies was one of the main shortfalls of the project. This happened because the regional project failed to consider the varying realities of policy environments and needs of respective participating countries. In addition, UNODC’s then limited capacity to coordinate the project were not properly assessed.

85. The complexity of regional programmes and projects need to be properly appreciated and dealt with at the design, formulation and implementation stages to enhance quality of delivery. Regional programmes and projects should recognize that participating countries are not uniform, including in the nature of their policy environment with respect to subject issues, priorities, capacity and specific needs, cultural differences in attitudes towards the issues involved, including language. It has been established that a number of such UNODC projects (for example, project AD/RER/02/C38, “Strengthening the Drug Control Coordination Unit (DCCU) at the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) secretariat”, and project AD/RAS/97/C74, “Strengthening of judicial and prosecutorial drug control capacity in East Asia”) have encountered difficulties in implementation because they underestimated the effects of those peculiarities in their respective designs.

86. In the light of the experience described, the starting point for formulating regional projects, therefore, ought to be the development of Regional Strategic Frameworks that deal with the subject matter. The next step would be to determine how to implement the national strategies within a coordinated regional cooperative environment through an agreed regional strategy. Such a design approach would allow for the following: (a) specific national needs to be at the centre of regional programmes; (b) the identification of particular capacity of participating countries that can be utilized in the implementation of the regional strategy; and (c) the determination and synchronization of parallel/sequential, joint/independent, national and regional activities within a regional cooperative

framework. Such considerations in the design would ensure the effective utilization of technical assistance. Institutionalizing that approach by means of the proposed comprehensive guidelines on project design would enhance effectiveness and sustainability of regional programme and project results.

87. IEU recommends that UNODC institutionalize comprehensive project design guidelines to give guidance to project development, so that it becomes an effective means of delivery of UNODC mandates.

D. Delivery mechanisms

88. Delivery mechanisms guide actions that translate organizational vision, mission, mandates, priorities, strategies and policies into reality by organizing and transferring relevant information and knowledge in appropriate ways. Delivery mechanisms include methods and methodologies, approaches, tools and toolkits, organizational structures and programme/project implementation arrangements employed by organizations to accomplish their missions. A delivery mechanism helps bring about change, in a particular socio-economic situation, from a current state to another desirable one in the future. Reducing the prevalence of money-laundering, incidence of corruption, international terrorism and the level of production and abuse of illicit drugs are examples of some of the desired changes UNODC aims to contribute to the global level.

89. UNODC uses a combination of various delivery mechanisms to achieve its desired changes. This section presents an analysis of evaluation findings of tools and toolkits, mentoring, partnerships, field offices (as decentralized delivery modalities), which, in combination with other factors, significantly determine the quality and sustainability of UNODC programme and project processes and results.

1. Tools and toolkits

90. In UNODC, “tools” are defined as “printed or electronic instruments for the transfer of knowledge and experience on a given topic or issue, organized in a systematic manner and developed by experts in the subject area, by means of which the target audience acquires know-how and the ability to apply it”. A “toolkit” is a “compilation of tools that brings together practical information for accomplishing a goal or beginning a project”. UNODC has produced a range of functioning tools in areas of its mandate.

91. IEU has established that tools and toolkits are an appropriate, effective and efficient mechanism for delivering technical cooperation. Overall, tools sampled for evaluation have been found to be of high-quality. UNODC has not, however, taken full advantage of that mechanism owing to some constraints relating to production, dissemination and review processes. It is estimated that the number of tools and toolkits produced and used at both headquarters and field offices runs into several hundreds. It is, therefore, apparent that tools and toolkits contribute significantly to the implementation of UNODC mandates.

92. The Unit found that tools and toolkits made a critical contribution to UNODC programme delivery because they were a cost-effective delivery mechanism for UNODC programmes. Given their potential, however, UNODC has not taken full advantage of the mechanism yet. Some gaps have been identified in the process of developing, disseminating and using tools and toolkits that need improvement in order for them to be fully utilized, including the following:

(a) There is no formal mechanism that allows consultation and the sharing of information on tools production, dissemination or assessment among and between producers (field offices and headquarters) and users. As a result, there is little communication between headquarters and the field offices or among field offices in the development and dissemination of tools;

(b) IEU has observed that there is a lack of consistency in the quality of tools. There is no formal guideline on design principles to which production of UNODC tools and toolkits should adhere in order for tools to be user-friendly, adaptable, relevant and complete;

(c) There is a lack of central institutional memory (a library or central website) within the Office to make possible the collection and clearance of information on tools. Consequently, those interested in developing or using tools (within or outside UNODC) are not benefiting from those already produced;

(d) The evaluation revealed that tools mainly developed at headquarters for use in developing countries are based on the experience of developed countries. That undermines the relevance of the tools to the problems of developing countries. Tools should be developed in full consideration of the capacities and constraints of fragile, capacity-weak and resource-poor countries if tools and toolkits are to effectively tackle their real problems;

(e) IEU has established that tools are not vigorously and systematically promoted for wider dissemination and use. That responsibility is usually left to field offices and projects and other interested organizations to find, retrieve and make use of them and

(f) Tools are not adequately followed through in order to gauge their effectiveness and impact, the main reason being that when projects are evaluated, the tools or toolkits employed do not feature as they should. Instead, they are largely subsumed in the project evaluation.

93. In the light of the above findings, in order for UNODC to maximize benefits from the use of its tools and toolkits in the implementation of its mandates, UNODC should primarily launch into the preparation of comprehensive guidelines addressing the design, dissemination, evaluation and refinement of tools and toolkits.

2. Mentoring

94. IEU has established that the feedback about mentoring, used mainly at present by the Global Programme against Money-Laundering, has been positive. Evaluation findings confirm that mentoring produces efficient and sustainable results for the Global Programme and is considered by donors to be the best method of offering countries or regions with personal, long-term and sustainable high-quality support.

95. In the UNODC context, the term “mentor” refers to an expert under a contract to provide technical cooperation expert advice to a State or group of States on a long-term basis (normally 12 months or more). The expert is resident in the beneficiary country or region, offering hands-on advice and direct transfer of skills in the implementation of a project.

96. One of the strengths of mentoring is its ability to customize the design and delivery of the technical assistance and training, as it progresses, to meet the specific needs of concerned national entities. Mentors also provide a more culturally welcome learning style for many assisted countries rather than the traditional, short-term training approaches such as workshops usually favoured by donors.

97. Specific experience of the Global Programme against Money-Laundering reveals that issues relating to the recruitment process and the range and quality of support required by mentors, by both host countries and executing agencies, could influence the effectiveness of mentoring.

98. The Global Programme against Money-Laundering should continue to fully and systematically document its experience in mentoring so that the appropriateness, cost-effectiveness and sustainability of results achieved through mentoring can be assessed in the future.

3. Partnerships

99. UNODC forges beneficial linkages and partnerships with United Nations bodies, regional and sub-regional organizations, regional and international financial and development agencies and non-governmental organizations active in the Office's mandated fields of illicit drug and international crime control. This has contributed to UNODC delivering on its mandates by cooperating at various levels, including cooperation in joint research initiatives, development and design of tools, joint funding of programmes and projects and dissemination of UNODC delivery mechanisms and knowledge products. Partnerships enable UNODC to pool both internal and external expertise and resources to accomplish its mandates.

100. Forging strategic partnerships with a range of organizations allows UNODC strategies and programmes to integrate with other initiatives and enhance UNODC contribution to sustainable development. IEU has come across some valuable partnerships, which will be cited as examples.

101. The UNODC Anti-Money-Laundering Unit has developed, in co-operation with a range of partners, a highly successful computer-based training tool to combat money-laundering. The success of the project is demonstrated by the fact that 120 key stakeholders contributed to the product and donors are willing to fund its enhancement and production in additional languages. The Asian member countries of the Asia-Europe Meeting have also endorsed provision of a computer-based training package to China, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam. The package will be translated into the languages of the foregoing countries.

102. Forging a functioning alliance with the Asia-Pacific Group has been strategic. Partnership with Asia-Pacific Group will provide UNODC with the opportunity to create synergy at the policy and strategy level as well as enjoy access to the experience of over 40 countries in dealing with problems of money-laundering. The Asia-Pacific Group is an important interregional grouping operating in a part of the globe that constitutes over a third of the world's population.

103. The Anti-Money-Laundering Unit puts significant emphasis on developing and maintaining strategic relationships with those international and regional organizations that are well positioned to assist it in networking and providing expertise to achieve its principal objectives. Such organizations include the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, the Council of Europe Select Committee of Experts on Anti-Money Laundering Measures 'MONEYVAL', the Commonwealth Secretariat, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, Organization of American States and the International Criminal Police (Interpol), ESAAAMLG, Group for Inter-Governmental Action against Money Laundering and the Egmont Group. Such partnerships certainly broaden the range and diversity of resources that the Anti-Money-Laundering Unit can draw on to assist member States.

104. The Global Programmes against Trafficking in Human Beings involves non-governmental organizations and international organizations in its technical cooperation projects. Those partners have already developed national and international networks, which are valuable for immediate and long-term responses to human trafficking. The Global Programme also maintains relationships with such regional entities as the Economic Community of West African States and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Global Programme also organizes conferences with relevant international organizations to familiarize them with the content and use of the legislative guides and to discuss best practice.

105. As demonstrated in the preceding discussions, forging external links and strategic alliance has been clearly beneficial in the UNODC experience. That should, therefore, continue and expand. Moreover, UNODC should continue to systematically develop and compile good practices relating to

effective partnerships in particular, but also should document constraints in general. The strategic nature and value of UNODC partnerships may be a subject of evaluation in the future.

106. For UNODC, doubling its efforts in forging strategic partnerships to strengthen existing and establishing new centres of excellence in developing countries would be one of the most sustainable contributions it could make in the capacity-building to implement its mandates at the national and regional levels.

4. Field offices

107. Currently UNODC has 21 field offices, eight country and 13 regional and sub-regional offices. Field offices develop and implement projects, manage the evaluation of projects, produce tools and other delivery mechanisms and also raise funds.

108. IEU has observed a lack of common understanding between headquarters and the field offices in their respective functions in the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects. Most UNODC global programmes were developed and coordinated by the substantive units at headquarters, often without sufficient input from the Field Offices. On the other hand, the regional and country offices have carried out more or less their own donor-led projects without systematic interaction on policy and programmatic issues with the pertinent substantive units at headquarters. IEU contends that the fundamental issue here is the lack of formalized project life cycle and associated appraisal, approval, implementation and evaluation mechanisms and clarity on the respective roles and responsibilities of the head office and the field offices.

109. Regional and field offices lack adequate levels of professional staffing with the expertise required to develop or implement, support and follow-up projects in the majority of UNODC mandates. They have to rely on backstopping from the over-stretched headquarters staff, which often results in delayed outputs. Therefore, there has been a mismatch between expectations of the Member States for assistance and the capacity of regional and field offices to deliver. This highlights a critical issue: the lack of a coherent organizational strategic plan with an enabling implementation strategy, including clarity on the UNODC rationale of decentralization as an effective delivery mechanism.

110. Evaluation findings of sub-regional project AD/RAS/97/C74, “Strengthening of judicial and prosecutorial drug control capacity in East Asia”, which covered six countries (Cambodia, China, Laos People’s Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam) revealed the following important issues noted in the preceding paragraphs:

(a) Project management was not sufficiently localized and implementation and backstopping, carried out from Bangkok and Vienna, were too remote and far from adequate. The project coordinator could not effectively manage the project by travelling to the six countries from the Bangkok office, resulting in delayed delivery of outputs;

(b) Chronic under-funding of the project resulted in the need to cancel some project activities and restructure project objectives and goals at a very late date;

(c) Inadequate levels of project staffing and the lack of a permanent contact person in the early stages of the project in each country made it difficult for beneficiaries and stakeholders to arrange and participate in project activities;

(d) Differing levels of capacity in the six countries were found to be more problematic than anticipated in the original project document. In some cases, it was difficult to plan activities and programmes that were appropriate for every participating country.

111. The points mentioned are typical constraints faced in the implementation of global programmes and regional and national projects that UNODC supports.

112. UNODC senior management has indicated that, within the context of its reform process, placing more staff with appropriate expertise in the field, and closer to the countries being supported would enhance co-ordination with countries directly and would also improve coordination with field offices of other United Nations programmes that have a significant role in regional or country development programmes. While that idea is welcome, it is not clear on what basis and how field offices will be restructured in the future.

113. In-depth evaluations have, however, led to some observations on the current transitional phase. There is some resistance to the restructuring process but it is hoped that the training component of the “Project Cycle Management: Skills Development Programme” will allay fears and concerns of regional desks and field offices. Currently, there is a perception that there is a lack of clarity on the demarcation between which elements are to be retained by the headquarter units alone, which elements are to be assumed by the desks and field offices alone and which elements are to be shared.

114. Concern has been expressed over the possible effect of restructuring on UNODC programme orientation. It is feared that restructuring might lead to, as noted in the evaluation of the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings, a regionalization of the global programmes, resulting in a distributed focus, rather than a consistent global approach, with the loss of a global perspective and access to global expertise.

115. In the light of the evaluations findings discussed above, a priority task is to clarify the field offices’ mission and provide them with a sharper organizational framework and terms of reference and resources. That will facilitate delivering decentralized, cost-effective technical support services to projects and programmes.

116. The important added values of decentralization include a positive contribution to the relevance of strategic plans; effective performance of programmes and projects by enabling decisions and actions taken in a more timely manner as a result of field presence. Such benefits can only be realized, however, if the decentralization strategy is grounded, and an appropriate structure laid, on the basis of wider principles and rationale anchored in UNODC’s strategic catalytic role of knowledge creation, acquisition, sharing and dissemination in all the areas of its mandate.

117. In the meantime, the performance of thematic and functional areas of activities has to be continuously monitored and reviewed in order to ensure synergy throughout the design, implementation and evaluation process of regional and sub-regional programmes and national strategies and projects.

E. Knowledge management: a cross-cutting enabling theme

118. IEU is raising the issue of knowledge management to underline the strategic importance of a functioning system that enhances the sustainability of UNODC activities and impact by continuously advancing knowledge on substantive, policy and programmatic issues of UNODC mandates. IEU, therefore, contends that there is a need for UNODC to develop a cross-cutting knowledge management strategy to complement the overarching UNODC strategy and programme strategies proposed by the present Annual Evaluation Report.

119. The ultimate aim of UNODC should be to enable Member States to deal with their relevant problems, individually and cooperatively, consistent with the international policy consensus and unassisted by UNODC. That is, however, only possible to the extent that the Office succeeds in gearing itself to be a “learning organization” that continuously catalyses, advances and shares relevant knowledge effectively.

120. Similarly, a continuing challenge for UNODC will be strengthening the institutionalization of a knowledge management system in all the areas of its mandate in order to consolidate its intellectual leadership in the collection, organization, analysis and sharing of pertinent information, knowledge and expertise with partners and beneficiaries at the global, regional and national levels. Maintaining such a position will be one of the strategic prerequisites for UNODC to enhance its catalytic role in the prevention and control of drug problems and reduce international crimes.

121. Steadily improving UNODC's role as the leading actor in the creation and dissemination of knowledge will include gathering information on current and future trends of use and abuse of illicit drugs, the prevalence of crime, their respective causes and mitigation measures for controlling and reducing its effects. Management of such knowledge would continue to further enhance UNODC credibility among its partners, beneficiaries and donors. The improved credibility of UNODC will in turn mean wider use of its knowledge products (information, assessments and research results), advisory services and delivery mechanisms, as well as help expand partnership initiatives, which would all contribute to better implementation of UNODC mandates.

122. Some indicative observations that IEU made in relation to information, databases and dissemination will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

123. The Anti-Money-Laundering Information Database (AMLID) provides authorized users' analyses of laws and regulations to combat money-laundering, including two general classes of money-laundering control measures, as well as information about national contacts and authorities. Those systems, supported by many other international organizations, and operated by the Global Programme against Money-Laundering has the credibility and non-political standing required to entice the sharing and input of critical information from various sources. The continued operation of those databases assists in combating money-laundering and the financing of terrorism.

124. The Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering Secretariat, whose members find the databases useful, observe that UNODC is not doing enough to promote the International Money-Laundering Information Network (IMoLIN) and AMLID computer-based programmes for wider use by practitioners working to combat money-laundering, especially now that both databases have recently been extensively upgraded. UNODC needs to undertake a user feedback survey to determine the extent of usage and users' views on the efficacy of the databases and their impact in combating money laundering.

125. IEU has discerned some concerns over the existing practice of developing and maintaining databases and disseminating knowledge products internally and externally for wider use. The quality of the databases currently in operation, in relating to those covered by evaluations, vary in the scope of their content vis-à-vis their intended purpose, in the degree of accuracy of their contents and in the regularity of updating of the information they contain. The Unit was unable to obtain evidence of the extent of their usage or systematic feedback from users of some of the existing websites and databases. The lack of a centralized website for tools and toolkits was, however, observed.

126. IEU has also observed the lack of a data validation and updating system, which assigns responsibility and develops a procedure for the verification of data and other information to ensure the accuracy of posted or published information and, hence, protect the credibility of UNODC and the hosting programmes.

127. The database on human trafficking flows offers both global and country-specific scope and coverage. At present, however, the database lacks the confidence of its users, owing primarily to the inclusion of information from the popular media, as well as cases in published reports, regardless of their reliability.

128. The evaluation of the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings lays out several criteria by which the quality of a programme database can be evaluated. They include purpose or rationale, structure, capacity, source, inclusion or exclusion rules, reliability index, scalability, future applications and location in UNODC or another entity.

129. One of the objectives for developing the National Drug Strategy Network (NDS) was to facilitate timely reporting and communication between Member States and the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) to meet convention obligations. Notwithstanding its accomplishments in helping Member States track and record information, the NDS is incompatible with the system used by the INCB at present.

130. The findings raised in the NDS evaluation suggest that UNODC, therefore, needs to strengthen its mechanism of integrating varying information requirements in order to establish an integrated information system that can benefit the Office as a whole. Best practises in house can serve as a model.

131. A steering committee should be set up to review outputs and results at predetermined stages in the project cycle or plan of work as well as to evaluate a particular system's performance within the UNODC proposed strategic plan. In the case of complex international projects, it should be possible for the steering committee to organize workshops, for example, to allow the participation of users and other stakeholders at the regional and national levels.

132. At the organizational level, the above discussions suggest that UNODC needs to develop a unified strategy for the strengthening of its knowledge management system, as a cross-cutting enabling theme that beneficial and crucial in the effective implementation of its mandates and programmes.

133. The knowledge management strategy to be incorporated into global, regional and national strategies should be developed on the basis of an outcome of a comprehensive review of the current knowledge management practices. The review should consider, *inter alia*:

(a) Examining the primary knowledge generation activities (research) and the flagship publications and general publications on drugs and crime trends (although they have not yet been evaluated);

(b) Drawing upon the existing UNODC knowledge products (databases, websites, networks and good practices) with the objective of ensuring their effectiveness and relevance in the implementation of UNODC strategy and

(c) Reviewing the collection, use and dissemination of good practices and evaluating findings, recommendations and results of research to ensure that experience gained from the implementation of activities, the major source of knowledge is used in the refining of tools and other delivery mechanisms that help to develop effective and relevant policies and actions. IEU is in the process of introducing feedback mechanisms for the implementation of evaluation recommendations whose benefit it will be possible to assess in the succeeding years to come.

134. It is a positive sign that UNODC has identified an improving knowledge base and analytical work as priorities for the medium term. Those priorities will have to be reflected in the proposed strategic plan. Further, UNODC will need to define what and how it intends to achieve those research objectives in accordance with and in support of its strategic plan.

135. IEU recommends that UNODC strengthen its knowledge management system on the basis of a comprehensive review carried out as discussed above. The system to be designed must complement UNODC's strategic plan by improving the quality of knowledge products and their dissemination across UNODC mandates and programmes.

III. Best Practices

136. IEU has identified a number of best practices that have been adopted or developed by global programmes and projects. Those best practices are described below. It is recommended that UNODC programmes and partners take stock of those best practices and consider adapting them to their specific needs in the future, when and if possible.

137. The following features, derived from the evaluation of the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings, are conducive to successful project implementation and can lead to best practices:

(a) A well-targeted project design conceptualized at the local level and collaboratively developed with the beneficiary country or region (with guidance from headquarters);

(b) A comfortable time frame within which to implement the project;

(c) Apart from administrative and preliminary activities, timing of elements that are independent of each other, eliminating a purely sequential process where succeeding elements are dependent on preceding elements being completed;

(d) Selection of the right partner agency (Ministry, Department, etc.) within the host Government;

(e) Identification and selection of the right national coordinator;

(f) The presence of an appropriately skilled field office programme manager (through qualifications/experience/training) for local supervision of the project and providing advice to the national coordinator;

(g) Ongoing monitoring and evaluation and

(h) Appropriate backstopping for the field office by the regional desk, and appropriate backstopping for both by the substantive office.

A. Capacity-building

138. The mentor initiative of the Global Programme against Money-Laundering has met with success in the provision of suitable experts to provide specific technical expertise, training and support to allow Member States to become active players in the international fight against money-laundering. The feedback is that both donors and beneficiaries find the system effective. Other UNODC programmes may wish to explore how to replicate that successful delivery mechanism by taking their specific conditions into account.

139. China has set a good example in requiring that individuals who participate in project-organized regional workshops and international study tours (in this case, a regional project entitled “Strengthening of judicial and prosecutorial drug control capacity in East Asia”) share the experience and knowledge they have acquired by carrying out training programmes for their colleagues when they return home. That practice will contribute to the sustainability of capacity-building activities by extending the transfer of knowledge acquired by one person to his or her compatriots, as with the results achieved through the principle of training the trainers.

B. Provision of information for policy development and action

140. The Global Programme against Money-Laundering has developed the unique AMLID database, comprising a collection of analyses of national laws and regulations to fight money-laundering and information on procedures for international co-operation. The database is managed by UNODC as part of an extensive system of international cooperation involving Governments, international and regional organizations, and international security organizations. It is clear that UNODC has found its niche in the system through that database, which is highly regarded by its partners. This has happened because: (a) there is no other organization that provides that service; and (b) UNODC enjoys the trust and credibility to create, operate and maintain a database dealing with internationally important and sensitive information. Such a position, therefore, enhances UNODC capacity to influence global policy consensus and action against money-laundering, but also entails significant responsibility to continually update the database and to improve its relevance.

C. Enhancing tools and toolkits

141. The latest version of the UNODC Anti-Corruption Toolkit has incorporated a new standardized approach to institutionalize transparency in public procurement. The methodology was developed through action-learning undertaken by a working group during the “National Integrity for Cleaner Public Life” Conference organized as part of project FS/HUN/00/R12, “Assessment of corruption in Hungary”.

D. Outreach and awareness

142. As part of technical cooperation under Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings, public service announcement and video have been produced and arrangements for their broadcast have been entered into with 45 countries. The videos can be downloaded and viewed free of charge for educational purposes. Thai Airlines, the Vienna underground Info screen and Irish Sea Ferry Operators are some of the partners who have so far agreed to show the videos in their facilities.

IV. Recommendations

143. Based on the findings derived from the four thematic and 10 project evaluations conducted in 2004, the following recommendations are made:

A. Strategic plan

Findings and recommendations

144. Evaluations carried out in 2004 show clearly that the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) needs to articulate a strategy that translates its priorities into programmes and projects in an integrated manner. While strategic frameworks have been developed at various levels of the organization, they are not guided by a unified strategy. While UNODC's mandate is provided for by instruments of international law (i.e. Conventions), and guided by resolutions of governing bodies, the former are for Member States to implement and the latter usually only provide generic guidance.

Recommendation 1

There is a need for UNODC to develop an overarching strategy (*a plan designed to achieve a long-term aim/goal*) as an instrument that operationalizes conventions, unifies strategic objectives, strategic frameworks and global programmes in line with resource availability. The strategy will provide the necessary links between operational priorities, the 2006–2007 strategic framework on the one hand, and results-based management and project cycle management on the other. This recommendation recognizes that UNODC now has a Strategic Planning Unit dedicated to the pursuit of an organizational strategy.

145. The 2004 evaluations established that UNODC global programmes were neither truly global nor programmes. Those activities carried out by the “global programmes” evaluated, are generally donor-driven, have grown over the years and have a presence in various parts of the globe, but have never been planned as programmes despite their global influence.

Recommendation 2

Global Programmes must be a part of the yet to be developed UNODC strategy. In turn, global programmes should develop their own strategic plans that articulate key result areas. This recommendation recognizes that UNODC management has already taken a decision and instructed all global programmes to develop “strategic frameworks” following recommendations made by evaluations.

B. Funding mechanism

Findings and recommendations

146. The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) has established that UNODC does not have an adequate, stable and predictable funding mechanism. Voluntary contributions, especially those that are earmarked, represent over 75 per cent of UNODC funding. This has led to the prevailing inadequate staffing of required experts both at the Vienna headquarters and the field offices. This is hampering the effective implementation of programmes and projects, and has caused disruption and suspension of activities and/or projects while in progress, thereby limiting the impact and sustainability of UNODC programmes. Many projects are launched without the prospect of adequate funding.

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that the Commissions and the Funding Partners examine and increase allocations and contributions to the general-purpose fund, as well as commit to providing stable funding for UNODC. Increasing significantly the general-purpose fund and providing stable funding will enable UNODC to plan in a manner that is more long-term and strategic. Further, it would enable UNODC to implement its mandate and priorities in a strategic manner and reduce the suspension and abandonment of projects. This recommendation recognizes that the “voluntary nature” of UNODC funding may never change, however, the IEU contends that measures can still be taken that can improve the adequacy as well as increase the predictability and stability of funding.

147. There is a “chicken and egg” debate about the reasons why funding for UNODC is inadequate, unstable and unpredictable. One view is that lack of a strategy and a clearly articulated programme of work leads to donor-driven short-term activities and, hence inadequate and unpredictable funding. The other view is that, by their nature, voluntary earmarked contributions do not create an enabling environment for strategic and long-term planning. The evaluations established that the regular budget, while stable and predictable, was inadequate for the mandated core activities of UNODC. Voluntary contributions are inadequate, unpredictable and unstable. The earmarking of most of the voluntary contributions significantly decreases the flexibility that would allow for long-term strategic planning and management.

Recommendation 4

It is suggested that a formalised bi-annual or annual programming dialogue between the donors and UNODC be instituted in order to increase funding stability and reduce rigidity on earmarked funds. Donors and UNODC through this dialogue process should strive to agree on “medium term strategic plan” and a fully funded biennial programme. It is recommended that UNODC’s yet to be developed strategy derive from this dialogue and reflect realistically what can be accomplished given the funding constraints.

148. As alluded to earlier, the Global Programmes lack of a programme approach is demonstrated by the fact that their activities are planned and funded on a yearly basis and do not contribute to a clearly defined strategy or goal. Such yearly plans and short-term funding arrangements make strategic and long-term planning impossible. Hence, while the activities are successful, the evaluations could not establish the full extent of their impact in relation to the global problems they are designed to address.

Recommendation 5

It is recommended that a complete review of all existing global programmes be done in order to identify means to attract substantial and long-term funding. This review should derive from the “dialogue” referred to in recommendation 4 above. The Executive Director may wish to assign a committee composed of relevant senior managers and competent technical officials to oversee the exercise.

C. Project design

Findings and recommendations

149. Based on the findings of evaluations conducted in 2004, IEU concludes that UNODC lacks a coherent and comprehensive project cycle mechanism that would guide the development, approval,

implementation and monitoring of projects. Project design tends to be weak and as a result has led to project documents not being standardized. This increases the likelihood of project documents being of poor quality, characterized by vague objectives, outputs and associated performance indicators. Further, project rationale often lacks rigour to operationalize effective strategies and solutions to deal with the presumed problem.

Recommendation 6

UNODC has already commenced the development and implementation of a new project cycle management system to streamline and strengthen all the issues related to project development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Training of all those who need to use the PCM will be the most critical element of this development. It is recommended that UNODC continue with this effort and institutionalise project design guidelines and use the logical framework as a tool for project design. Further the guidelines should among others include requirements for needs assessment, baseline data and ensure stakeholder participation at all stages of the project design and development. Management should ensure compliance with all guidelines.

150. IEU has observed that it is common during the implementation of projects for delays to occur in the start of activities and the completion of outputs. This often results in the extension of project duration to allow completion of outputs and postponement and/or abandonment of certain components. The causes of these were often due to the use of imprecise tools that led to inaccurate time frame assessments for the completion of outputs and projects. Further, the evaluations have established that project monitoring is weak and ineffective and that this can affect donor confidence.

Recommendation 7

The design guidelines should indicate a broad range of design tools for use in the estimation of time frames based on best practice. The guidelines should also provide a list of tools and frameworks indicating how to identify and assess risks and assumptions associated with output and project completions. Such measures would then enable the preparation of contingency plans in case key assumptions changed to affect outputs, project components or project completion as planned.

In order to increase donor confidence and commitment, promote sound financial management, and accountability, senior management should ensure that UNODC improves the project monitoring system thereby increasing transparency. The current exercise on Project Cycle Management should be used to ensure that such a system is developed and put in place.

151. Evaluation has established that there is a lack of a clear and rigorous mechanism that reviews, screens, scrutinizes, verifies and validates adherence to project design guidelines and requirements.

Recommendation 8

The new Project Cycle Management system should provide such a mechanism, whereby it would be possible for a technical team, or any other relevant body, to check the compliance of projects to design guidelines across a series of stages of project development before they are finally approved by the Programme and Project Committee.

D. Tools and toolkits

Findings and recommendations

152. IEU established that at UNODC it had been standard practice since the genesis of the Office to develop tools and toolkits as a means of programme delivery. Further, the evaluation established that tools and toolkits, as instruments of delivering technical cooperation, are appropriate and effective modalities. However, UNODC has not taken full advantage of the mechanism such that it is fully and properly utilized.

Recommendation 9

Recognizing the strategic nature of tools and toolkits to the delivery of programmes and technical cooperation, it is recommended that UNODC establish policy guidelines to inform the entire process of tool and toolkit development and dissemination. As part of sharing information and knowledge management, a central website, which registers all information on tools, must be developed at headquarters.

153. Evaluation has observed that there is a need for ensuring that projects use relevant tools and toolkits to attain their set objectives.

Recommendation 10

As part of the project approval process, a technical review team or other relevant body should be established to scrutinize whether the tools and toolkits and other delivery mechanisms through which a project intends to attain its objectives have been identified and whether, where appropriate, the latest updates and enhancements to the specified tools and toolkits have been recognized and taken into account in the project document.

E. Field offices

Findings and recommendations

154. Evaluations conducted in 2004 reveal that regional and country offices often carry out their own donor-led projects with little systematic interaction and formal communication on policy and programmatic issues with pertinent substantive units at headquarters.

Recommendation 11

The role and responsibilities of regional and country offices should be reviewed in order to mitigate the above-mentioned gaps and gear their structure and resources to implement the new UNODC priorities and impending strategic plan. In order to better utilise donor led initiatives, UNODC must strive for harmony and complementarity between donor interests and the Office's strategic plan.

155. Regional and field offices lack enough Professional staff in the expertise required to develop or implement programmes and follow up projects in the majority of UNODC subject areas.

Recommendation 12

As part of the reform and restructuring process, UNODC should review the staffing situation in regional and field offices with a view to rationalizing the deployment of staff between headquarters and field offices in line with the responsibilities and workloads at each level.

F. Knowledge management: a cross-cutting enabling theme

156. Global programmes and project evaluations are largely silent on knowledge management. IEU seeks to underline the strategic importance of a functioning knowledge management system, as a cross-cutting enabling theme, that needs further strengthening in order to enhance the sustainability of UNODC programme impacts by continuously advancing knowledge on substantive, policy and programmatic issues relating to all UNODC mandates.

157. That idea seeks to build upon what has already been achieved to complement the proposed unified UNODC Strategy. It is about giving the required impetus and reinforcing programmes with critical knowledge management capabilities in order to contribute better to the objectives of the ongoing reform process. Further, it recognizes that knowledge generation is one of UNODC strengths.

Findings and recommendations

158. The evaluations established that UNODC generates high-quality knowledge products such as guidelines, tools, toolkits, databases, evaluations and good practices and information packages. However, as identified in the tools and toolkits evaluation and elsewhere UNODC lacks a comprehensive knowledge management and dissemination strategy that would ensure wider consistent use and updating of those products in order to enhance their continued relevance and effectiveness.

Recommendations 13

It is recommended that UNODC launch a comprehensive review of its current knowledge management system in order to create the conditions for becoming a centre of excellence by consolidating its intellectual leadership in the development of a new and continued refinement of existing knowledge products through an improved and strengthened knowledge management system.

It is recommended that, on the basis of the review, UNODC develop a cross-cutting knowledge management strategy, in an integrated manner, to be embedded in all programmes, so as to strengthen their capacity in the creation, development, management and dissemination of knowledge products, consistent with the strategic objectives set out in the proposed overarching UNODC strategy and programme strategies.

G. Project evaluations

Findings and recommendations

159. As explained earlier, in 2004, 42 project evaluations were planned by programme managers, of which 20 were completed. The backlog of project evaluations is slowing down the introduction of the new evaluation management system in UNODC.

Recommendation 14

Senior management should provide the necessary support to the Division for Operations and IEU to take immediate measures to clear the backlog, including:

- (a) The Division for Operations should prepare a list of the backlog of projects awaiting evaluation or postponed from previous years in terms of (i) ongoing or completed projects; (ii) type of evaluation (mid-term and terminal); (iii) length of time overdue; (iv) current plans; and (v) availability of funding;
- (b) On the basis of the information collected, the Division for Operations, jointly with IEU, should work out a realistic plan to clear the backlog at the earliest possible time so that UNODC can reap the benefits of evaluation findings in a timely manner. Moreover, early clearance of the backlog could give way to a quicker and smoother institutionalization of the changes being introduced in the management of evaluations at UNODC;
- (c) As part of the project cycle, programme managers should institute a planning process that results in timely evaluations.

160. Many project evaluations covered in this Annual Evaluation Report lack rigour and coherence in their analysis. The gap could be attributed in part to poorly designed projects in the first place, but IEU also contends that the management of project evaluations also needs some urgent improvement.

Recommendation 15

In view of the seriousness of the problem, UNODC senior management, in consultation with the Funding Partners, should consider providing IEU with extra resources to expeditiously support programme/project managers in the management of project evaluations including, in the development of project evaluation terms of reference, reviewing draft project evaluation reports, and advice on criteria of assessing and selecting consultant evaluators. IEU should be provided with the necessary resources to offer that service by hiring an appropriate evaluation specialist to assist IEU and the Division for Operations to clear the backlog faster and at the same time ensure a better quality of evaluation.

V. Conclusion

161. The evaluations conclude that: UNODC is implementing technical assistance programmes in areas of its mandate to Member States in order to help them to actively participate in efforts to fight drug problems and international crimes, and to comply with the requirements of pertinent international conventions and protocols. UNODC is assisting Member States in building human and institutional capacities by developing and using effective tools and a range of delivery mechanisms to share knowledge and expertise. However, requests for UNODC technical assistance from Member States by far surpass resources available at its disposal to fully respond to those needs. Partners involved in UNODC technical cooperation are making significant contributions to UNODC mandates.

162. The achievements were made despite the interacting structural weaknesses of an inadequate, unstable and unpredictable funding mechanism and lack of an organizational strategic plan. IEU contends that, in order to sustain achievements gained so far, it is vital for UNODC to take steps to rectify those strategic deficiencies, especially in the face of that ever-expanding demand for its assistance and the need for maintaining and enhancing its leadership role in accordance with its mandates. The Unit recognizes that the voluntary nature of funding at UNODC is unlikely to change, but contends that this unpredictability and instability can be mitigated by taking measures as proposed in the recommendations section.

163. This evaluation report also concludes that donor confidence is critical to the issues of adequate, predictable and stable funding. To this end accountable and transparent financial management systems, a robust programme/project monitoring system and continuous dialogue with the donors is critical in ensuring donor confidence.

164. Further, the Commissions and donors need to take note and urgently address those issues identified in this report (in particular those which are beyond the powers of UNODC management), which pose a threat to UNODC's ability to deliver efficiently and effectively.

165. Finally, the report concludes that UNODC's strength lies in its ability to enhance its strategic and catalytic role as a centre of excellence in the creation, acquisition, sharing, dissemination and management of knowledge. UNODC's flagship publications and other knowledge products are valued by the international community and the Office could increase its visibility and its leadership role in this area.

Annex I.

SUMMARY MATRIX GPML

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
1. GPML lacks a global strategy and hence a coherent global programme. As a result GPML has not been able to make long-term plans and commitments. GPML is not a global programme but supports activities globally.	GPML plans are developed on a yearly basis and cover short-term activities and the funding is also only assured for short-term periods. GPML work is heavily influenced by ad hoc decisions and demands from within UNODC and its activities are determined by the availability of donor funding.	GPML must develop a strategic plan that provides guidance to the Global Programme against Money-Laundering, address the long-term global priorities, secure longer term funding as well as reduce frequency of ad hoc decisions.
2. GPML core budget is very limited and supports only one official at headquarters. The rest of the AMLU staff and activities are financed from extra budgetary resources provided by donors on a short-term basis. As a result GPML is activity oriented and its plans are developed on a yearly basis.	The three regional coordinators and the activities are funded on a yearly basis, dependent on the generosity of donors. No resources are available that allow for long-term planning or the development of a truly global programme. The security of staff and commitments at the field level are impacted by the limitations/non-availability of core funding.	UNODC should increase the GPML core funding to allow for more stable funding and longer term planning. An increase in core funding would create more security for staff, enable the GPML to plan and commit to a truly global programme.
3. All GPML staff except for the mentors are located at the headquarters in Vienna. This makes communication with the field difficult and participation of field offices sometimes impossible. GPML lacks presence at the field level and hence its activities are centralized.	A total of four professional staff is located at headquarters. This number is inadequate to cover the whole world from Vienna. The centralization of staff results in extensive travel and inadequate global coverage. Non-representation in the field leads to poor or non-participation by field offices in anti-money-laundering activities.	The structure and configuration of GPML and AMLU should be enhanced by providing core funding and hence allowing for 5 staff to be located in field offices, 10 mentors to be strategically deployed in the regions and a core staff of 5 to be located at headquarters to support regional coordinators and plan global activities.
4. The mentor initiative while small (has employed a total of 8 mentors) is recognized by donors and the recipient countries as an effective and efficient mechanism of delivering assistance through the transfer of skills, sharing of information and providing technical support to Member States.	The recipient countries in the Caribbean, East and Southern Africa and Asia and the Pacific region confirm that there has been transfer of skills as evidenced by the development of legislation, FIUs, successful investigations and confiscation of proceeds from criminal activities. Current donors want to continue to support the mentor initiative because of its success and new donors would also like to provide more funding for the initiative.	GPML should expand the mentor initiative and link this initiative to country and regional activities by developing a strategic plan and comprehensive global programmes that enable the donors to fund the whole package (mentors and activities).
5. The evaluation established that GPML current activities are having an impact. The GPML has been recognized by its current donors as a leading United Nations programme against money-laundering. The beneficiary countries also expressed satisfaction with the quality of assistance that has been provided.	GPML current activities provide support to countries on legislation development, short-term experts, long-term mentors, training the judiciary, investigators and prosecutors and policy makers. The Programme assists in the establishment of FIUs and other anti-money-laundering institutions. There is evidence from the assisted countries that investigations and successful prosecution and confiscation of assets and proceeds of crime are being achieved.	The current GPML activities need to be continued and consolidated by developing a strategic Global Programme against Money-Laundering. The GPML provides support to countries through its activities.

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
6. The UNODC within the United Nations system has the mandate to deal with anti-money-laundering issues and yet the resources allocated to it and to the GPML are limited. However the issue of anti-money-laundering and financing terrorism touches on the work of other United Nations entities that have more resources than UNODC. The GPML within the United Nations is recognized as a leader in this field and as a repository of information on anti-money-laundering.	Duplication of activities being carried out by other United Nations entities. Anti-money-laundering activities are not always coordinated within the United Nations system. Anti-money-laundering activities in UNODC are not always channelled through GPML. In general synergies are not created within the United Nations system in addressing anti-money-laundering issues.	GPML must reach out and develop or enhance joint initiatives and partnerships as well as coordinate with other United Nations entities and other international institutions involved in anti-money-laundering activities. Synergies must be built between the various United Nations entities, other international institutions and GPML in order to create greater impact.
7. The use of UNOPS contracting arrangements enable GPML to place mentors in the field in a timely manner. However, support for mentors by UNOPS once they are in the field is lacking.	Mentors have had problems with payment of salaries and other entitlements. No adequate arrangements have been made with host countries to facilitate working and living arrangements. Mentors are not clear about whom to contact when they have problems.	UNODC should evaluate the quality and cost of services being provided by UNOPS. Further, there should be an evaluation of personnel practices, timely responsiveness and quality of support of the United Nations Office at Vienna personnel function to determine why managers choose UNOPS given some of the problems experienced.
8. There is poor communication and lack of information at the field level about GPML field activities. This leads to non-participation by field offices in GPML activities. Field offices are unable to provide answers or respond to requests from countries. This leads to confusion at the field level and in the countries that are supported by GPML.	Regional offices in South Africa and East Africa were unaware of GPML activities taking place in their areas of representation. There was no field participation in GPML activities. In the Asia and the Pacific region some AML projects were started by donors and field offices without full knowledge or involvement of GPML headquarters.	Locate GPML staff in regional/field offices to ensure joint and full participation in AML activities by field offices and AMLU. Locations of GPML staff in field offices will improve communication and help with a better flow of information.

Key: AMLU = Anti-Money-Laundering Unit
FIU = Financial Intelligence Unit
GPML = Global Programme against Money-Laundering
UNODC = United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNOPS = United Nations Office for Project Services

Annex II.

SUMMARY MATRIX TOOLS AND TOOLKITS

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
1. No overall, comprehensive policy for production and dissemination of tools or their application can be observed within the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Fragmentation of tool production and dissemination activities is due primarily to the absence of overall policy guidelines..	There are no policy guidelines available in UNODC regarding tool production. Tools have been produced by each programme or project according to its own procedures.	Policy guidelines should be established to inform the entire process of development and dissemination of tools and toolkits. The preparatory process for tool and toolkits, must include the following: needs assessment, consultation procedures, target audiences, a dissemination strategy, feedback mechanisms and measures of impact. In the context of country-based projects, such information should be provided explicitly in project documents.
2. There is a critical gap between headquarters and the field in tool production (global and local). No concerted strategy to exchange information and experience between headquarters and the field is evident. No institutional mechanism exists to transfer experience from one to the other. The lack of a central source of information on UNODC tools is a critical gap, which needs to be filled.	There was no one place from which the evaluators could obtain information on tools, either global or local.	A central web site that registers all information on tools, whether produced by headquarters or by regional, field and project offices, should be established at headquarters. An obligation should be placed on all those producing tools to post information on the web site according to prescribed guidelines. A model format for this can be the survey on treatment training materials.
3. Global tools on drugs rely heavily on the experience of developed countries and consequently their relevance for resource-poor country situations is diminished. Basing these tools on the experience of developing countries and their best practices should improve their effectiveness and impact.	The global tools examined (i.e. the <i>Drug Abuse Treatment Toolkit</i> , the Global Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse's <i>GAP Toolkit</i> and the Global Youth Network toolkit) have based themselves largely on the experience of developed countries. Developing countries do not have the resource base to adopt practices that are based on such experience. Global tools have not been used extensively in local tool production processes as a result.	Tools developed by headquarters should be based primarily on the experience of developing countries, to suit the conditions and situations in resource-poor developing countries. Excessive dependence on experience in developing countries should be avoided. This is a critical factor in making tools more relevant and effective.
4. Experience and best practices from developing countries are not incorporated to a sufficient extent in many of the UNODC tools.	The argument for producing tools based on the experience of developed countries is that there is little information or knowledge of the best practices of developing countries. There has been no concerted effort to gather information or the experience of developing countries. Tool design has been based on the experience of developed countries.	UNODC should play a more active and initiatory role in collecting, organizing and analysing relevant experience and best practices of developing countries. A research programme that analyses field experience and builds up a corpus of knowledge is vital to technical cooperation effectiveness.
5. There is a lack of consistency and resulting deficiencies in the production process of these tools.	Tools produced at headquarters have adopted varying processes of needs assessment, consultation with peer groups and practitioners. These consultation processes have varied in their intensity and the extent of peer group participation.	Tools should be produced in an operationally and user-friendly manner. The design of tools is an important aspect of preparing tools. For tools to be user-friendly and address real needs, there has to be an assessment of what is required, more consultation with practitioners and peer groups and more thought given to the appropriate design of products. The exception to this would be when tools of a more academic nature have to be produced for the guidance of policy makers, and high-level technical personnel.
6. The dissemination of tools is as important as their production. Dissemination is a relatively neglected aspect in many tools, in part because of resource constraints and in part because of a lack of appreciation of the importance of vigorously promoting them. Field offices have not been fully engaged in the promotion of many tools.	Many tools have not been disseminated effectively, as there is no planned strategy for their dissemination. Dissemination appears to be more an afterthought once tools are prepared. There has been no target audience in mind to reach out to before the preparation of tools.	Resources should be allocated to the dissemination of the tools at the time that the tools are planned. Optimal outcomes are not obtained as a result of inadequate attention to the dissemination process. The dissemination of tools to promote their relevant application at the country level is as important as the production of the tool.

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Tools are produced but are not adequately followed through on to obtain optimal impact.		
7. In the production of most tools by headquarters, the feasibility of adapting them to country situations has not been explored.	There is no evidence of any global tool being adapted at the country level. There has been no provision in any of the tools considered for country-level adaptation. The product network approach of the International Trade Centre has aimed at producing global tools, with a view to their adaptation, through a network of local institutions. This approach has been deemed to have been successful by evaluators.	As many tools as feasible should be prepared with the objective of country-level adaptation in mind. The feasibility of arranging for institutional networks at the country level to facilitate such adaptation should be examined. Such a methodology should contribute to capacity-building. The experience of the product network approach of the International Trade Centre is relevant in this regard.
8. While large numbers of local tools are produced by UNODC projects, there is no standard mechanism, in most instances, to control their quality. Each project acts on its own and local tool production appears to be a fragmented process. These are important tools to reach out to a large and relevant practitioner constituency. They are in local languages. Improving their quality and ensuring more consistency (Especially in technical content) across projects and countries should make them more effective.	An inventory of local tools brought to light nearly 100 tools produced by various projects and programmes in the field. There was no evidence that these tools were known beyond an individual project or field office, apart from a few exceptions. In many instances, headquarters personnel were not aware of the tools.	Institutional mechanisms to transfer exchange of experience and information on tool production and dissemination should be in place to bridge the current gap between headquarters and the field. There should be obligations on the technical units at headquarters and regional field and project offices to interact with each other in tool production. When the appraisal of field-level projects is undertaken at headquarters, it should be an obligatory task to ensure that relevant global tools are utilized in these projects.
9. There is no evidence that evaluations of projects and programmes have adequately addressed the issues relating to tools and tool production. The UNODC evaluation process can contribute to the production of better and relevant tools and to ensuring that tools are disseminated effectively in order to achieve greater impact.	No evidence has been found that tools have been assessed as an important part of projects and programmes in the course of evaluations.	Evaluations of technical cooperation programmes, whether global programmes or field-level projects, should be obliged to examine the contribution made by tools produced within them for the achievement of programme and project objectives.

Annex III.

SUMMARY MATRIX NDS

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/ examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
<p>The “project document” on NDS was inaccurate and misleading, particularly on the description of the status of NDS installation in Member States. The project was implemented using only a proposal as its framework of reference.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Authorship of the “project document” cannot be attributed to the current ITS staff since it pre-dated their tenure.</p>	<p>The document suggested that, by the time DA funds were disbursed, 25 Member States had already fully operational NDS installed. In reality only 16 countries had NDS installed. While software had been developed, tested, and installed by the end of Phase II of NDS, as initially envisaged, no country had fully adopted it since the system was inoperative. The “project document” used for this evaluation is entitled “Computer and Telecommunication System for International and National Drug Control (NDS) – A UNDCP proposal: Use of Development Dividend.”</p>	<p>Management should commission an independent inquiry regarding the circumstances culminating in misleading information appearing in the project proposal, as well as how the project subsequently dealt with the situation it encountered.</p> <p>UNODC must ensure that no projects are implemented solely on the basis of a project proposal.</p>
<p>The DA funds were used in part to develop a new software package from scratch in order to “fix” problems that had not been mentioned in the proposal, rather than being used fully to expand the system to additional Member States as was foreseen.</p>	<p>Since there was no satisfactory system in operation in Member States, the software had to be developed, tested, and installed as soon as the DA was disbursed.</p>	<p>An audit of the Development Account component of NDS should be carried out.</p> <p>A complete evaluation of NDS should be conducted.</p>
<p>Once the basic software problems were resolved, the originally intended rollout of the system to Member States began. A majority of the Member States reported the utility and performance of the system as high.</p>	<p>Of 11 Member States assessed in this evaluation, eight reported that they “Always” use NDS (73 percent), two reported “Often” (18 percent), and one reported “Rarely” (9 percent). Member States rated the overall performance of NDS positively: 2 rated NDS as “Excellent”; 7 “Good”; 1 “Fair”; 0 “Poor and one left the question blank</p>	<p>Continue the NDS initiative with the implementation of the recommendations contained in this report.</p>
<p>Sustainability is a concern.</p>	<p>The Member States were asked whether they could sustain the system without UNODC assistance: 4 stated “often,” 2 “rarely,” 3 “never” and 2 left the question blank. All of the 11 Member States had at least some personnel trained. Yet only 7 had IT departments in their countries, of which only 5 had their IT staff trained in the system.</p>	<p>Conduct a training needs assessment of Member States that will form the basis of NDS training activities. Authorship of the “project document” cannot be attributed to current ITS staff since it pre-dated their tenure. Increase the visibility of the information exchange forum on the NDS website.</p>
<p>Data from Member States are currently transmitted to INCB through various means. Some Member States send their data via NDS, yet the data are not compatible with the system currently in use by INCB.</p>	<p>Data are transmitted to INCB through one or more of the following means: email (n=10), post (n=9), fax (n=6), and NDS (n=5). All data from Member States currently have to be manually keyed-in once received at INCB.</p>	<p>A more compatible system, International Drug Control System (IDS), is currently under development. Continue this effort until a fully compatible system is in place between Member States and INCB.</p>
<p>An opportunity for a potentially broader collaborative mechanism was missed by not having brought in INCB and other UNODC sections as stakeholders in the NDS project.</p>	<p>Currently ITS has the sole responsibility for technical and substantive aspects of the NDS initiative.</p>	<p>Management should establish an internal steering committee that includes INCB and other UNODC sections, and charge it with administering the project.</p>

Key: LAN = Local Area Network
GA = General Assembly
NDS = National Drug Control System
IDS = International Drug Control System
INCB = International Narcotics and Control Board
UN = United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Annex IV.

SUMMARY MATRIX GPAT

<i>Findings: identified problems/issues</i>	<i>Supporting evidence/examples</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
1. GPAT is the world leader from a criminal justice perspective and the most influential programme in providing incentives to ratify the Human Trafficking Protocol and for measuring progress towards an international consensus on, and agreed response to the problem of human trafficking.	Donors, beneficiary countries, international experts, NGOs and IOs identify GPAT as such. Results from this evaluation confirm the international assessment.	That GPAT continue (in a modified form).
2. GPAT was conceived of, implemented and developed without a strategic plan. It is not truly global, but it has a presence in various parts of the globe and its influence is global.	GPAT emanated from an executive decision of the then United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP). Subsequently, activities have been driven by donors unrelated to global need (e.g. the most prolific destination, transit and source countries). In place of a Strategic Plan, AHTU develops dot point annual work plans.	That GPAT develop a Strategic Plan which identifies a clear Mission Statement, Key Result Areas, Interventions, Evaluation Questions and Performance Targets/Indicators, etc. The Strategic Plan should be supplemented with an Operational Plan.
3. GPAT was intended to be strictly time-limited (36 months) incorporating five demonstration projects, following which a grand Global Strategy was to be developed in cooperation with Member States. UNODC now views GPAT as enduring.	There are 33 'demonstration' projects in various stages of implementation: completed (n=1), ongoing (n=12), pipeline (n=8) and pre-pipeline (n=12). Member States have had sufficient time to make themselves known to GPAT for pre-ratification assistance. The 'grand' Global Strategy was never formulated.	That GPAT move to post-ratification implementation assistance. The 'demonstration' phase for projects, after five years since GPAT was implemented, should be considered at an end.
4. GPAT has not devoted sufficient attention to trafficking for labour exploitation or trafficking for organ removal.	Stakeholders report disappointment at the apparent lack of attention; few GPAT activities specifically address these elements, and outcomes which have highlighted them have been serendipitous, rather than by design.	That GPAT devote more attention to trafficking for labour exploitation and organ removal.
5. Despite being identified at the launch in 1999, subsequently in reports to the CCPCJ, and in past and current AHTU Work Plans, the Global Programme has not addressed the issue of smuggling of migrants.	The Smuggling of Migrants Protocol is currently without a home in the UN generally, or UNODC specifically, beyond the work of the Conference of the Parties to the Transnational Organised Crime Convention, and legislative services provided by UNODC's Advisory Services and Crime Conventions Section.	That GPAT assume responsibility for the Protocol to Prevent the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, to become the Global Programme against Trafficking and Smuggling of Human Beings (GPATS).
6. Despite twelve months having elapsed since the reorganisation of UNODC, which resulted in distributed responsibilities for GPAT rather than centralised within AHTU as previously prevailed, technical assistance projects which have been devolved have not received optimal attention.	Despite general compliance with the intentions of and in principle support for the restructure, AHTU is reluctant to pass control for projects to Regional Desks, and Regional Desks and Field Offices are ill equipped to receive projects. The Desks/Offices are generally populated with illicit drugs specialists without experience in human trafficking/smuggling.	That UNODC, the AHTU, and Regional Desks/Field Offices give full and immediate effect to the 2003 Office restructure. AHTU should assist in this process by providing the Desks/Field Offices with appropriate training.

7. The focal point of GPAT is the AHTU. It comprises just two core-funded Professionals. This is inadequate to support the full range of GPAT activities. Supplementary staffing can only be provided through short-term donor funding.	There are currently 46 activities/projects on the AHTU Work Plan. Donors and other stakeholders are shocked at the low number of staff, and characterise GPAT, in the circumstances, as a less than serious attempt by the UN to address the crime of trafficking in human beings. The addition of anti-smuggling activities, itself required to promote the Unit's future in an environment of diminishing comparative advantage, only adds to the need for an expansion in core staff.	That the staffing level and structure of the Anti-Human Trafficking (and Smuggling) Unit be enhanced. Two teams (one anti-human trafficking; the other, anti-smuggling of migrants), comprising two Professionals and a general administrative assistant each, reporting to a Chief, and at least in the short-term, supported by a database consultant, should comprise the Unit. Associate Experts should be viewed as supernumeraries.
8. Data collection, and research more generally, are deficient. GPAT has not established, nor has it attempted to, that the problem of trafficking in human beings is of sufficient size and seriousness to warrant the status and response of a United Nations Global Programme. It is not possible, in the absence of reliable data, to determine if GPAT has resulted in a reduction in the number of persons trafficked, or in an increase in the number of traffickers prosecuted.	Data collection is centred on a trafficking flows database, comprising secondary sources, including official government statistics, reports of research institutes or of intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations; and from newspaper articles and news agency bulletins. This is supplemented by project-specific (i.e. country/Region-specific) research into the nature of human trafficking, but not the incidence and prevalence of the crime.	That GPAT develop a research agenda, which should include the incidence and the prevalence of trafficking and smuggling of persons. The agenda should provide for open access to GPAT-derived data for secondary analysis by external researchers, widening the breadth of research available to the international community.
9. GPAT does not use a systematised Project Management Cycle schema, leading to a lack of a capacity to control the number/type and duration of projects under development, diverting resources in attempting to (eventually) obtain funding.	Global Programme projects appear to remain as pipeline or even pre-pipeline for as long as takes to obtain funding. In the interim, further developmental work and ongoing fundraising activities are undertaken, to the detriment of more viable potential or current projects/activities.	That GPAT develop and implement a Project Management Cycle schema. The Cycle should be supplemented with a Document Management System.

Key: AHTU = Anti-Human Trafficking Unit
CCPCJ = Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice
GPAT = Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings
IO = International Organisation
NGO = Non Governmental Organisation
UNDCP = United Nations International Drug Control Programme
UNODC = United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Annex V.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

2004 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Background information

1. There is a great diversity in the evaluation profession, with practitioners coming into the profession from different training backgrounds, experience, work settings; hence, the perceptions about the primary purpose of evaluations are also diverse. Despite this diversity, evaluators are bound by one common goal: to construct and provide the best possible information and advice that might bear on the value of what is being evaluated. The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) considers that goal as its *raison d'être*.

2. The work plan of IEU for 2004 has resulted in a series of evaluation reports that, as stand alone documents, provide guidance to the stakeholders concerned. It is essential that the findings, lessons learned and recommendations are not confined to a small audience.

Purpose

3. The purpose of the 2004 Annual Evaluation Report is to provide a comprehensive analysis and objective assessment of UNODC performance derived from evaluation exercises completed during that period. The main objectives are to share the evaluation results with Governments as well as with donors and for UNODC to use the report as a management tool. The evaluation report also provides a means for UNODC to be accountable to its governing bodies, donors, partners and the United Nations.

4. The evaluation report is a summary of how UNODC's programme was delivered during 2004 and focuses on main issues arising from the analysis based on the various evaluations conducted during the year. The major themes that emerge in the evaluations are delineated to facilitate clearer understanding. That enables UNODC to determine the overall outcome and effectiveness of its activities. Emphasis is placed on thematic evaluations, project and programme support, project design and management, learning from lessons and knowledge management.

5. It will also provide an implementation plan and actions to be taken on the recommendations of the 2004 Annual Evaluation Report. The implementation plan reflects the agreements between senior management and programme managers on the actions to be taken.

Scope of the report

6. The 2004 Annual Evaluation Report produced by IEU covers aspects of UNODC work by analysing and summarizing the results of thematic and global programmes, project evaluations and self-evaluation fact sheets submitted to the Unit during 2004. Discussions with key members of UNODC staff compliment the review of evaluation reports, project documents, progress reports and publications.

7. The analysis makes use of statistical material to the extent possible. Wherever applicable, statistical analysis shall be applied to (but not limited to) aspects of evaluations, such as overall achievement of results and outcomes, impact and sustainability issues. The report also covers institutional arrangements, managerial and technical backstopping as well as administrative support.

8. The evaluation report provides a summary, analysis and synthesis of thematic, global and project evaluation results in a logical sequence, which embodies the main evaluation parameters of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

1. Relevance/appropriateness

9. To determine the relevance of programmes and projects in terms of the UNODC overall priorities, strategies and plans, including UNODC's mandate and the decisions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. It should be determined:

(a) Whether the objectives of the global programmes are pertinent to the goals set out for UNODC and if the projects represent a suitable and appropriate means of achieving those aims;

(b) Whether the expected outcomes and results of the programmes or projects contribute to the attainment of the UNODC objectives and long-term goals;

(c) Whether the programmes and projects are appropriate for achieving the UNODC priorities;

(d) Whether strategic planning measures within the programme or project are relevant modes of operation. This includes an examination of the logical sequence and nature of activities in relation to the work programme and operational plans;

(e) Whether the quality and the usefulness of project outputs contribute towards the attainment of results and overall objectives;

(f) Whether the programmes and project appropriately respond to identified drug and crime needs and problems.

2. Effectiveness/efficiency

10. To review the effectiveness of programmes and projects, by:

(a) Assessing the management and financial systems that affect programme and project implementation;

(b) Investigating the operational mechanisms with emphasis on how UNODC supports activities/projects and the field;

(c) Determining the effectiveness of UNODC administrative procedures, financial systems and institutional arrangements, and how those have affected programme/project implementation and delivery;

(d) Determining UNODC's efficiency in programme delivery through the examination of programme and project implementation;

(e) Identifying successes, problems and lessons learned from improved programme and project delivery.

3. Impacts

11. To examine the impact being created by UNODC in the prevention of organized crime, drug abuse and terrorism by:

(a) Examining the leading and catalytic function fostered by UNODC, including where possible, a presentation of how they have influenced policies, strategies and other activities of the cooperating agencies, governments and partners;

(b) Determining the progress made in attaining long-term results and how those results have had an impact on the drugs and crime situation;

(c) Assessing the value of programme/project results from any follow-up processes, such as monitoring and reporting;

(d) Analysing and synthesizing the usefulness and impact of outputs, including where possible, the opinions of recipients and beneficiaries as reflected in evaluation reports.

4. Follow-up of evaluation recommendations

12. To assess the progress of the implementation of recommendations stated in evaluations of projects and programmes by:

- (a) Including evaluation implementation plan for 2005;
- (b) Assessing the status of implementation of recommendations for evaluations done in 2004;
- (c) Assessing management commitment to the implementation of evaluation recommendations.

5. Performance and knowledge management

13. UNODC has in the last biennium adopted results-based budgeting and is developing a results-based management approach. The evaluation should examine the existing knowledge management approaches in the organization and provide an assessment of UNODC's organizational learning. The following aspects shall be reviewed:

(a) UNODC institutional mechanisms for the sharing of knowledge, including monitoring and evaluation information;

(b) UNODC projects, in particular, knowledge management projects (such as training, tools, toolkits, etc.);

(c) How lessons are fed back into the planning and design processes and policy formulation.

Report format

13. The report will set out the outcomes and methods of improvement arising from the analysis. That is to be achieved through several steps:

(a) State the major areas of concern arising from the analysis, separating the issues into:

- (i) Policy and programme concerns, such as institutional arrangement, backstopping, support to the field, administrative procedures and funding arrangements;
- (ii) Project concerns, such as project design, implementation, management, attainment of results, monitoring and follow-up, and project follow-up (e.g. next phase projects);
- (iii) Issues of impact and sustainability;

(b) Prepare recommendations, addressing both the policy and programme concerns and the project concerns, that:

- (i) Draw on the lessons learned from the successful implementation and performance of relevant and effective global programmes and projects;
- (ii) Formulate responses that can be implemented efficiently and with the available resources;

- (c) Review the role of evaluation in supporting knowledge and performance management by:
 - (i) Identifying evaluation and oversight mechanisms and activities supporting knowledge and performance;
 - (ii) Reviewing the role of evaluation in feeding back to planning evaluation results;
 - (iii) Reviewing the role of evaluation in knowledge management;
 - (iv) Reviewing the mechanisms in place for sharing knowledge within and outside UNODC.

- (d) Make suggestions for the development of a comprehensive knowledge management framework to guide UNODC mechanisms and activities in that area;

Team Composition

15. One person is required for the excursus. The consultant should have ample experience in evaluation, management processes, as well as report writing skills.

Planning and implementation arrangements

16. Under the overall guidance of the Chief of the IEU, the consultant will prepare a draft report, which will be submitted six week after the commencement of the assignment. UNODC will take one week to give feedback on the draft and one additional week will be used to finalize the document. The evaluation will be for the duration of two months spread over the period from 13 December 2004 to 4 March 2005.

17. The evaluator will receive the payment in three instalments: an initial payment to cover expenses; an intermediate payment, made upon assessment of a satisfactory first draft; and final payment, made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSA (lump sum) of the evaluator and is inclusive of incidental expenses.

18. In case the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the terms of reference, the time frame agreed, or the products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld until such time as the products are modified to meet UNODC standards. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNODC, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report and payment will be pro-rated for work done as determined by the Chief of IEU.

Annex VI.

LIST OF THEMATIC AND PROJECT EVALUATIONS

1. Evaluation of tools and toolkits as a modality of programme delivery by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
2. Evaluation of the Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings.
3. Evaluation of the Global Programme against Money-Laundering.
4. National Database System (NDS Ver 5.1), project number AB/GL/96/C09.
5. “Combined interdiction united strategy for the Islamic Republic of Iran (CIRUS)”, project AD/IRA/99/E51, and “Strengthening the Drug Control Coordination Unit (DCCU) at Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) secretariat, project AD/RER/C38 (combined evaluation report).
6. “Assessment of corruption in Hungary”, project FS/HUN/00/R12.
7. “Strengthening of judicial and prosecutorial drug control capacity in East Asia”, project AD/RAS/97/C74 (terminal evaluation).
8. “Strengthening the treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abusers in Egypt”, project AD/EGY/01/F53, and Jordan, project AD/JOR/01/F49 (combined evaluation report).
9. “Networking for reducing risk-taking behaviour related to drug abuse and HIV/AIDS among young people in South Asia”, project ADRAS02G23IND (terminal report).
10. “Evaluation of legal assistance (Islamic Republic of Iran)”, project LAS AD/IRA/99/E53.
11. “Evaluation of demand reduction projects (DARIUS)”, project AD/IRA/99/E52, and “Participatory experiences empowering local initiatives (PERSEPOLIS)”, project AD/IRA/99/E54 (a combined evaluation report).
12. “Capacity-building in drug control for the Government of Mozambique”, project AD/MOZ/97/C47 (terminal evaluation report).
13. “Drug abuse and STD/HIV/AIDS prevention project (Brazil)”, project AD/BRA/99/E02 (terminal evaluation report).
14. “Community-based counselling, treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abusers in disadvantaged areas (South Africa)”, project SAF/E66 (terminal evaluation report).