



UNITED NATIONS
Office on Drugs and Crime
Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific

June 2004

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

AD/RAS/97/C74 Strengthening of Judicial and Prosecutorial Drug
Control Capacity in East Asia

Evaluator

Christie S. Warren
Consultant

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME

Vienna

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMNS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. INTRODUCTION	9
1.1 Background and Context of Project C-74	9
1.2 Purpose and Objective of this Evaluation	10
1.3 Scope of the Evaluation	10
1.4 Evaluation Methodology	11
2. ANALYSIS AND MAJOR FINDINGS	11
2.1 Overall Performance Assessment	11
2.1.1 Appropriateness and relevance of project to meet needs and solve problems	11
2.1.2 Effectiveness of the project in actually solving identified problems	11
2.1.3 Efficiency of the project	12
2.2 Attainment of Project Objectives	12
2.2.1 Project Objectives	12
2.2.2 Indicators of Achievement, Expected Outputs, and Proposed Activities	13
2.2.2.1 Indicators of Project Achievement	13
2.2.2.2 Project Outputs	17
2.3 Implementation	24
2.4 Institutional and Management Arrangements	25
3. OUTCOMES, IMPACTS, AND SUSTAINABILITY	26
3.1 Outcomes	26
3.2 Impacts	27
3.3 Sustainability	28
4. LESSONS LEARNED	28
4.1 Lessons Learned	28
4.2 Best Practices	30
4.3 Constraints	30
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	32
6. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS	35
ANNEXES	

LIST OF ACRONYMNS

CCDAC	Central Committee for Drug Abuse Control (Myanmar)
LAG	Legal Assistance Group
LCDC	Lao National Commission for Drug Control and Supervision (Laos)
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MLA	Mutual Legal Assistance
NACD	National Authority for Combating Drugs (Cambodia)
NNCC	National Narcotics Control Commission (China)
ONCB	Office of Narcotic Control Board (Thailand)
SODC	Standing Office on Drugs Control (Vietnam)
UNODC	United Nations Office of Drug Control

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Aim and Character of Project

Project AD/RAS/97/C74, part of the broader ACCORD Plan of Action targeting a drug-free ASEAN by 2015, sought to strengthen the judicial and prosecutorial capacity of Cambodia, China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam to administer national drug control legislation and support subregional cooperation. The project was one of eleven projects carried out as part of a Subregional Action Plan implemented by UNDCP and the six governments that signed the 1993 Memorandum of Understanding on drug control in East Asia. The eleven projects comprise a programmatic initiative to develop procedures and mechanisms required to raise the capacity of the six countries to cooperate effectively. Six of the eleven projects, including this one, comprise a programmatic initiative to develop mechanisms and procedures required for the six countries to cooperate effectively in international drug investigations and prosecutions.

Project C-74 was designed to work in conjunction with other UNDCP projects to address the need for improved judicial and prosecutorial performance in drug prosecutions. It was specifically designed to increase awareness of judges and prosecutors of regional issues in drug trafficking, provide training in drug-related legislation, increase regional cooperation in drug-related issues, and create mechanisms for exchanging enforcement information with the aim of developing international investigations, thereby attack drug trafficking organizations at higher organizational levels than is normally permitted at national levels. Ultimately the project aimed to identify central authorities to process requests for subregional requests for legal assistance and ensure that requests for assistance are made in accordance with relevant legal procedures and required evidentiary standards. Training in these specialized areas has not been provided by any other internationally-sponsored project, although limited judicial and legal training in support of drug control has been provided in some of the six MOU countries on a bilateral basis. However, subregional issues were not included in these programs.

Major Findings of Evaluation

C-74 was the only legal project within the Subregional Law Enforcement Program. As such it was a relevant and much needed component of UNODC's overall anti-drug effort. The project's three component parts, designed to improve the capacity of judges and prosecutors to apply national drug legislation, to provide assistance in law development, and to create a mechanism for developing and implementing mutual legal assistance agreements among the six MOU countries, formed a reasonable and appropriate holistic approach to problems identified in the original Project Document. However, given the short length of time during which the project operated, the complexity of issues inevitably involved in legal reform, and the relatively low level of project funding, original expected outcomes were overly ambitious in scope. This fact was ultimately recognized and resulted in programmatic revisions in July 2002, shortly before the project concluded.

Issues relating to the use, trafficking, and suppression of drugs in this subregion are longstanding, deeply rooted, and complex in nature. The impact a small three year legal project can have on suppressing drugs in a subregion in which legal systems, political complexities, and levels of development are very different is necessarily limited. Nevertheless, the project did produce a number of concrete results:

1. The number of subregional countries with legal authority in place to cooperate in matters relating to international drug trafficking prosecutions increased during C-74.

- Significantly, as a direct result of this project, Myanmar enacted mutual legal assistance legislation in 2004.
2. Formal and informal mutual legal assistance among the MOU countries was successfully carried out in a number of cases.
 3. Two twinning programs were carried out for periods of two weeks each in Bangkok. Participants from five MOU countries attended drug trials, participated in daily mutual legal assistance activities, and observed daily governmental activities related to drug control in Thailand.
 4. Ten national seminars were conducted in six countries, in which the application of national drug legislation and responses to requests for international cooperation were addressed.
 5. Twenty – one high-level officials from the six MOU countries participated in two fellowship programs to Malaysia, Greece and the Balkans, where they observed mechanisms for implementing mutual legal assistance.
 6. A Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee, comprised of members of each of the six MOU countries, was formed. The Committee met three times annually.
 7. Using recommendations developed by the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee, a Drug Law Prosecution and Judicial Reference Handbook was created.
 8. UNODC and project personnel provided expert legal advice to officials in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Myanmar to facilitate drafting of new national legislation.
 9. Two subregional workshops on maritime trafficking and law and mutual legal assistance were conducted.

Despite these positive results, the project suffered from several deficiencies.

Funding shortfalls and irregularities in payments resulted in the need to postpone or cancel some activities. In July 2002, when the end of the project was imminent, a Project Revision Document was filed. At that time, a number of project objectives were revised or curtailed, and the project itself was extended for an additional three months to allow final activities to be carried out. Some activities carried out during this final period could not be followed up on, reducing their impact and sustainability.

Management and staffing arrangements were not optimal. Responsibility for virtually all administrative and substantive tasks rested solely with the Project Coordinator, who was assisted by a very small staff. Mixing administrative duties with responsibility for coordinating and delivering most of the project's substantive outputs reduced the effectiveness of the Project Coordinator as well as much of the project's work and activities. Between 30 and 35 consultants were used to assist the Project Coordinator carry out his substantive responsibilities. National counterparts criticized the cost and effectiveness of so many consultants.

The lack of initial baseline data and statistics as well as inadequate and incomplete periodic monitoring of goals and objectives impacted the delivery of project outputs. Necessary project modifications took place at a very late date, reducing overall sustainability of project activities. Modifications of programmatic goals and objectives during the course of the project were often informal and unsystematic.

Sustainability of impact and results were further compromised when the training component of the project was dropped. Unless judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials are trained to use in a practical way abstract information and theories they receive during a project, there will be no long-term impact.

Lessons Learned

A number of valuable lessons emerged during implementation of C-74, and they should increase the success of follow-up activities. Lessons learned include:

1. Regional legal cooperation is a necessary and effective strategy in the transnational fight against drugs.
2. Although the original concept of C-74 was sound and valid and sought to fill an existing gap in UNODC's regional drug strategy, the Project Document did not adequately predict the significance of constraints that would turn out to impact the project.
3. While the overall regional goal of increasing the capacity of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials to secure convictions in drug cases is appropriate, the specific needs of each country in its efforts to meet that goal must be addressed individually.
4. Sustainability of project goals cannot be attained without an adequate program to train judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials to implement national legislation and international conventions.
5. Creating practical solutions for bridging the gaps between different legal systems is more complex than originally believed.
6. Governmental capacity and political realities have a great impact on the ability of a legal project to succeed.

Conclusions and Recommendations

There is a strong continued need for a legal component as part of UNODC's Subregional Action Plan. Unless legal institutions in this subregion are strengthened, drug-related legislation is improved, and the capacity of judicial sector participants is elevated, lasting improvements in drug control cannot be accomplished. Since the drug situation in this subregion has a demonstrable impact on drug problems in other parts of the world, including Europe and the United States, funds and efforts spent on strengthening the ability of law enforcement agencies and judicial sector officials in this region will bear fruit virtually everywhere else in the world. Work begun during C-74 should therefore continue so that momentum gained and lessons learned are not lost.

If work begun during C-74 is continued, a number of project modifications should be made. These include:

1. An initial Baseline Study should be undertaken to adequately document the current legal and practical realities in each of the six MOU countries. In collaboration with local counterparts, local project activities appropriate and feasible in each country should be prioritized. Generalized region-wide activities, while useful to raise awareness of regional issues during the original phase of C-74, should be carried out on a more focused, strategic basis in the future.
2. Management and staffing structures should be reconfigured.
3. Individualized country plans with proposed outputs and activities specific to each country and designed to bring each country to more equal levels should be included as part of the next project document. It is recommended that these country plans be developed in a consultative fashion with substantial input from country representatives.
4. In order to fulfill original project goals, which remain relevant, and to ensure sustainability of project activities, the training component of the project should be reinstated. The capacity of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials cannot be raised unless they have the skills to utilize the theoretical knowledge they are given. No measurable results will be seen toward the attainment of project goals and

- objectives unless members of the law enforcement and judicial sectors are provided with practical training.
5. Detailed, practical information relating to legal and evidentiary requirements in drug prosecutions for each country should be developed to assist law enforcement officials, prosecutors and judges who engage in mutual legal assistance.
 6. Regional meetings and activities should be limited to policy and planning issues and not provide training or skill-building. Any geographic expansion of the project should be limited to countries or regions of strategic importance to the original six MOU countries.
 7. Regional or international study trips should be limited to countries in this region. In order to maximize the impact of these trips, participants should be required to create and carry out dissemination plans to pass on the training they receive to others in their country.
 8. Realistic program objectives and measurable indicators of success should be developed for the project. Periodic evaluations should be carried out so that needed adjustments can be made in a timely manner.
 9. Project staff should have specific and proven administrative, management, training, and capacity-building skills.
 10. The work of the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee should be continued. Focused, concrete goals for the Committee's work should be set.
 11. Mutual Legal Assistance should be included as an agenda item at future MOU country meetings.
 12. Assistance should be provided to Laos and Cambodia to facilitate their accession to drug-related conventions.
 13. Continued assistance should be provided to upgrade domestic legislation to bring all countries into compliance with the 1988 Convention.

In conclusion, C-74 was a valuable and necessary component of the overall Subregional Action Plan, and it was a partial success. Those interviewed during this assessment universally stated that despite problems that occurred during implementation of the project, it did have an impact in the six MOU countries. Valuable lessons were learned, and through trial and error, the actual situation and needs in each country were identified in more depth than they were at the start of the project.

Unless follow-up work is carried out, momentum gained during C-74 will be lost. National counterparts are unanimous in their desire to continue the work they began during the project. With some modifications, the project can move closer to achieving its objectives, making a sustainable impact in this subregion, and becoming a valuable component of UNODC's overall anti-drug strategy.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Context of Project C-74

This project, part of the broader ACCORD Plan of Action targeting a drug-free ASEAN by 2015, sought to strengthen the judicial and prosecutorial capacity of Cambodia, China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam to administer national drug control legislation and support subregional cooperation. The original goals of the project were articulated as establishing a program of in-country legal training for drug control by national institutions to meet the specific needs of each of the countries and a mechanism for developing and implementing Mutual Legal Assistance Agreements and other initiatives to facilitate subregional cooperation.

This project was one of eleven projects carried out as part of a Subregional Action Plan implemented by UNDCP and the six Governments¹ that have signed the 1993 Memorandum of Understanding on drug control in East Asia. The eleven projects comprise a programmatic initiative to develop procedures and mechanisms required to raise the capacity of the six countries to cooperate effectively. Six of the eleven projects, including this one, comprise a programmatic initiative to develop mechanisms and procedures required for the six countries to cooperate effectively in international drug investigations and prosecutions.

This project aimed to increase overall subregional cooperation among the MOU signatory countries, which had previously not worked together formally in the drug control field. Two agreements to promote drug control cooperation in border areas, one between Myanmar, China and UNDCP and the other between Myanmar, Thailand, and UNDCP, were signed in 1992. These two agreements were supported by two law enforcement projects implemented in a cooperative manner by the countries involved. A number of UNDCP projects, focusing on law enforcement, demand reduction, and alternative development activities, involved more than one country and were designed to enhance regional cooperation. Additionally, UNDCP legal advisers have provided assistance to the six MOU countries in drafting drug control legislation.

Project C-74 was designed to work in conjunction with other UNDCP projects to address the need for improved judicial and prosecutorial performance in drug prosecutions. It was specifically designed to increase awareness of judges and prosecutors of regional issues in drug trafficking, provide training in drug-related legislation, increase regional cooperation in drug-related issues, create mechanisms for exchanging enforcement information with the aim of developing international investigations and thereby attack drug trafficking organizations at higher organizational levels than is normally permitted at national levels. Ultimately the project aimed to identify central authorities to process requests for subregional requests for legal assistance and ensure that requests for assistance are made in accordance with relevant legal procedures and required evidentiary standards. Training in these specialized areas has not been provided by any other internationally-sponsored project, although limited judicial and legal training in support of drug

¹ Cambodia, China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, and Vietnam.

control has been provided in some of the six MOU countries on a bilateral basis that did not include subregional issues.

1.2 Purpose and Objective of this Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation was to establish what project C-74 achieved and whether it attained its objectives; to assess the extent to which the project met the needs of the beneficiary countries; to assess whether the strategy and implementation arrangements were appropriate and the approach relevant to the needs of beneficiary countries and the expectations of donors; to determine whether resources were utilized efficiently to produce sustainable outcomes; and to examine results achieved as a whole, in particular outcomes and impacts, in relation to explicit and implicit objectives of the project.

This evaluation was specifically to focus on assessing the experience of beneficiary countries and their perspectives on the benefits they received.

1.3 Scope of the Evaluation

In accord with the Terms of Reference², this evaluation focused on the following areas:

- The results achieved by the project as a whole, in particular the outcomes, impact, and sustainability;
- The strategies and approaches applied;
- The magnitude, scope, and strategy of the project in relation to the problem;
- The extent to which the program contributed to the improvement of institutional and interdiction capacities to combat illicit drug trafficking in Southeast Asia;
- The interrelation of the project with other activities of the governments concerned as well as with assistance from bilateral donors;
- The extent to which the assistance provided to separate countries contributed to improvement of drug control in the region as a whole;
- The continued relevance of the main objectives when considering overall development of the drug problem;
- The sustainability of results;
- Unintended impacts of the program, both positive and negative;
- The effectiveness of project management and quality of timeliness of monitoring and backstopping of the projects by all parties concerned;
- The roles and responsibilities of the various parties, including the countries of Southeast Asia and other countries, donors, UNODC, and other parties.

1.4 Evaluation Methodology

This evaluation was based on a review of available project documents, including the Memorandum of Understanding on Drug Control, the original Project Document, all Semi-Annual and Annual Project Progress Reports, the Law Enforcement Programme Evaluation Report, the Project Revision Document, the

² The terms of reference for this evaluation are contained in Annex A.

Terminal Report, all Mission Reports, Consultants' Reports, Reports on Fellowship Programs, and reports and materials contained in project binders. In addition, written and published materials made available by national counterparts were reviewed.

A list of all organizations visited and persons interviewed in each of the six MOU countries during the assessment is contained in Annex B.

In advance of each interviews, a questionnaire containing 22 questions relevant to evaluation criteria was sent to all persons to be interviewed. (Annex C)

2. ANALYSIS AND MAJOR FINDINGS

2.1 Overall Performance Assessment

2.1.1 Appropriateness and relevance of project to meet needs and solve problems

C-74 was the only legal project within the Subregional Law Enforcement Program. As such it was a relevant and much needed component of UNODC's overall anti-drug effort.

The project was designed to conduct activities and produce outputs that contributed toward the Drug Control Objective of the Subregional Action Plan, which is to reduce production, trafficking, and use of illicit drugs, psychotropic substances and precursors on a sustainable basis in the subregion. The immediate objectives of the project were to improve the capacity of judges and prosecutors to apply national drug-related legislation, to provide assistance in law development, and to create a mechanism for developing and implementing mutual legal assistance agreements among the six MOU countries.

These three components of C-74 formed a reasonable and appropriate holistic approach to problems identified in the Project Context section of the original Project Document. However, given the short length of time during which the project operated, the complexity of issues inevitably involved in legal reform, and the relatively low level of project funding, original expected outcomes were overly ambitious in scope. This fact was ultimately recognized and resulted in programmatic revisions in July 2002, shortly before the project concluded.

2.1.2 Effectiveness of the project in actually solving identified problems

As noted in the original Project Document, issues relating to the use, trafficking, and suppression of drugs in this subregion are longstanding, deeply rooted, and complex in nature. The impact a small three year legal project can have on suppressing drugs in a subregion in which legal systems, political realities, and levels of development are very different is necessarily limited. Nevertheless, the project did have some impact in several areas.

2.1.3 Efficiency of the project

For a number of reasons, project efficiency was not always consistent or maximized.

A comprehensive Legal Workshop was held in a timely manner in April 1999. At that workshop, representatives from the Legal Advisory Group in Vienna, the Bangkok UNODC office, and 29 representatives from the six MOU countries met to prioritize training needs and develop curriculum topics for national and cross-border training programs for judges, prosecutors, and investigators.

When the Project Coordinator assumed full-time responsibilities in October 1999, he stated that it took him a number of months to become familiar with issues in the drug control field and the actual situation in the MOU countries. Therefore, activities planned in the Project Document to take place in early stages of the project were delayed. The original project workplan and a timeline of actual project activities are set forth in Annexes D and E.

Over the course of the project, objectives and activities were re-prioritized on an informal basis, resulting in the elimination of most of the project's training component and making much of the work carried out at the April 1999 workshop moot.

Funding shortfalls and irregularities in payments resulted in the need to postpone or cancel some activities. In July 2002, when the end of the project, scheduled for December 2002, was imminent, a Project Revision Document was filed. At that time, a number of project objectives were revised or curtailed, and the project itself was extended for an additional three months to allow final activities to be carried out. As discussed below, some activities carried out during this final period could not be followed up on, reducing their impact and sustainability.

Management and staffing arrangements were not optimal. Responsibility for virtually all administrative and substantive tasks rested solely with the Project Coordinator, who was assisted by a very small staff. This required that the Project Coordinator travel frequently and impacted his ability to effectively manage. Mixing administrative duties with responsibility for coordinating and delivering most of the project's substantive outputs reduced the effectiveness of the Project Coordinator as well as much of the project's work and activities.

2.2 Attainment of Project Objectives

2.2.1 Project Objectives

Immediate project objectives were modified over the course of C-74, although this was done on an informal basis. Immediate objectives set forth in the original Project Document were:

To improve the capacity of judges and prosecutors regarding the application of national drug control legislation;

To facilitate cooperation in matters of international requests for assistance regarding drug or related investigations and prosecutions; and

To provide an ongoing mechanism for future collaboration in drug control.

In June 2002, reflecting a perceived need to prioritize objectives and activities given shortages in funding and limited remaining time, a Project Revision Document was filed. At that time, immediate objectives for the project were modified and articulated as follows:

To improve the capacity of judges and prosecutors regarding the application of national drug control legislation;

To facilitate cooperation in matters of international requests for assistance regarding drug-related investigations and prosecutions (mutual legal assistance) and to provide an ongoing mechanism for future collaboration in this respect (formation of subregional Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee and organization of annual meetings); and

To promote legal reform so as to meet international standards of drug control, acting jointly with Headquarters.

The second modified objective was given highest priority for the remainder of the project.

Details on the extent to which project objectives were met are set forth in the following sections of this assessment. In general, the second amended objective, facilitating cooperation in matters of mutual legal assistance and providing an ongoing mechanism for future collaboration, produced the most concrete results. The third amended objective, promoting legal reform, was partially met. There was little or no success in meeting the first objective, improving the capacity of judges and prosecutors to apply national drug control legislation.

2.2.2 Indicators of Achievement, Expected Outputs, and Proposed Activities

In the original Project Document, a series of Immediate Objectives were linked to Indicators of Achievement and Expected Outputs. Specific activities were proposed to further and support individual project objectives and outputs. When the Project Document was amended in July 2002, a number of the Immediate Objectives, Expected Outputs, and proposed activities were modified at the same time.

Indicators of Achievement, Expected Outputs, and Proposed Activities in support of the Immediate Objectives for the project, along with ultimate results for each, are set forth in the following section.

2.2.2.1 Indicators of Project Achievement

Indicators of Achievement set forth in the original Project Document, along with end of project results, are as follows:

Indicator 1 The number of subregional countries with legal authority in place to cooperate in matters relating to international drug trafficking prosecutions.

1a. End of Project Results

	Party to 1988 Convention	MLA Legislation	MLA Treaties/Agreements	Central Authority to Coordinate MLA
Cambodia	No. Ratification currently pending in National Assembly.	Yes: Chapter XXV, Laws on the Control of Drugs. Model MLA sub-decree to implement Article 108 drafted and currently in front of Minister of Justice.	Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, Russia. Proposed drug cooperation agreement with Cuba pending.	No
China	Yes	No	43 bilateral agreements	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Treaty & Law Department
Laos	No	No	China	No
Myanmar	Yes	Yes: Enacted April 28, 2004.	China, Thailand, Vietnam	Central Committee for Drug Abuse Control
Thailand	Yes	Yes: B.E. 2535 (1992)	United States, Canada, Great Britain, Norway, France	Office of the Attorney General
Vietnam	Yes	Yes: Chapter V, Law on Narcotic Drugs Prevention and Suppression. (but their country report says no specific law on this.)	Poland, Laos, Russia, China, Mongolia, Ukraine	No

Indicator 2 Number of bilateral drug control cooperation treaties signed.

2a. End of Project Results

Since this data was not gathered during C-74 and is not available elsewhere, it is not possible to report on this indicator.

Indicator 3 The number of requests made and responded to for assistance involving other countries related to drug investigations and prosecutions.

3a. End of Project Results

Because of disparities in legislation affecting mutual legal assistance in the six MOU countries, much of the actual collaboration that took place among national counterparts in drug-related cases was necessarily informal and thus cannot be specifically quantified. Nevertheless, counterparts in every country stated that the frequency of formal and informal mutual legal assistance increased during C-74, and that this increase was due to relationships between country representatives that were forged during the project and specifically during meetings of the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee.

Examples of mutual legal assistance include:

Cambodia: Cambodia cooperated with Laos, Vietnam, Australia, the United States, New Zealand, Thailand and Vietnam.

China: Between 2001 and August 2002, China received 19 formal requests for legal assistance from countries including Japan, South Korea, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, Spain, Lithuania, the Czech Republic, South Africa, and Brazil.

During the same time frame, China submitted six requests for legal assistance to South Korea, Romania, Germany, Singapore, and the United Arab Emirates.

Through informal channels, the Ministry of Public Security received more than 100 requests for legal assistance during that time period.

Myanmar: Mutual legal assistance was implemented in five high profile cases involving organized crime. These included one case in which 357 kilograms of heroin were seized from a vessel leaving Yangon for Singapore, and one case in which 126 pounds of heroin were seized by the Drug Enforcement Agency in New York inside a package of towels exported from Myanmar.

Vietnam: Between 1998 and 2002, police agencies investigated and prosecuted 41 cases involving 52 foreign offenders in cooperation with drug control agencies of other countries.

Indicator 4 Increase in the number of successful trials of persons accused of drug trafficking offences.

4a. End of Project Results

Because baseline data on the number of drug-related trials was not collected at the beginning of C-74, and because consistent, reliable trial statistics are not kept in any country with the possible exception of Thailand, the success of this indicator could not be measured. Anecdotal evidence presented below indicates that convictions were achieved in several high-profile drug cases following collaboration between several MOU countries.

Indicator 5 Number of judges and prosecutors having received training on legal issues that arise in national and subregional drug investigations and prosecutions.

5a. End of Project Results

	Workshops	Seminars	Total Number of People Trained	Number of Judges Trained	Others
Cambodia	Two: January 2000; December 2000	Two: December 2000; September 2001	70	50	
China	One: September 2002		35	25	10 law enforcement officers
Laos	One: April 2000		35	25	10 law enforcement officers
Myanmar	Two: June 2000; December 2001	One: November 2000	70	50	
Thailand	Two: February 2000; November 2002	Two: October 2000 and November 2002	70	50	
Vietnam	Two: March 2000; December 2002	One: November 2001	70	50	

2.2.2.2 Project Outputs

Output 1: Judges, prosecutors and senior law enforcement officers in each MOU country better informed on national drug control legislation and the legal and procedural prerequisites for more effective international cooperation on drug law control.

Note: According to the former Project Coordinator, this was formally dropped as an Expected Output in July 2002 when it was decided that national training programs should not be within the purview of this project.

Output 1: Indicators of Achievement

- 1. 75% of participants in workshop training successfully complete an evaluation exercise conducted at the conclusion of the training.**

Results

Evaluations administered at the conclusion of project activities focused on seeking participants' opinions about such topics as program locations, hotels, and services. Evaluation exercises to measure whether participants were better informed and trained on substantive legal issues were not conducted, so this output could not be measured.

- 2. Drug control and related legislation from the six MOU countries provided to each country.**

Results

Not completed.

Legislation was collected but totaled more than three hundred pages. It was originally to be included in the Drug Law Prosecution and Judicial Reference Handbook that was produced, but the cost was deemed prohibitive. Instead, the Handbook included relevant international conventions and citations to domestic laws.

- 3. Procedural guidelines governing the application for and response to mutual legal assistance requests drafted and approved by each country.**

Results

Completed.

Using recommendations developed by the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee, a Drug Law Prosecution and Judicial Reference Handbook was created. The handbook is being translated into Chinese by NNCC, and other counterparts have requested funding assistance to translate it into other languages.

Output 1: Activities

- 14. Twinning programs:** Two training workshops for judges and prosecutors held in each country to provide instruction on the rules of evidence, provisions of national drug control and related legislation and procedures for deciding upon mutual legal assistance requests. Depending upon the needs of each country other relevant topics such as asset seizure, controlled deliveries, money laundering, undercover operations, extradition may be part of the curriculum.

Results

Completed.

Two twinning programs were carried out for periods of two weeks each at the Office of the Attorney General and the offices of ONCB in Bangkok. Four representatives from China and two representatives from all other countries except Laos participated in the twinning programs. Participants attended drug trials, discussed and participated in mutual legal assistance activities, and observed day-to-day activities related to drug control in Thailand.

The main criticism received relating to the twinning programs was that they occurred too late in the project and could not be followed up on.

- 15. National seminars:** Two seminars held in each country to discuss legal issues resulting from the application of national drug legislation and responding to requests for international cooperation. To include drafting of legal procedural guidelines for addressing requests for mutual legal assistance.

Results

Completed as follows:

Cambodia: Two workshops (11-13 January, 2000 and 12-14 December, 2000) and two seminars (6-8 December, 2000 and 12-14 September, 2001) were conducted. Approximately 70 officials were trained, including 50 judges.

China: One workshop was held in combination with a national course conducted by at the People's Public Security University on 22-28 September, 2002. 35 people were trained, 25 from the judiciary and ten law enforcement officials.

Laos: One workshop was held in Vientiane 5 – 7 April, 2000. 35 people attended the workshop, including 25 from the judiciary and ten law enforcement officials.

Myanmar: Two workshops were held 7-9 June 2000 and 10-12 December 2001. One seminar was held 21-23 November 2000. Approximately 70 officials were trained, 50 of whom were from the judiciary.

Thailand: Two workshops (9-11 February 2000 and 25-27 November 2002) and two seminars (24-26 October 2000 and 28-29 November 2002) were held. Approximately 70 officials were trained, including 50 judges.

Vietnam: Two workshops (21-23 March 2000 and 2-4 December 2002) and one seminar (28-30 November 2001) were held. Approximately 70 officials were trained, including 50 judges.

16. **Legislation translated:** Drug control and related legislation of the six countries translated into English and distributed to each of the MOU countries.

Results

Although the report from the first project workshop held in Bangkok in April 1999 recommended that the laws of all countries be sent to the UNDCP office as soon as possible and translated into English, this was reportedly not done.

17. **International seminars:** Support for jurists, prosecutors and legal academics to attend relevant international seminars where issues of subregional Mutual Legal Assistance and other forms of international cooperation will be discussed.

Results

One Vietnamese official reportedly attended a seminar on money laundering in Singapore. Funding for further international training programs was not deemed available.

18. **Publications:** Assistance to provide publications and specialist literature to establish or develop a reference library for the training institution in each country.

Results

Limited activity was carried out in this section since it was deemed too cost-intensive. Two documents were published: the Drug Law Prosecution and Judicial Reference Handbook mentioned above and a booklet titled "Extradition, Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters and International Transfer of Prisoners in Fighting Crime," published in Vietnam with assistance from C-74.

Output 2: Judicial and prosecutorial training systems strengthened to develop an understanding of the legal issues associated with drug control and subregional cooperation.

Note: This was formally dropped as an expected output in the July 2002 Project Revision Document because it was deemed too vague and cost-intensive. Additionally, there was reportedly limited interest on the part of national counterparts in following up to develop national

training programs. However, it should be noted that during the course of this assessment, national counterparts in all countries expressed a strong interest in training programs.

Output 2: Indicators of Achievement

1. Each country has designated institutions for training judges and prosecutors in drug law issues.

Results

Before this indicator was dropped, national training institutions were identified in several countries. During this assessment, a number of possible institutions were identified by national counterparts in four countries.

Thailand: Negotiations undertaken with Chulalongkorn University stalled over the issue of budget and reserving a specific room at the university for the training program. However, Thai counterparts state that negotiations could be revived and completed without much difficulty.

There is also a Judicial Training Institute in Bangkok that might be considered. This institution currently sponsors long-term training programs for judges and prosecutors.

Cambodia: Kim Sathavy, Director of the Royal School for Judges and Prosecutors in Phnom Penh, states that the RSJP is willing to support long-term drug-related training for judges and prosecutors.

China: NNCC suggests the following institutions as possible sites for long-term training programs: Public Security University, Beijing; Criminal Police College; Yunnan Police Academy; China Criminal Police College, Sheng Yang City.

Vietnam: SODC suggests the Police Training Institute, Hanoi.

2. Each country has curricula for drug law training, established targets for the numbers of persons to be trained and made appropriate budgetary provision for trainers, premises and associated costs.

Results

Although this information was collected at the initial project meeting in Bangkok in April 1999, it was not utilized or followed up on during the project.

Output 2: Activities

1. **Training needs assessment:** Assessment of national capacity and identification of needs in each MOU country.

Results

At the April 1999 Legal Workshop in Bangkok, training needs were identified for each country. This data was not followed up on to develop an appropriate training curriculum.

2. **National training institutions:** Selection of national institutions to develop and offer a drug control law training program.

Results

See Output 2, Indicators of Achievement, above.

3. **National training program:** Development of a drug control legal training program to meet each country's individual needs.

Results

Not completed.

Information received during this assessment indicates that there is a critical need for training of this kind.

4. **Study tours:** Provision of long and short term training and study attachments within the region or elsewhere to develop human resources relevant to individual country needs.

Results

Three study tours, called fellowships, were designated in the Project Document. Due to funding shortages, only two were carried out.

Malaysia: Between September 4 and October 11, 2000, a 38-day fellowship program was jointly carried out with the Malaysian Central Authority Against Drugs. 21 representatives from the six MOU countries participated.

Greece and the Balkans: Between March 18 and April 8, 2001, a second fellowship program was carried out in Greece, Turkey, Bulgaria, and Albania. 21 representatives from the six MOU countries participated.

- 5. Specialized national training programs:** Development of a specialized course of study for judges and prosecutors covering mutual legal assistance issues related to drug prosecutions.

Results

This activity was not carried out in any comprehensive or organized manner. However, three national training seminars were conducted during the project:

Cambodia: one training session in Phnom Penh, organized by the Faculty of Law.

Vietnam: one training program in Hanoi, organized by the Police Training Academy.

China: one training program in Beijing, carried out in cooperation with the People's Public Security University in Beijing.

Output 3: Legislation enacted and treaties or agreements concluded by each MOU country to facilitate inter-country cooperation to further drug related investigations and prosecutions.

Output 3: Indicator of Achievement

Laws enacted and treaties or agreements signed to provide each country with a legal framework to facilitate mutual legal assistance in drug control matters.

Results

Partially completed. See chart above at Section 2.2.3.1.

Output 3: Activities

- 1. Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee:** Establishment of a Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee comprising senior legal and law enforcement representatives from the MOU countries to identify the issues to be addressed to assist MOU countries with providing mutual legal assistance to one another.

Results

Completed.

The Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee was formed at its first annual meeting in Bangkok in November 2000. At this meeting, the Committee produced a set of recommendations on mechanisms for creating a workable system of cooperation in the region based on Article 7 of the 1988 Convention.

- 2. Annual Advisory Committee meetings:** Annual meetings of the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee to review the current standing of mutual legal assistance among the MOU countries and to make recommendations for improvements.

Results

Completed.

The MLA Committee held three annual meetings, usually at the end of the annual regional seminars.

After the first annual meeting in Bangkok in November 2000, the Advisory Committee held a second annual meeting in Hanoi in June 2001. The meeting was attended by representative of all six MOU countries and was held in conjunction with personnel from Project B-65. Participants revised recommendations from the previous year. The Advisory Committee held a third annual meeting in Beijing in August 2002. Final review of the MLA Recommendations was carried out and a strategy for implementing them after termination of the project was discussed.

- 3. Expert legal advice:** The provision of expert legal advice to those countries that undertake activities to increase their Mutual Legal Assistance capacity.

Results

Vietnam: LAP personnel provided assistance to Vietnamese officials in drafting a new Law on Drug Control in October/November 2000. The law entered into force in June 2001. Eight enabling decrees were subsequently enacted by Vietnamese officials, although without project assistance.

Cambodia: In conjunction with advice received from C-74 staff, a representative from LAG in Vienna worked with NACD in November 2001 to review needed changes to legislation. Subsequently, a Model Sub-Decree on Sales of Confiscated Goods and National Anti-Drug Fund, a Model Sub-Decree on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, a Model Prakas on Controlled Delivery and Incitement to Sale, and a Model Sub-Decree on Anti-Money Laundering Measures were drafted. They are currently in front of the National Assembly, whose work has been stalemated because of political instability in the country. However, it is widely expected that all legislation will pass when the National Assembly reconvenes.

Myanmar: In conjunction with advice received from C-74 staff, assistance was provided by LAG staff from Vienna in drafting MLA legislation, which passed in April 2004. A Law on Control of Money Laundering was also passed on June 17, 2002. Although this was accomplished without direct assistance from C-74, model legislation and other material from project seminars and workshops assisted in the drafting process.

4. **Subregional workshops on mutual legal assistance:** Two subregional workshops to raise awareness and discuss procedural issues relating to the provision of mutual legal assistance in drug control matters between the MOU countries.

Results

Completed

The first workshop, held in Bangkok May 28 – 30, 2001, focused on maritime trafficking and law. At this workshop, a set of recommendations was adopted aimed at strengthening the legal framework for the control of maritime trafficking.

The second subregional workshop was held in Phuket, Thailand December 9 – 12, 2002. Since termination of C-74 was imminent at that time, the focus of this workshop was on conducting an inventory of all legal issues pertaining to drug control remaining at the end of the project.

2.3 Implementation

A proposed workplan and timetable were submitted in the original Project Document. A comparison of the original timetable and the timeline of activities as actually carried out (see Annexes D and E) shows that implementation of project activities was delayed from the outset. For example, composing the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee, originally planned for the second quarter of Year 1, did not actually occur until the fourth quarter of Year 2. National workshops took place later than planned, and several activities, including twinning programs and the second fellowship program in Greece and the Balkans, were carried out so late in the project that follow-up activities that would have made their impact more sustainable could not be implemented.

It appears that substantive activities consistent with the original Project Document were carried out until July 2002, when it was determined that revising the project would be necessary in order to ensure the achievement of project objectives with a reasonable degree of adequacy before the scheduled termination date of 2003. At this time, a Project Revision Document was filed and the project was extended for an additional three months. Activities relating to the establishment of national courses on drug laws were dropped, as was the goal of identifying national institutions to provide permanent training programs. While the unrealistic scope of original project objectives and activities doubtless made it necessary to execute revisions in the project, doing so five months before the project's scheduled termination date limited the ability of project staff and national counterparts to minimize the negative impact of necessary revisions, prioritize remaining tasks, and make plans to maximize project sustainability.

2.4 Institutional and management arrangements

Consistent with its regional approach, the project was implemented and managed from the Bangkok office. Permanent staff was very small, and the Project Coordinator undertook to personally implement most project activities himself. This approach required frequent travel on his part and necessarily limited his ability to administer in an effective and consistent manner.

National counterparts in the six MOU countries³ were designated. These counterparts served as contact points for the Project Coordinator during the life of the project. They were responsible for organizing and carrying out many project activities in their respective countries. No permanent project staff were hired or placed in the countries themselves.

Between 30 and 35 consultants were used to assist the Project Coordinator carry out his substantive responsibilities. National counterparts reported that consultants did not always appear to be adequately briefed on the legal and drug-related situation in the six MOU countries. Additionally, there was criticism that funds used for this number of outside consultants could better have been used to train and build capacity of officials within project countries. The written report of one international consultant suggested that in general, outside consultants should have been selected more carefully since some were more knowledgeable than others. It was reported that consultants were often required to put training materials together in unreasonably short periods of time and without adequate input from the Project Coordinator or local counterparts.

Assistance received from LAG in Vienna in drafting legislation was considered helpful although not always timely. For example, counterparts in Myanmar reported that after they drafted MLA legislation, they forwarded it to Vienna, as they had been told to do, and waited more than one year for input from LAG. After numerous inquiries to Vienna, Myanmar was forced to enact the statute without substantive feedback from LAG. Also, a draft of the Judges Guidelines handbook foreseen in the Project Document was to be forwarded to Vienna so that it could be adapted for use in each country. Since this was never done, C-74 project staff were compelled to create a handbook by themselves at the end of the project.

In the interview of the Project Coordinator during this assessment, he stated that he felt that a slightly larger project staff of three to five people in the Bangkok office would have been more optimal and would have allowed him to work more effectively.

Note: At the time the project was originally designed, the question of how to best oversee, manage, and implement it was addressed. The option of contracting out project responsibilities to an organization headquartered outside the subregion was considered and rejected. For every reason, this decision was sound and very

³ Designated national counterparts for each country were National Authority for Combating Drugs (Cambodia), China National Narcotics Control (China), National Commission for Drug Control and Supervision (Laos), Central Committee for Drug Abuse Control (Myanmar), Office of Narcotics Control Board (Thailand), Vietnam National Drug Control Committee (Vietnam), Office of Narcotics Control Board (Thailand).

appropriate. A significant criticism of C-74 from national counterparts was that project management was not sufficiently localized and that implementation and backstopping, carried out from Bangkok and Vienna, were too remote. Situating management outside the subregion would have increased these problems and further reduced already scarce project resources.

As set out below, it is recommended that the use of international or national staff, or alternatively the use of international mentors, be considered during any follow-up phase of this project in order to reduce burdens on the Project Coordinator and maximize project impact and sustainability at the local levels.

3. OUTCOMES, IMPACTS, AND SUSTAINABILITY

3.1 Outcomes

The original Project Document foresaw the following project outcomes:

1. Improved understanding by judges and prosecutors of national drug legislation and its operational implications and of the legal requirements for conducting subregional cooperation related to drug control. A better understanding of the difference between the legal systems of the MOU countries and how to bridge these differences.

Results

Not accomplished. Although awareness of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials of the importance of subregional cooperation related to drug control was elevated, understanding of national drug legislation and its operational implications was not increased. Additionally, counterparts still have many questions about the legal systems of other MOU countries and have no idea how to bridge the differences.

2. The quality of legal training will have been enhanced on a sustainable basis by the establishment of a drug control law program in a recognized institution in each country. In addition to training on domestic legal issues, the program will familiarize participants with international and regional issues and procedures associated with the specialized legal concerns of drug control. Access to specialist knowledge and practice will be available to judges and lecturers through twinning arrangements with established institutions in other countries.

Results

Much of this expected outcome was not realized. The quality of legal training in the six MOU countries was not enhanced or impacted by the project. Negotiations to identify recognized institutions in each country broke down, and this activity was dropped as a program objective in July 2002. However, participants were familiarized with international and regional issues relating to mutual legal assistance, and information on specialized knowledge and practices was made available through assistance provided by international consultants and during twinning programs.

3. Judges involved with prosecutions of drug offences and related matters will have access to an internationally developed reference document in the form of Judges Guidelines.

Results

This outcome was achieved. A Judicial and Prosecutorial Handbook setting forth guidelines for implementation of the 1988 Convention was created.

4. The process to establish mutual legal assistance instruments and other procedures to effect subregional cooperation will have commenced as the result of studies and recommendations by a high level advisory committee of MOU countries representatives.

Results

This outcome was achieved and was probably the most significant accomplishment of C-74. Through meetings of the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee, relationships between counterparts of the six regional countries have been established, permitting successful informal mutual legal assistance and an ability and willingness on the part of officials to readily contact their counterparts in other countries to seek assistance.

Other possible outcomes, such as increased numbers of drug convictions and increased requests for mutual legal assistance cannot be empirically measured since baseline data was not gathered at the beginning of the project, and reliable statistics are not maintained in most countries.

3.2 Impacts

Everyone interviewed stated that despite problems that occurred during the project, it did have an impact in the six countries.

3.2.1 Regional Collaboration and Mutual Legal Assistance

The most significant impact of the project was an increase in the awareness of the importance of mutual collaboration in the fight against drugs. The Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee provided a forum in which high-level policy makers from the six subregional countries could discuss common problems and strategies and form relationships that have already allowed them to seek assistance from each other when drug cases transcend national boundaries.

Anecdotal information demonstrates success in several instances. In several high-profile drug cases, countries have cooperated together, resulting in successful arrests and seizures. For example, in the “Fiji Case,” traffickers and drugs were arrested and seized en route from Myanmar to Australia. Australia, Fiji, Myanmar, and Singapore all cooperated effectively together to carry out a successful prosecution. In the

“Andaman Sea Case,” mutual collaboration between Thailand and Myanmar also resulted in successful prosecutions.

In China, representatives from NNCC have traveled to Myanmar to interview suspects, gather evidence, and set up special drug tribunals. Representatives from CCDAC in Myanmar have similarly traveled to China to interview suspects, gather evidence, and establish adequate chains of custody to permit seized evidence to be admitted at trial in Myanmar.

3.2.2 New legislation

Assistance provided by LAG in Vienna was instrumental in developing and enacting drug-related legislation in Myanmar, Vietnam, and Cambodia. Strong, well-crafted laws are among the most effective weapons in the legal war against drugs, and assistance in legislative drafting contributed one of the most lasting impacts of the project.

3.3 Sustainability

Sustainability of the project was impacted by problems created by an overly-ambitious project document, limited and unreliable funding, and an initial lack of familiarity with many of the problems that turned out to impact the delivery of project outcomes. Although creating a permanent forum for addressing regional cooperation in the form of mutual legal assistance was a significant project outcome, there is no guarantee that the work of the Advisory Committee can or will continue unless it is incorporated permanently into the annual MOU meetings.

Unfortunately, sustainability of impact and results were compromised when the training component of the project was dropped. Increased awareness of common needs and issues was a necessary first step in a regional approach to addressing drug trafficking. However, increased awareness led to an increased desire for tools to implement the lessons that were learned. Unless judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials are trained to use in a practical way the abstract information and theories they received during the project, there will be no long-term gain. Seeds that were planted during C-74 will die in fallow ground.

The most consistent comment received during this evaluation was that the length of C-74 was too short and there must be follow-up work done to render sustainable work begun during the project.

4. LESSONS LEARNED

4.1 Lessons Learned

1. The principal lesson learned is that regional legal cooperation is a necessary and effective strategy in the transnational fight against drugs. Project participants immediately understood the usefulness of liaising with counterparts in other countries, and once they were provided a forum and

strategy for doing so, they began to work together on both a formal and informal basis on cross-border trafficking issues.

2. The original concept of C-74 was sound and valid and sought to fill an existing gap in UNODC's regional drug strategy. However, the Project Document did not adequately predict the significance of constraints that would turn out to impact the project. If a next phase of C-74 is implemented, a thorough Baseline Study should be carried out in consultation with local counterparts in each country to carefully analyze relevant existing situations and develop strategies most likely to be successful in each country.
3. While the overall goal of increasing the capacity of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials to secure convictions in drug cases is appropriate, the specific needs of each country in their efforts to meet that goal are very different. A generalized, cookie-cutter approach cannot successfully be implemented in all countries. For example, the greatest need in China is for assistance in drafting legislation to fill large legal loopholes that prevent successful prosecutions. In Cambodia, the level of knowledge and capacity of judicial sector officials is the greatest problem, and familiarization with and training on drug laws and prosecution procedures is seen as the greatest need. In Thailand, where the general level of capacity is higher than in other countries, specialized programs in such issues as maritime trafficking are requested.
4. Uncertainties and shortages in funding made it difficult to plan and carry out activities. Every effort to ensure adequacy of funding should be made prior to the beginning of the next project. A contingency plan for funding shortfalls should be developed. When activities must be cancelled due to funding shortages, as happened during C-74, project counterparts and participants often become disappointed and cynical.
5. Creating practical solutions for bridging the gaps between different legal systems is more complex than originally believed. This is especially true when working with law enforcement officials, who have little or no formal legal training and who are nevertheless responsible for much of the concrete footwork in drug cases. It is their field work that often has the greatest impact on issues such as the admissibility of evidence and the legality of detentions and statements, which in turn directly impact the ability of prosecutors to prosecute and judges to rule in criminal cases.
6. Governmental capacity and political realities have a great impact on the ability of a legal project to succeed. For example, in Cambodia, the stalemate in the National Assembly and unpredicted turnover in the Ministry of Justice impeded the passing of necessary legislation and the enactment of decrees. Project goals for each country should be sufficiently individualized and flexible to account for unforeseeable constraints such as these.

4.2 Best Practices

1. A useful lesson that emerged from C-74 was that regional projects have the benefit of providing and maintaining a wider perspective than national projects. Activities that promote regional information-sharing can be undertaken in regional projects when they would not necessarily be appropriate or possible as part of national projects. Also, in some situations, maintaining a regional mandate and scope is useful. For example, much of the funding for C-74 came from the United States, which prohibits funding of any activities in Myanmar. Because this was a regional project, funding from other sources could be used to support necessary activities in Myanmar.
2. Having said that, the impact of regional activities cannot be made sustainable in a region in which governments, laws, and official capacities vary as much as they do in this subregion unless individualized plans of action and concrete follow-up activities are carried out in each country. If appropriate concrete follow-up activities to utilize information learned in regional meetings and international study tours are not carried out in each country, a regional project such as C-74 runs the risk of being perceived as an excuse for expensive travel and meetings by a small group of elite participants. China set a good example in this regard by requiring that everyone who participated in C-74 activities plan training programs of their own after returning home so as to pass on information they learned from the project.
3. As part of a strategy to encourage and facilitate regional cooperation, utilizing regional expertise to equalize capacity should be explored. In this subregion, the level of expertise in Thailand and China is higher than in other countries. Providing representatives of these countries with Train the Trainers instruction and then allowing them to take over some of the capacity-building responsibilities in the region would have the additional benefit of providing another forum for regional collaboration and networking. However, sensitivities involved in placing one country in a hierarchical position over others would need to be taken into account.

4.3 Constraints

Constraints impacting the success of project objectives have been identified throughout this assessment. They include:

1. Differing levels of capacity in the six countries were more problematic than anticipated in the original Project Document. At times, it was difficult to plan activities and programs that were appropriate for everyone. ONCB in Thailand, for example, complained that some training programs, in which drugs were identified and their usage explained, were too simplistic, while LCDC in Laos was not prepared for the sophisticated level of other activities.
2. Governmental uncertainties and political constraints impeded the impact of the project in some countries. Cambodia was unable to move forward with some

activities because necessary legislation did not exist and the work of the National Assembly had come to a halt.

3. Accession to treaties and implementing legislation are not consistent in all countries. Cambodia and Laos are still not parties to the 1988 Convention.
4. The impact of the differences in the legal systems in the six MOU countries was underestimated. Although theoretical lectures on civil code, common law, and customary law were provided, counterparts are still at a loss as to how to bridge these differences. Until practical strategies are developed to work within the different legal systems or to facilitate legislative changes to relax some of the stricter legal requirements in some countries, this issue will continue to be problematic.
5. As discussed above, chronic underfunding of the project resulted in the need to cancel some project activities and re-structure project objectives and goals at a very late date.
6. The absence of baseline data and statistics made empirical measurement of project impacts impossible. With the possible exception of Thailand, reliable data and statistics are not kept in any of the six countries. It was therefore not possible to report on progress made on some indicators, such as changes in the numbers of drug prosecutions and convictions.
7. The failure to administer evaluations at the conclusion of training programs, which was foreseen in the Project Document, similarly made it impossible to evaluate the success of those programs and the degree to which levels of participants' knowledge and skills changed as a result of training programs.
8. Bare project staffing arrangements and the lack of a permanent contact person in each country often made it difficult to arrange and participate in project activities from the counterparts' point of view. There were complaints that activities were often scheduled at the last minute and without adequate notice, requiring that officials cancel their own work to participate in project activities.
9. Different languages spoken in each country was a significant constraint that had a large impact on the sustainability of the project. Fluency in English was a prerequisite for participating in project activities, and because there were rarely national follow-up activities after regional meetings and international study trips, program impact was almost always limited to a small number of highly-placed governmental officials who spoke English. Complaints were made that the same limited number of people participated in all meetings and trips. A number of participants complained that having to travel so much impeded their work schedules, and those who were not invited to participate because their language skills were insufficient complained that they felt left out of the project.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is a strong continued need for a legal component as part of UNODC's Subregional Action Plan. Unless legal institutions in this subregion are strengthened, drug-related legislation is improved, and the capacity of judicial sector participants is elevated, lasting improvements in drug control cannot be accomplished. Since the drug situation in this subregion has a demonstrable impact on drug problems in other parts of the world, including Europe and the United States, funds and efforts spent on strengthening the ability of law enforcement agencies and judicial sector officials in this region will bear fruit virtually everywhere else in the world. Work begun during C-74 should therefore continue so that momentum gained and lessons learned are not lost.
2. Every effort should be made to ensure that adequate funding is secured for any follow-up project undertaken.
3. A number of modifications to the project should be made.
4. An initial Baseline Study should be undertaken to adequately document the current legal and practical realities in each of the six MOU countries. In collaboration with local counterparts, local project activities appropriate and feasible in each country should be prioritized. Generalized region-wide activities, while useful to raise awareness of regional issues during the original phase of C-74, should be carried out on a more focused, strategic basis in the future.
5. Management and staffing structures should be reconfigured. Most national counterparts stated that having a project representative in each country on at least a part-time basis would facilitate the planning and implementation of project activities and make sure that follow-up activities and measurements are carried out. Under the direction of an overall Project Coordinator in Bangkok, possible staffing models might include:
 - Placing a national staff person in each country to serve as a facilitator/implementer for project activities;
 - Placing international mentors in each country, or rotating several mentors between the six countries. This is a model familiar to United Nations agencies since it used in many other projects. International mentors assist in coordinating activities in each country and are specifically tasked with building the capacity of local counterparts both in substantive legal areas and also in the management of project activities.
6. In order to avoid some of the problems associated with C-74, individualized country plans with proposed outputs and activities specific to each country and designed to bring each country to more equal levels should be included as part of the next project document. These country plans could be created in several ways:

- A consultant with expertise in project development could be retained to work with representatives of each country to develop individual workplans.
- A meeting of country representatives in positions to make binding recommendations as to workplans for their countries could be convened. This group may or may not be consist of the same people who comprise the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee. In small breakout groups, each country would be tasked with developing a national workplan. In a plenary session, all groups would present and discuss their workplans. A regional action plan consisting of the collected country plans would emerge as the product of this meeting.

Individualized country workplans would provide focus for necessary work in each country and avoid burdening countries with project activities not relevant to or needed by them.

7. In order to fulfill original project goals, which remain relevant, and to ensure sustainability of project activities, the training component of the project should be reinstated. All national counterparts state that the absence of concrete, practical, training programs utilizing case studies was the largest failing of the project. The capacity of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials cannot be raised unless they have the skills to utilize the theoretical knowledge they have been given. No measurable results will be seen toward the attainment of project goals and objectives unless members of law enforcement and the judicial sector are provided practical training.
8. A review of the Legislation Questionnaire, Training Needs Assessment, and Immediate Next Steps documents generated at the April 1999 meeting in Bangkok should be undertaken to determine the extent to which they are still relevant. These documents might be useful as part of the recommended Baseline Assessment.
9. Where appropriate, training programs should focus on how to implement domestic drug legislation and provide concrete, practical information on how to request and provide legal assistance from other countries.
10. In order to maximize sustainability of training activities, a Train the Trainers program should be provided to promising trainers identified in each country by national counterparts. Such a course should include principles of adult education, assessment of national training needs, setting concrete and realistic training goals and objectives, formulating lesson plans, utilizing effective training methodologies, and measuring the impact of training programs. Individual TOT programs could be given in each country, or one larger training program to which trainers from all countries are invited could be given. Such a program would do a great deal to maximize project sustainability.

In the long run, Train the Trainers programs would minimize the number of international training experts required and could assist in developing a

permanent base of core trainers suitable for long-term national training committees or institutions in each country. Training national trainers would also reduce many of the language problems associated with C-74. Local trainers could train local trainees in their own language. Only a small number of interpreters, if any, would be needed to provide translation for international experts or staff. If language were no longer a barrier in training, project information could be disseminated to a larger number of people in each country and the overall project impact would be exponentially higher.

11. Detailed, practical information relating to legal and evidentiary requirements in drug prosecutions for each country should be developed to assist law enforcement officials, prosecutors and judges who engage in mutual legal assistance. Specific information for each country might include:
 - Legal requirements/protections for detaining, arresting, and extraditing a suspect;
 - Legal requirements for interrogating a suspect;
 - Legal requirements for collecting and preserving evidence and maintaining any necessary chain of custody;
 - Legal requirements for detaining, questioning, and extraditing witnesses;
 - Legal requirements for seizing and forfeiting assets;
 - Any special legal provisions that relate to drug cases involving foreign nationals.

Such a handbook should provide ready-to-use information, checklists, and necessary forms for handling transnational drug-related crimes in each system. It should be distributed to all courts and law enforcement agencies in each country so that when evidence is seized or a suspect is arrested in a transnational case, judicial and law enforcement personnel can quickly, effectively, and legally take all necessary steps to gather and preserve evidence necessary to secure prosecutions in other countries. The handbook should also contain names and contact information for appropriate contact personnel in each country.

Although the Judicial and Prosecutorial Handbook developed during C-74 does contain some of this information, national counterparts stated that the handbook was too general and not specific enough to be of much use to them.

12. If the recommendation above is adopted, the continued usefulness of providing copies of the laws of each country relevant to drug prosecutions to all counterparts should be reconsidered. That recommendation, set forth in the original Project Document, might be overly burdensome and of limited value to practitioners if a practical handbook and checklists are developed.
13. Regional meetings and activities should be limited. They should address only policy and planning issues and not provide training or skill-building. Since national legislative and capacity-building issues are seen as paramount at this time, it is recommended that any expansion of the scope of the project be limited to countries or regions of strategic importance to the original six MOU

countries. Any expansion might be limited to including new countries in mutual legal assistance activities. While many lessons could doubtless be learned in countries and regions such as Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and the Philippines, elevating national legislation and local capacity to prosecute drug crimes and participate in mutual legal assistance in the countries of this subregion are currently more pressing issues.

14. If regional or international study trips are included, require that participants create and carry out a dissemination plan to pass on the training they receive to others in their country. This will maximize the impact of expensive regional and international activities.
15. Consider limiting study trips to countries in this region. A number of counterparts stated that it would be helpful for them to observe the practical day-to-day work of law enforcement and court personnel in the countries of this subregion now that they have had the opportunity to observe how mutual legal assistance is implemented in other, more distant regions of the world.
16. Develop realistic program objectives and measurable indicators of success. Make sure periodic evaluations are carried out so that needed program adjustments can be made in a timely manner. Because goals, objectives, and indicators changed during the course of C-74 and because ongoing measurement of impact was not undertaken, this terminal evaluation was somewhat difficult to carry out.
17. The Project Coordinator for the next phase should have specific and proven administrative, management, training, and capacity-building skills.
18. Continue the work of the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee. Make its work more focused and concrete and less symbolic.
19. Include Mutual Legal Assistance as an agenda item at future MOU country meetings.
20. Provide assistance to Laos and Cambodia to facilitate their accession to drug-related conventions.
21. Continue to provide assistance in upgrading domestic legislation to bring all countries into compliance with the 1988 Convention.

6. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Project C-74 was a valuable and necessary component of the overall Subregional Action Plan, and it was a partial success. Although inadequate funding, management issues, and an incomplete understanding of many of the issues and constraints faced in this region prevented the project from achieving all of its objectives, C-74 did make inroads in important areas. Most importantly, an awareness of regional issues of common importance was gained, forums and mechanisms to support mutual legal assistance were introduced, and organized

mutual legal assistance began to be utilized on both a formal and informal basis in UNODC's anti-drug efforts.

As is the case with all new projects, some activities were more successful than others. Valuable lessons were learned, and through trial and error, the actual situation and needs in each country were identified in more depth than they were at the start of the project.

Unless follow-up work is carried out, momentum gained during C-74 will be lost. National counterparts are unanimous in their desire to continue the work they began during the project. With some modifications, the project can move closer to achieving its objectives, make a sustainable impact in this subregion, and become a valuable component of UNODC's overall anti-drug strategy.

ANNEX A



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

Terminal Evaluation of the Subregional Project

Strengthening of Judicial and Prosecutorial Drug Control Capacity in East Asia (AD/RAS/97/C74)

Terms of Reference

BACKGROUND

Changing economic and social conditions in the subregion have led to a growing demand for illicit drugs and psychotropic substances. Trans-border trafficking is controlled by organizations whose members are located in any number of countries. Drug control legislation that meets domestic and subregional needs as well as international standards is a key requirement of international and national drug control programmes.

It is equally important to upgrade the standards of law implementation. Many persons in the subregion who have responsibilities for carrying out the judicial process have limited experience of, or training for, the application of the recently amended drug control laws. The prosecution of international traffickers gives rise to complex legal issues that require specific training to understand and address. The international aspect of drug trafficking and the corresponding need for cooperation is for many countries a new experience.

In the subregion, drug investigations are becoming more complex and enforcement officers are using new techniques to identify and prosecute trafficking

organizations. The drug control laws in the MOU countries have recently been amended or enacted. These changes are placing pressure upon the prosecution and judiciary to fully understand the problem of drug trafficking and the application of national legislation that has been designed to control the problem. It is important that judges and prosecutors have a common understanding of the evidentiary standards to be applied in drug prosecutions. Many judges and prosecutors have not received training in this area of the law and consequently there are often discrepancies with respect to the manner in which drug trafficking and related offences are prosecuted and adjudicated. Judges and prosecutors need to receive training in the law in order to professionally administer the drug legislation and meet the objectives of the national drug control plans.

A key ingredient of effective law enforcement in drug control is the ability of countries to cooperate and support each other's initiatives. The exchange of information between the countries of the subregion is currently limited; however, its level and importance can be expected to grow as drug enforcement agencies recognize the value of cooperation. Not all countries in the subregion have developed the necessary legal mechanisms to permit cooperation in drug control matters to take place. To overcome slow or negative responses there is a need for channels of communication and clearly defined legal procedures to enable cooperation to take place. Officers of the court need to be familiar with the procedures and standards to be applied. In most of the subregional countries training in this specialized area of law is insufficient.

Limited judicial and legal training in support of drug control has been provided to some of the six MOU countries. However, this has mainly been carried out on a bilateral basis that overlooks the importance of subregional cooperation. Training for judicial and other court officers in the specialized field of drug control is not available through other internationally sponsored projects.

The Subregional Action Plan for Drug Control, approved in May 1995 by the Governments of Cambodia, China, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam and by UNODC, encompasses eleven projects. Six of the eleven projects, including this one, comprise a programmatic initiative to develop the mechanisms and procedures required for the six countries to cooperate effectively in international drug investigations and prosecutions.

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

Immediate Objectives:

- To improve the capacity of judges and prosecutors regarding the application of national drug control legislation.
- To facilitate cooperation in matters of international requests for

assistance regarding drug or related investigations and prosecutions.

- To provide an ongoing mechanism for future collaboration in drug control.
- To develop and adopt new legislation, accessions to the UN Conventions.
- To develop the foundation of a system for mutual legal assistance in the subregion.

Main activities of the project

1.
 - a) Training workshops for judges and prosecutors, held in each country, to provide instruction on the rules of evidence, provisions of national drug control and related legislation and procedures for deciding upon mutual legal assistance requests. Depending upon the needs of each country other relevant topics such as asset seizure, controlled deliveries, money laundering, undercover operations, extradition may be part of the curriculum.
 - b) Seminars held in each country to discuss legal issues resulting from the application of national drug legislation and responding to requests for international cooperation. To include drafting of legal procedural guidelines for addressing requests for mutual legal assistance.
 - c) Drug control and related legislation of the six countries translated into English and distributed to each of the MOU countries.
 - d) Support for jurists, prosecutors and legal academics to attend relevant international seminars where issues of subregional Mutual Legal Assistance and other forms of international cooperation will be discussed.
 - e) Assistance to provide publications and specialist literature to establish or develop a reference library for the training institution in each country.
2.
 - a) Assessment of national capacity and identification of needs in each MOU country.
 - b) Selection of national institutions to develop and offer a drug control law training programme.
 - c) Development of a drug control legal training programme to meet each country's individual needs.
 - d) Provision of long and short term training and study attachments within the region or elsewhere to develop human resources relevant to individual country needs.

- e) Development of a specialized course of study for judges and prosecutors covering mutual legal assistance issues related to drug prosecutions
- 3.
- a) Establishment of a Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee comprising senior legal and law enforcement representatives from the MOU countries to identify the issues to be addressed to assist MOU countries with providing mutual legal assistance to one another.
 - b) Annual meetings of the Mutual Legal Assistance Advisory Committee to review the current standing of mutual legal assistance among the MOU countries and to make recommendations for improvements.
 - c) The provision of expert legal advice to those countries that undertake activities to increase their Mutual Legal Assistance capacity.
 - d) Subregional workshops to raise awareness and discuss procedural issues relating to the provision of mutual legal assistance in drug control matters between the MOU countries.

Evaluation Purposes

The purpose to this evaluation is to establish what the regional judicial project has achieved and if it has attained its objectives. The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project is meeting the needs of the beneficiary countries and whether the strategy and implementation arrangements are appropriate and the approach relevant to the needs of beneficiary countries and the expectations of the donors. Further is to determine whether resources are utilized efficiently to produce sustainable outcomes. What are the results achieved as a whole, in particular the outcomes and impact, in relation to the explicit or implicit objective(s) of the project.

The evaluation will focus on assessing the beneficiary countries experience of the project and their perspectives on the benefits received.

Evaluation Scope

In particular, the evaluation of the project will address:

1. The results achieved by the projects as a whole, in particular the outcomes, impact and sustainability.
2. The strategies and approaches applied.
3. The magnitude, scope and strategy of the projects in relation to the problem.
4. The extent to which the programme has contributed to the improvement of institutional and interdiction capacities to combat illicit drug trafficking in South East Asia.

5. The inter-relation of the project with other activities of the governments concerned as well as with assistance from bi-lateral donors;
6. The extent to which the assistance provided to separate countries contributes to improvement of drug control in the region as a whole;
7. The continued relevance of the main objectives when considering overall development of the drug problem.
8. The sustainability of results.
9. Unintended impacts of the programme, both positive and negative.
10. The effectiveness of project management and quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping of the projects by all parties concerned.
11. The roles and responsibilities of the various parties: the countries of Southeast Asia; other countries, including donor countries; UNODC; other parties.

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

DOCUMENTATION

The following documents are annexed to the TOR:

- Project summary
- Project document
- Project revision document
- Annual progress reports
- Terminal report
- Law Enforcement Programme evaluation report
- UNODC standard format and guidelines for evaluations
- Summary assessment questionnaire

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A study of relevant documents
2. Initial briefing by responsible UNODC staff at the Regional Center for East Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok

3. Interviews in the six countries with national officials, experts and other knowledgeable parties.

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

Performance Indicators:

- The evaluator will have prepared an evaluation methodology, questions and tools before going to the field that are acceptable to the Law Enforcement Adviser
- The evaluator will have produced a draft and final report in English of a quality acceptable to the UNODC Regional Centre and within the stipulated time frames and in accordance with provided report outline.

Qualifications of the evaluator:

The evaluator should have a minimum first degree or equivalent qualification and expertise in at least one of the following fields:

- Training in Law and Legal Affairs
- Judiciary expertise
- Law Enforcement
- Economics

In addition the following criteria should apply:

- extensive international legal expertise
- experience in conducting independent evaluations
- familiarity with drug control issues and legislation in Southeast Asia is an advantage
- knowledge of bilateral/multilateral technical cooperation, particularly in institution building in the field of legislation and drug control policies
- extensive knowledge in implementation of judicial projects
- fluent in the English language and excellent writing skills
- no direct involvement in the design, appraisal or implementation of the project

BRIEFING, CONSULTATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

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

EVALUATION REPORT AND FOLLOW-UP

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

The evaluator will submit the final report to the UNODC Regional Centre not later than three weeks. The report will contain findings, conclusions and recommendations as well as a recording of the lessons learned during the programme implementation. In addition the evaluator has to fill out and submit the summary assessment questionnaire.

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

WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE

Tentative work plan and timetable of the evaluation mission:

Evaluation mission planned for April-June 2004

Work plan for the evaluator: (22 working days)

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

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

2 days mission to Beijing

2 days mission to Yangon

2 days mission to Hanoi

2 days mission to Phnom Penh

2 days mission to Vientiane

3 days preparation of summary report in Bangkok

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

ANNEX B

The following people were interviewed during this evaluation:

Thailand:

Mr. Yngve Danling, Law Enforcement Advisor, UNODC; Mr. Fumio Ito, Associate Expert, UNODC; Ms. Arpaporn Chomcherngpat, Project Assistant, UNODC; Mr. Jeremy Douglas, UNODC; Mr. Tun Nay Soc, UNODC; Mr. Gerassimos Furlanos, Former Project Coordinator; Ms. Rebecca Miller, Project Officer; Mr. Kobgoon Chantavaro, Senior Legal Officer, Office of Narcotic Control Board, Thailand.

Laos:

Mr. Klaus Nyholm, UNODC Representative (Laos); Ms. Viengsamay Srithirath, Program Assistant; Mr. Viloun Silapany, Acting Director, Lao National Commission for Drug Control and Supervision; Mr. Sida Laukaphone, Director of Law Research Center, Ministry of Justice; Mr. Khamkong Outhane, People's Supreme Prosecutor; Mr. Chanthaly Doungvilay, Vientiane People's Court.

Cambodia:

Mr. Graham Shaw, Project Officer, UNODC (Cambodia); Mr. Sovann Tith, Project Officer; Pol. Gen. Khieu Sopheak, Secretary General, National Authority for Combating Drugs; Ngan Cham Roeun, Director, International Cooperation Department of NACD; Judge Kim Sathavy, Director, Royal School for Judges and Prosecutors, Mr. Em Hoy, Legal Department, NACD.

Myanmar:

Pol. Col Kham Awng, Head of Department, Central Committee for Drug Abuse Control; Pol. Col. Sit Aye, Director of International Relations, CCDAC; Pol. Col. Tin Maung Htay, Director, Law Enforcement, CCDAC; U May Din, Director, Office of the Attorney General; Pol. Lt. Col Wa Tin, Deputy Director, Law and Research, CCDAC; U Aung Ngwe, Divisional Justice, Yangon Division; U Khin Maung Oo, Deputy Director, Office of the Attorney General; Daw Khin Cho Cho, Assistant Director, Central Bank of Myanmar; Pol. Maj. Kyee Tin, CCDAC.

Vietnam:

Pol. Lt. Col Ta Duc Ninh, Senior Official, Planning General Division, Standing Office for Drug Control; Colonel Phan van Trinh, Deputy Head of Drug Crime Investigations, SODC; Bui Xuan Hieu, Head of International Cooperation and Project Management Division, SODC; Nguyen Thien Phu, Head of Anti-Drug Department, Police Academy; Tran Duc Hung, Deputy General Director, Vietnam Marine Police; Ms. Nguyen Thi Nga, Office of Supreme Prosecutor of Vietnam; Pol. Col. Nguyen Xuan Yem, Deputy General Director, SODC; Troels Vester and Nguyen Tuong Dzung, UNODC Programme Officers.

China:

Wei Xiao Jun, Division Director; Zhao Wan Peng, Deputy Division Director; Wang Zhan, International Cooperation Division; Gong Wan Lu, Anti-Smuggling Unit, Bureau of Customs; Wang Xiao Mu, Legislative Drafting Division, NNCCC.

ANNEX C

Terminal Assessment Questionnaire

1. What were your roles and responsibilities in the project “Strengthening of Judicial and Prosecutorial Drug Control Capacity in East Asia?”
2. Were the program’s objectives relevant to the drug problem in your country?
3. Were the project’s strategies, approaches and implementation arrangements appropriate and relevant to the needs of your country?
4. To what extent did the project meet the needs of your country?
5. Do you believe the project achieved its immediate objectives?
6. What overall impact did the project have in your country?
7. What results do you think were achieved by the project with respect to:
 - Strengthening the capacity of judges and prosecutors to apply drug control legislation?
 - Facilitating cooperation between countries in requests for assistance in drug-related investigations and prosecutions?
 - Providing an ongoing mechanism for future collaboration in drug control?
 - Developing and adopting new legislation and accessions to United Nations conventions?
 - Developing the foundation of a system of mutual legal assistance in the Greater Mekong Subregion?
8. Do you believe the project produced any sustainable outcomes? If so, what were they?
9. How did the project relate to other activities conducted by your government? To other projects underway in your country?
10. While this project was underway, was your country receiving bilateral assistance from other international donors?
11. If so, how did the project interact with the assistance provided by those donors?
12. To what extent did the assistance you received improve drug control in your country? In the Greater Mekong Subregion?
13. Did the project have any unintended impacts, either positive or negative? If so, what were they?

14. How effective was the project management?
15. Were the project's resources utilized efficiently and effectively?
16. Were monitoring and backstopping of the project by UNDCP timely and effective?
17. Were monitoring and backstopping of the project by your country timely and effective?
18. What was your overall experience with the project?
19. Did the project meet your expectations?
20. Is there still a need in your country for the type of assistance provided by the project?
21. If additional funding were to become available, would you be interested in continuing with the work of the project?
22. Please tell us any other thoughts or ideas you have about the project.

ANNEX D

Original Project Document Work Plan

Activities	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4
- Identification, selection and Contract of Institution to Coordinate the Project Activities.	X											
- Identify and arrange National Institution(s) to coordinate of National Activities		X	X									
- Needs analysis survey		X	X									
Activities for Output 2												
- Mutual Legal Advisory Committee appointment and annual meetings		X				X				X		
- Program and Curricula Design meetings		X	X									
- Subregional Mutual Legal Workshops			X				X				X	
- National Workshops, Thailand and Laos			X			X				X		
- National Workshops, China & Myanmar				X			X				X	

Train the Trainers course (China)	1999				2000				2001				2002				2003			
	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4
Evaluation: Year 1 and 3													X							
Fellowships (not envisioned in original workplan)								X ⁱⁱ		X ⁱⁱⁱ										
Assistance in development of laws (not in original workplan)								V M C		C M				C					M	M
Subregional seminars (not in original workplan)										X ^{iv}						X ^v				
Publications (not in original workplan)																X ^{vi}		X ^{vii}		
Twinning (not in original workplan)																X				

ⁱ Key: C(Cambodia), H(China), L(Laos), M(Myanmar), T(Thailand), V(Vietnam). Except where noted, the list of activities replicates the original workplan contained in the Project Document.

ⁱⁱ Fellowship to Malaysia.

ⁱⁱⁱ Fellowship to Balkans.

^{iv} Subregional seminar in Bangkok; theme of the seminar was maritime law and trafficking.

^v Subregional seminar in Phuket; purpose of the seminar was to identify legal issues that had been addressed during the life of the project and remaining issues still outstanding.

^{vi} Strengthening of Judicial and Prosecutorial Drug Control Capacity in East Asia” and “Drug Law Prosecution and Judicial Reference Handbook.”

^{vii} Booklet titled, “It’s the Law” published. 3,000 copies of “Drug Law Prosecution and Judicial Reference Handbook” published and distributed to counterparts in six MOU countries.
