



UNITED NATIONS
Office on Drugs and Crime

EVALUATION OF UNODC SUPPORT MECHANISMS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Independent Evaluation Unit

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

Evaluation of **UNODC Support Mechanisms** **for Technical Cooperation**

Independent Evaluation Unit



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2007

This report was prepared by John Mugabe, consultant (lead author), Backson Sibanda, team leader and Chief of the Independent Evaluation Unit, Dawn Del Rio and Marta Maranon, consultants, Roger Miranda, Evaluation Officer, and Fumika Ouchi, Evaluation Specialist.

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

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

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

A copy of this report can be found at www.unodc.org.
From the menu select: News and Publications/Publications/Evaluation.

Preface

This evaluation sets out to determine how far the provision of services and support has impacted the efficient and effective delivery of technical assistance. It is the most challenging evaluation that the Independent Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has undertaken in the last three years, largely because it touches on nearly all aspects of the work of UNODC. Further, it is the first time that the views of UNODC staff on the provision of services and support by other staff of the organization have been solicited, a fact that is bound to generate some heat. While this is not an evaluation of the performance of individuals or of UNODC entities, it can be viewed as threatening because it touches directly or indirectly on the efficiency and effectiveness of services and support provided by some UNODC entities to other UNODC entities that deliver assistance to Member States.

This evaluation was carried out through an interactive and participatory process. It reflects the views of all those who contributed their ideas, opinions, experiences and knowledge. As expected, those who receive services and support – and who are directly impacted by the provision of such service – were particularly vocal. Also as could be expected, the experiences are divergent and sometimes opposing and conflicting. It has been a great challenge to summarize and synthesize these views into a coherent message that helps the organization to strengthen its programme delivery, especially since it has been nearly impossible to reconcile the views of service providers with those of service receivers. The main purpose of this evaluation, however, is to identify specific ways of strengthening Support Mechanisms for Technical Cooperation (SMTc) in order to guarantee more efficient and effective operations of UNODC and its network of field offices as the main vehicles for delivering technical assistance to Member States.

I hope that this report does not polarize the house. Rather, it offers an opportunity for services and support providers to listen to their clients and for the recipients to appreciate some of the limitations and constraints imposed on providers by the complex system of rules and regulations of the United Nations. This report should offer an opportunity for “real-time” dialogue between the parties. As I release this report, I hope it goes some way in contributing to a more efficient and effective UNODC. Further, I hope that through this interactive process most people at UNODC have come to better appreciate the value that carrying out evaluations can bring to all our work. I hope this evaluation creates better understanding and not fewer friends of evaluation.

Backson Sibanda
Chief
Independent Evaluation Unit

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Preface.....	iii
Abbreviations and acronyms	vi
Executive summary	viii
Management Response	x
I. Introduction	1
A. Background	1
B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation	2
C. Evaluation methodology	2
D. Report structure	3
II. Overall context.....	3
A. Background and overview	3
B. Regional outlook and priorities	4
C. Strategic programme frameworks	9
D. Support mechanisms and institutions.....	10
III. Headquarters support mechanisms	10
A. Inter-divisional collaboration and backstopping	10
B. Strategic planning	11
C. Resource mobilization.....	11
D. Administrative support measures.....	12
E. General observations	12
IV. Major findings and analysis.....	12
A. Programmatic or substantive issues	12
B. Human resources, finance and IT issues	17
C. Analysis	22
V. Lessons learned and best practices	23
A. Substantive or technical considerations	23
B. Administrative arrangements	24
VI. Recommendations	25
VII. Conclusions	28
 Annexes	
I. SMTCT evaluation TOR	29
II. Results of field and headquarters surveys.....	37
III. Factors of technical cooperation delivery	44
IV. Summary of contract types in field offices	45
V. List of UNODC field offices	46
VI. List of persons interviewed	47

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACCORD	ASEAN and China Cooperative Operations in Response to Dangerous Drugs
AMES	Africa & the Middle East Section
AMLU	Anti-Money-Laundering Unit
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ATS	amphetamine-type stimulant
CARICC	Central Asia Regional Information and Coordination Centre
CAU	Coordination and Analysis Unit (ROCA)
COCOL	Country Office for Colombia
COIRA	Country Office for Iran
COMMIT	Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking
CONIG	Country Office for Nigeria
COPARMEX	Confederación Patronal de la Republica Mexicana
CPS	Co-financing and Partnership Section
DDR	Drug Demand Reduction
DM	Division for Management
DO	Division for Operations
DPA	Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs
DSR	drug supply reduction
DTA	Division for Treaty Affairs
ESAAMLG	Eastern and Southern African Anti-Money-Laundering Group
EU	European Union
EWCAS	Eastern Europe and West/Central Asia Section
FHAM	Fund for HIV and AIDS in Myanmar
FO	field office
FOINV	Field Office Inventory
FOML	Field Office Management Ledger
FOSI	Field Office Staff Information
FRMS	Financial Resources Management Section
GAP	Global Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse
GCS	Global Challenges Section
GPML	Global Programme against Money-Laundering
HRMS	Human Resources Management Service
HSB	Human Security Branch
ICT	information and communication technology
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
ITS	Information Technology Section
LACS	Latin America and the Caribbean Section
LAS	Legal Advisory Section
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
NGO	non-governmental organization
ODCCP	Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention

OIOS	Office of Internal Oversight Services
PAIB	Public Affairs and Inter-Agency Branch
PARB	Policy Analysis and Research Branch
PCM	Project Cycle Management
PDB	Partnership in Development Branch
PMU	Programme Management Unit
PPC	Programme and Project Committee
ProFi	Programme and Financial Management Information System
PSU	Programme Support Unit
RCEAP	Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific
ROBRA	Regional Office for Brazil and the South Cone
ROCA	Regional Office for Central Asia
ROEA	Regional Office for Eastern Africa
ROMENA	Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa
ROMEX	Regional Office for Mexico and Central America
ROSAF	Regional Office for Southern Africa
ROSEN	Regional Office for West and Central Africa
RPU	Recruitment and Placement Unit
ROSA	Regional Office for South Asia
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SEAPS	South/East Asia and the Pacific Section
SMTC	Support Mechanisms for Technical Cooperation
SPF	Strategic Programme Framework
SPU	Strategic Planning Unit
SSA	Special Service Agreement
TLAB	Treaty and Legal Affairs Branch
TOR	term of reference
TPB	Terrorism Prevention Branch
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNDCP	United Nations International Drug Control Programme
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFDAC	United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNON	United Nations Office at Nairobi
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UNOV	United Nations Office at Vienna
WHO	World Health Organization

Executive summary

In 2002, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) undertook an exercise to re-examine its operations and released a plan of action and guidelines. Since 2003, a number of operational priorities and guidelines have been developed to enable UNODC to pursue its priorities fully, rapidly and in an integrated manner. The guidelines are intended to provide guidance to UNODC governing bodies in relation to prioritizing action. The objectives of these efforts included improving governance, funding, operations, staff-management relations and communications. These were to be achieved in an efficient, coherent and credible manner. Such governance initiatives reflect the desire of UNODC to reorganize itself in order to increase its productivity and effectiveness.

This evaluation focuses on the administrative and substantive support mechanisms that UNODC currently has in place at headquarters and in field offices, as well as on the administrative support mechanisms provided by other organizations, including the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Office of Project Support. It is about ways of strengthening these mechanisms in order to guarantee a more efficient and effective delivery system of technical cooperation. Support mechanisms include, but are not limited to, headquarter substantive backstopping, management, strategic planning, information and communication technology, and financial and human resources services.

The evaluation examines UNODC structures and mechanisms, including the way in which the organization's systems, strategies, practices and procedures affect the implementation of technical cooperation initiatives. It is expected that the evaluation will contribute to improving organization within UNODC. In addition, the evaluation assesses the effectiveness, efficiency and quality of UNODC initiatives beginning in 2004 with a view to drawing lessons learned and best practices that can be used to improve organizational operations, as well as to make recommendations for concluded, ongoing and new initiatives. The evaluation also identifies priorities for consideration.

Major findings

The key findings are organized into the following four clusters:

- Organizational structure and the role of field offices
- Coherent strategy for mobilizing and managing human and financial resources for the efficient operation of field offices
- Ability and flexibility to learn and adjust
- Building the human resources base of field offices

The evaluation established that the current structure of UNODC does not really accommodate the evolution, operations and growth of field offices. Field offices tend to operate as add-ons to the organization and seem to have evolved much outside the organization and overall culture of UNODC headquarters.

UNODC does not have a coherent strategy for supporting field offices to develop projects and raise funds for their implementation. Divisions and field offices within the organization tend to compete for funds from the same group of donors. There is a lack of synergy between the fund-raising efforts of the field offices and those of headquarters.

Most of the field offices have "survived" because they have been innovative and responsive to some of the constraints to their operations. However, headquarters bureaucracy has not always supported these innovations.

UNODC does not have a strategy for building the human resources base of its field offices. Field offices and Human Resources Management Section have not really identified long-term staffing needs, nor have they put in place a strategy for acquiring and retaining the best available expertise. Human Resources Management Section has not provided the necessary leadership, guidance and support to field offices to

ensure that their staffing needs are met. Staffing is managed on an ad hoc basis around short-term needs without a long-term focus.

Financial Resources Management Section (FRMS) and Information Technology Section (ITS) have been proactively engaged in identifying the needs of field offices, ensuring that they have the necessary systems and staff in place. FRMS and ITS approaches to backstopping field offices can be considered as best practices in UNODC since they have been responsive to the needs of field offices.

Recommendations

This evaluation has identified a number of recommendations. The following are some of the issues addressed by the recommendations:

- Review and reform UNODC organizational communication and coordination mechanisms.
- Streamline responsibilities and accountability between field offices and headquarters.
- Management to urgently take decision and clarify the roles and responsibilities of Human Security Branch and the field offices in relation to the implementation of projects and provisions of technical expertise to Member States. Management should also consider clarifying the roles and responsibilities of other UNODC entities that are impacted by this evaluation.
- Review field offices' staffing needs and design a long-term capacity-building strategy.
- Design a comprehensive strategy for fund-raising that secures stable and predictable funding in support of field offices as the major vehicle by which UNODC delivers technical assistance to Member States. Further, provide training and seed money to field staff to enable them to fund-raise more efficiently.

Conclusion

The evaluation concludes that there is a need to decentralize decision-making authority to field offices and to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the field offices and headquarters.

27 March 2007

Management Response to the Evaluation of UNODC Support Mechanisms for Technical Cooperation

A missed opportunity

1. The management of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in March 2007 reviewed the evaluation report that was submitted by the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the UNODC. The report contains ten findings and associated recommendations. Following careful review of the report, the UNODC management provided detailed comments on the conclusions herein, suggesting that it contained methodological and contextual flaws, as well as weaknesses related to inaccuracies and misinterpretation of information.
2. Concerning a number of findings, UNODC management agrees and accepts IEU's recommendations; specifically findings 1, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. On these six findings and recommendations UNODC management is committed to implementing the recommendations within available resources. However, with respect to findings 2, 3, 4 and 5, UNODC management is of the opinion that not only did the IEU develop its conclusions on a systematically inadequate basis, it also failed to provide constructive and useful recommendations for management to act upon.
3. Indeed, UNODC management believes that the tone and substance of many findings are antagonistic rather than constructive. While respecting the independence of the IEU, its effectiveness – and that of UNODC as a whole – would be improved by a culture of providing lessons learned, sober reflection and strengthening institutional memory rather than passing prosecutor-like judgement.
4. In the past, UNODC has learned and will continue to learn from commentaries provided by independent bodies. We hope that the IEU will equally learn from UNODC's efforts to improve itself. We are bound together not by a student/teacher relationship or even worse by a prosecutor/defendant pattern. To the contrary, while respecting each other's independence, it is necessary that we learn from each other through a constructive relationship. Otherwise such reports are a missed opportunity.

Regarding management issues (Human Resources Management Service)

5. The report on the evaluation of UNODC's support mechanism for technical cooperation was submitted to the Division for Management for its review and comments. On 15 December 2006 the Director for Management provided detailed comments on the report to the Chief of the Independent Evaluation Unit, suggesting that the report lacked context and benchmarks, failed to reflect the impact of resource constraints, contained inaccuracies, mistakes of fact and misinterpretation of many human resources principles. Unfortunately, the present version still contains many of these weaknesses, which is

why the previously provided comments are reiterated below so as to put the SMTCT evaluation into a proper perspective.

6. The SMTCT report's biggest problem is of a methodological nature: The evaluation - at least as far as human resources management is concerned - is not analytical, but impressionistic.¹ The report is silent on the nature of the questionnaires, how many were sent & to whom, and what the rate of return was & from whom. Polling is OK, but care must be taken - and evidenced - that it is representative, reflective of proper accountability and not, on the one hand, a mere popularity contest or, on the other, an impressionistic gauging of staff members' mood. Specifically, we are not reassured that only staff under HRMS's purview have provided feedback on HRMS's performance; nor, incidentally, is there much evidence in the report as regards a proper understanding of the reality, as opposed to desirability, of HRMS's resources and mandate vis-à-vis field offices. Annex II is no help in this regard, unfortunately, as it is incomprehensible and the numbers not explained. Further, the SMTCT report takes the current number and location of field offices as a given, without considering that some of the problems observed might derive from the circumstance that we are spread rather thinly and that UNODC's field offices differ vastly in the size of their portfolios, both actual and potential. The status quo, for a number of reasons, is not tenable, and we are in the process of addressing it. Unfortunately, the SMTCT report will not be very useful in this effort because, rather than basing the assessment on the existing legal framework and taking into account the specific historical background as well as financial realities, the report ignores all of this, builds up a straw man and then proceeds to knock it down.

7. It is not evident from the report if the evaluators appreciate the difference between staff and project personnel as well as between the specific roles of HRMS, UNDP, UNOPS and Field Representatives in the recruitment and administration of staff and other personnel (e.g. consultants, contractors, local support staff; for details please see paragraphs 7 through 14 below). All is mixed up, there is no evident organizing principle or explicit analytical framework. It is never indicated if a perceived problem is UNODC-specific and amenable to management intervention, or if it is systemic and thus outside the purview of UNODC. The attempt at background (paragraphs 20 - 60) points in the right direction, yet falls short because it does not systematically include relevant data. For instance, there is no uniformity - or logic - in the provided information on budgets (programme vs. support) and staffing (failing to disaggregate the various kinds of personnel: international & local; professional & others as well as project staff). Lacking is also historical depth to show trends as well as correlations between staffing levels and portfolio size. In short, rather than a descriptive snap-shot, a meaningful evaluation would have to be considerably more analytical, contextual & historical. The accuracy of statements of polled or interviewed persons is neither properly attributed nor examined, verified or contextualized and, therefore, of dubious quality.² Some persons were only "met"

¹ Examples abound of unverifiable assertions, such as:

"... there are concerns that HRMS is not as efficient as it should be. For example, according to DO [who precisely?] there are often unnecessary delays [by what standard or benchmark?] and inflexibility in the recruitment of staff and consultants for funded projects." (paragraph 74 of the SMTCT report), a statement contradicted by: "The FOs view this service [i.e. the recruitment and management of international staff] to be of good quality." (paragraph 103 of the SMTCT report).

"HRMS does not know the exact number of field staff." (paragraph 92 of the SMTCT report). HRMS knows exactly the number of field staff, for which it is responsible, and even of other personnel, even though it has no respective mandate, which is that of the respective Field Offices and the Division for Operations.

² There is consensus [among whom? Delegates, Headquarters staff, Security Officers?] that UNODC divisions are organized and operate without adequate collaboration and backstopping." (paragraph 67 of the SMTCT report).

"There is general consensus [among whom?] that UNODC lacks an overall institutional strategy." (paragraph 75 of the SMTCT report).

"There is consensus [among whom?] that coordination, communication and dissemination of

(Annex VI of the SMT report), such as the Director for Management, who was visited once for a courtesy call, yet inexplicably never interviewed or systematically questioned. The UNODC Representative in India (ROSA), was not even “met,” despite his office’s prominence in the report. His comments are appended to the present management response (appendix I, page 11).

8. The following comments mainly refer to the HR aspects of the SMT report (i.e. paragraphs 99 - 112). At the outset, it is important to understand the role played by HRMS in the recruitment and administration of UNODC staff. The terms of reference attributed to HRMS are inaccurate and misleading.³ To clarify: The Personnel Service of UNOV was set up with the creation of UNOV to provide services to all UN Secretariat offices and units based in Vienna. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 45/179 of 21 December 1990, the Secretary-General approved the structure of United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) and in 1993 the Secretariat promulgated an administrative instruction, through which the Personnel Service of UNOV was called upon to recruit and administer staff of the Programme.⁴ The Programme Support Section of UNDCP was responsible for liaising with the Personnel Service of UNOV with regard to actions for UNDCP staff. In 1993 the UNDCP field presence comprised 16 field offices with a total of 35 international staff and 62 local staff. Today the number of staff has grown to 791 in 21 offices, with HRMS being tasked to recruit and administer 75 international staff under UN Secretariat human resources policies. There has been a significant expansion in the operations of UNODC in 13 years without the requisite increase in support resources. UNODC has gone from being headquarters-based to field-based. HRMS continues to be responsible for 950 payrolled staff in Vienna (including 75 UNODC staff in the field). Personnel arrangements established between UNDCP and UNDP (and most recently UNOPS) remain in force for the recruitment and administration of field based staff.

9. The management of human resources at UNOV/UNODC is based on the Staff Regulations and Rules, the various Secretary-General bulletins, administrative instructions and related guidelines issued by the Office of Human Resources Management (OHRM). As stipulated in the “Delegation of authority in the area of Human Resources Management to the United Nations Office at Vienna,” dated 3 April 1995, the Assistant Secretary-General informed UNOV that OHRM would retain the central role of developing “new policies and practices to meet the changing needs of the Organization in planning for the future, performance and career management, gender balance, and policy setting.” Consequently, the role of HRMS has been - and is - to apply to staff holding United Nations Secretariat letters of appointment all pertinent HR policies.

10. With specific reference to the assessment of HRMS, below are detailed comments, which highlight the inaccuracies, misrepresentations and mistakes contained in the report.

information at headquarters and between headquarters and FOs need improvement, but disagreement as to the best mechanism to improve coordination.” (paragraph 76 of the SMT report). This may well be so, but the SMT report neither pursues this point nor entails workable - indeed any - remedial suggestions.

“There is disagreement [among whom?] as to the source of the administrative problems associated with human resource planning and recruitment.” (paragraph 77 of the SMT report). Ditto.

³ **“HRMS is responsible for overall policy formulation on human resources management and provides relevant services to managers. HRMS further provides the following specific services: recruitment and placement, staff administration, staff development, staff assistance and human resources tools such as links to Galaxy and e-PAS etc.”** (paragraph 16 of the SMT report).

⁴ **“Personnel Arrangements for the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP)”** (ST/AI/388 of 14 September 1993)

Recruitment and Staffing through HRMS

11. HRMS recruits and administers staff members working at UNOV/UNODC in Vienna, either under 100, 200 or 300 Series of United Nations Staff Regulations and Rules. HRMS engages non-staff members through individual contractor and consultant agreements. The Service also recruits staff working in field offices under 100 series and project staff under 200 series. It is important to note that of the approximately 500 staff directly recruited and administered by HRMS for service with UNODC, only 75 are based in the UNODC Field Offices.
12. The guiding employment principles of the United Nations Secretariat are contained in the administrative instruction on the Staff Selection System (ST/AI/2002/4 of 23 April 2002, latterly ST/AI/2006/3 of 15 November 2006). Selection decisions for staff recruited through HRMS are approved by the Executive Director on the recommendation of respective programme managers, who also decide on the composition of interview panels. In December 2006, at the initiative of HRMS, recruitment of international project staff was decentralized to the field offices.

Recruitment and Staffing through UNDP (paragraph 123 of the SMTCT report)

13. All local personnel on Service Contracts and Special Service Agreements (SSAs), consultants, local staff members under 100 Series of the Staff Rules or under 300 Series (UNDP's Activities of Limited Duration) are recruited and administrated by UNDP within the framework of the Working Agreement between UNODC and UNDP. The majority of the local personnel working for projects are recruited under Service Contracts or Special Service Agreements. Personnel on Service Contracts and Special Service Agreements are individual consultants or consultants and their benefits are strictly those expressly provided in their contracts. UNDP's services are reimbursed.
14. All local recruitment is delegated to Field Representatives, who are responsible for determining terms of reference, job descriptions, the composition of interview panels, classification decisions for established posts (not SSAs or Service Contracts), selection of personnel etc., performance management, etc. Field Representatives do not report to HRMS or the Division for Operations on such recruitments undertaken through UNDP.

Recruitment and Staffing through UNOPS (paragraph 127 of the SMTCT report)

15. Field Representatives also go through UNOPS directly to recruit staff on 200 series of appointments, actions which are not reported either to HRMS or to the Division for Operations. Thus, to emphasize, such recruitment is carried out without any HRMS involvement. Nevertheless, HRMS does provide advice to Field Representatives to resolve complex and/or problematic cases. In the recent past, for example, such assistance, for which HRMS is neither mandated nor resourced, was provided to Field Offices in Myanmar, Vietnam, Nigeria, Barbados, South Africa and India to name but a few. Such services are well documented and provided on a regular basis, contrary to what is specified in the report, which is why their omission in the SMTCT report is inexplicable.

Delays in Recruitment (paragraph 109 of the SMTCT report)

16. HRMS is one of the very few offices which has met the Secretary-General's guideline to fill vacancies within 120 days (despite short notice periods and lack of proper documentation). In 2006, UNOV/UNODC was one of only four Departments in the Secretariat who received a satisfactory indicator in the assessment of the DG/ED's compact with the Secretary-General on meeting the targets of the Human Resource Action Plan. Having said this, it is a truism that human resources management is a shared responsibility between Programme Managers, who have ultimate accountability, and HRMS, with the latter's role consisting of guiding, supporting and monitoring.⁵ The SMTCT report, while conceding that HRMS often receives recruitment requests on short notice, is one-sided and fails throughout to address, let alone analyze, the role of the Programme Managers in managing human resources, the funding constraints, the frequent short

⁵ In this connection, the specific case mentioned in paragraph 109 is particularly illustrative, because it was put on hold, not by HRMS but by the Division for Operations (Mr. Haeussermann's eMail of 5 April 2006 refers), a circumstance not to be gleaned from the tendentious presentation in the SMTCT report.

notice that HRMS receives for recruitment of staff and the many instances in which recruitment requests are incomplete. As is evident from the vacancy monitoring table, Programme Managers can take months even to short-list candidates but thereafter, once the case reaches HRMS, expectations are very high to complete the process immediately, without taking into account the time for administrative formalities, including reference checks, medical clearance, release of candidates, etc. As regards the Independent Evaluation Unit, not to put too fine a point on it, all too often requests for consultant recruitments or contract modifications are received with only a few days' notice or even ex post facto, which is against the UN rules (detailed records are available to substantiate this claim). Nevertheless, accelerating and streamlining the recruitment has long been a concern for HRMS. Requests to Programme Managers to provide quarterly or semi-annual recruitment plans to allow for more orderly scheduling and processing have only recently begun to bear fruit. This is something that will be forcefully pursued.

Inconsistencies in types of contracts and benefits, job security (paragraph 108 of the SMT report)

17. Five types of contractual modalities are being used to recruit personnel for UNODC. These were developed by the United Nations and UNDP precisely to meet their operational needs, including at the field level, taking into account the project-funding situation.⁶

18. There is no doubt that inconsistencies exist in benefits and entitlements due to the use of these varying contractual types. This, together with the resulting problems of morale, has been highlighted in the various mission reports of the Chief of HRMS. However, this is an Organization-wide problem, which cannot be resolved locally. At the risk of appearing immodest, but not least because of the arguments advanced by UNODC, harmonization of working conditions is a central component in the Secretary-General's reform agenda (cf. paragraph 31, proposal 4, page 19 of *Investing in the United Nations: For a stronger Organization worldwide* (A/60/692 of 7 March 2006)).

Length of Contracts (paragraph 99 of the SMT report)

19. There is no doubt that short-term contracts in the field as well as one-year only contract extensions everywhere have created morale problems as well as anxiety about job security. It must be understood, though, that this is not an HRMS initiative or problem, but the unfortunate result of a shortage of General Purpose Fund income. In fact, HRMS serves as a lightning rod for a problem it cannot influence, let alone resolve. In Field Offices, the respective Representative determines the duration of contracts for project and local personnel.

Training and staff development issues (paragraphs 101 and 105 of the SMT report)

20. The only source of training funds is the regular budget, which is sub-allotted by OHRM. By a General Assembly resolution, these resources are exclusively usable for staff members on posts financed through regular budget. For staff in Vienna, HRMS has, found creative ways of expanding training opportunities by providing lunch-time forums, job-shadowing, self-study resources through on-line learning and CD-ROMs, etc., in addition to providing training in substantive and technical skills, team-based training, centrally run programmes, etc. Field staff are invited and participate in training in conjunction with their missions to Vienna. HRMS was also able to organize the participation of annual Field Representatives in leadership development programmes held in various duty stations including Vienna in 2005 and 2006 and a management development programme held in Vienna in October 2006. For the past four years, learning events have been organized in conjunction with the Field Representative Seminars. National staff have also travelled to Vienna to undertake training in personnel policies and practices and training has also been provided on human resource matters during the missions of the Chief of HRMS. HRMS has also funded the services of a staff member who provides ProFi training to field staff. However, it is impractical to think that training of local personnel recruited by UNDP or UNOPS can be

⁶ The evaluators lack of understanding is nicely illustrated by the following sentence: “**Also, the four existing categories (international staff, fixed-term, service contracts and SSAs) create the impression that there are different categories of staff members.**” (paragraph 108 of the SMT report). Here, staff members are confusingly collapsed with project personnel and contractual instruments.

driven from Headquarters Vienna without any dedicated resources.

21. Assuming that the funding situation will improve, HRMS will of course recommend that provision be made in the UNODC budget for training for field staff. Training programmes for national staff should be harmonized with other United Nations Agencies at the local level and with UNDP and UNOPS who provide services to UNODC. In this context, it should be noted that HRMS has asked UNDP to allow UNODC personnel recruited through them to participate in UNDP training programmes and has actually organized this for staff in various field offices.

Consultancy Roster (paragraph 112 of the SMT report)

22. In A/RES/53/221 of 23 April 1999 the General Assembly endorsed the report of the Secretary-General on comprehensive guidelines for the use of consultants in the Secretariat (A/53/385). This report requested the Secretary-General to circulate the revised guidelines as a matter of priority, throughout the Secretariat, with a view to ensuring full compliance. Emanating from this report was the requirement to establish a computerized candidate roster to ensure that consultants are contracted in an objective, transparent and cost-effective manner. The Secretary-General's report called for the roster to be maintained on the basis of up-to-date skills data provided by user departments. "To ensure selection of consultants on a more competitive basis, departments and offices are required to consider several qualified candidates for each assignment. In the rare cases of *force majeure*, a single candidate may be engaged on an exceptional basis, but a reasoned and documented justification should be recorded before his or her selection." (A/53/385).

23. In conformity with the above and taking into account the External Auditors' recommendation in 2001, in coordination with the Programme Managers of UNOV/UNODC and the Information Technology Service, HRMS developed the HR Roster database in October 2001. The Roster contains summary information of prospective external candidates interested in consultancy and individual contractor work, as well as short-term or temporary work opportunities with UNOV and UNODC.

24. The purpose of the Roster is to provide a resource for Programme Managers to assist in identifying prospective candidates for review/selection for temporary work (SLWOP, mission/maternity leave replacements or for outside expertise). Each substantive office was requested to designate focal point(s) for inputting/updating data in the Roster. The Roster contains comprehensive guidelines, help features and a downloadable presentation on its launch.

25. HRMS conducted an orientation session for the designated focal points beginning January 2002. All focal points were briefed that they will be responsible for updating and maintaining the summary information of the candidates in the Roster database. Since last year, Field Offices were given access to the Roster and this exercise was completed in March 2006 (with Pakistan being the last field office due to server upgrading).

26. In the last two years the template of the HRMS developed roster has been shared with other departments of the UN Secretariat as a best practice.

Serious communication problems, how staff members view HRMS, "Throwing the book" (paragraph 112 of the SMT report)

27. HRMS's role is that of implementing policies approved by the legislative bodies, taking into account local needs and facilitating HR management. Whilst HRMS has to adhere to the United Nations Staff Regulations and Rules, with exceptions to the staff rules being approved by OHRM, it has endeavoured to do this with maximum flexibility, and the SMT report does not entail a single documented and verifiable example to the contrary. To cite only one example of HRMS's proactive and creative support to Field Offices, the Service has worked with OHRM to establish special conditions of service arrangements for UNODC staff working in Afghanistan under very difficult conditions.

28. HRMS would welcome the opportunity for its staff to travel to field offices as part of its outreach activities. However, funding for this is a severe constraint. It should be noted that, where funding was

made available, the Chief of HRMS travelled to Afghanistan, Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar, and India, and received excellent feedback from those duty stations. The related mission reports clearly indicate that a number of local difficulties, including complex problem cases, were resolved on the spot as a result of the Chief's presence at the duty station. The opportunity was also taken to visit UNDP field offices during these missions. The evaluation team was informed of the Chief's travel.

29. Since it has not been possible for HRMS staff to travel to all field offices, the Chief of HRMS has made it a policy to conduct regular telephone calls or send e-mail messages to field offices to discuss ongoing issues and address the concerns of field staff. The evaluators may also have been unaware that the Chief, HRMS, and the Chief of the Recruitment and Placement Unit have, in practical terms, been "on call" to staff from other duty stations on a 24-hour, seven-day a week basis and have unfailingly made themselves available to the many staff members who approached them in this way.

30. It is not clear on what basis the report indicates that HRMS does not provide briefing on rules and regulations. Apart from individual briefings of staff, orientation programmes are run regularly in Vienna for all new staff, regardless of funding. HRMS has also invited staff at large to spend a week in HRMS to learn about application of various systems, policies and procedures. Only three offices (Office of the Executive Director/Director-General, OOSA and Security Service) have taken up this offer. Mini-workshops, town hall meetings, Messages of the Day, etc. are provided to explain personnel policies and practices. The concern has been one of participation of managers to such events or release of their respective staff members rather than one of organizing briefing sessions. For example, in the Orientation Programme scheduled for 11 December 2006, only 50% of new staff members responded to HRMS's invitation to participate.

Lack of coherent strategy for mobilizing and managing human and financial resources (paragraph 129 of the SMT report)

31. A key finding of the report is that "*FOs and HRMS have not really identified long-term staffing needs nor put in place a strategy for acquiring and retaining the best available expertise.*" This is an arguable point, and would have merited serious analysis as well as references to benchmarks and best practices elsewhere in the United Nations family, taking into consideration an unpredictable and unstable funding situation. It is, of course, in the interest of UNODC generally and of the Division for Management specifically, to move away from the *ad hoc* management of staffing towards a more strategic, long-term focus. Also, while acknowledging that there is room for improvement in any Service, HRMS would be in a much better position to reply to accusations of poor responsiveness as well as lack of client focus, and to address these ostensible shortcomings, if there were specificity & documentary evidence of them. Much of the criticism in the report is vague and general, and/or focuses on issues where HRMS has no impact and no authority. As a number of the conclusions made regarding personnel policies and practices are inaccurate, greater efforts could have been made to research and understand types of contracts and policy issues and clarify any obscure aspects before jumping to unwarranted conclusions. The draft report's thrust is also at variance with the assessment of the Vienna Staff Council which, in its annual reports has repeatedly commended HRMS for its client-focused services. As it stands, the SMT report, regrettably, is of little help in improving the services HRMS provides.

32. By way of conclusion: The SMT report, in large parts, does not follow or live up to its own terms of reference (reproduced as Annex I). Despite considerable human and financial resources invested in it, the result is disappointing, marred by glaring misunderstandings, misrepresentations and misinterpretations. To redress the erroneous picture painted by the SMT report, we would welcome it if the services provided by HRMS were evaluated properly and factually by professionals with the requisite background and knowledge.

Regarding Treaty Affairs matters (Terrorism Prevention Branch)

33. Whereas the Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB) fully welcomes and will be pleased to implement further organizational and institutional step to better articulate the role and relationship between TPB and field offices, the report does not mention, take into account and is not informed by the various steps that the Branch has already taken in the past in this regard. These steps include:

34. In May 2005, the Director of Operations and the Director of Treaty Affairs wrote a joint letter to all Field Representatives, in which they explained the work of UNODC and TPB in counter-terrorism, the role and contributions of the UNODC field offices in support of this work and the procedures to be followed.

35. TPB's Global Project document, accessible in the Profi, spells out the objectives and activities of UNODC's technical assistance in counter-terrorism. It also contains a segment on project implementation strategy, which spells out the role of TPB and the field offices.

36. TPB conducts on-going, regular consultations with and draws on the regional offices in planning and implementing its project activities, including the provision of project sub-allotments, where relevant. Formal communications to Member States are routinely copied to the field offices.

37. Since 2004, TPB has worked closely with the UNODC regional offices in Bangkok, Cairo, Dakar, Nairobi, Pretoria and Tashkent and have established mutually agreed upon regional subcomponents and work plans for the Global Project. Missions have been undertaken to the offices in Bangkok, Cairo, Dakar, Nairobi and Pretoria to brief the UNODC Regional Representative and the concerned staff on the project's operational approaches, discuss the regional components and work plans and agree on implementation arrangements.

38. To enhance field orientation and to build-up field-based counter-terrorism legal expertise, TPB has placed field experts in strategic locations. In countries where a UNODC office exists, the experts are placed in the UNODC office, under the direct supervision of the UNODC Representative. This is/will be the case in Bangkok, Cairo, Dakar, Egypt, Mexico, Nairobi and Tashkent.

39. It is also disappointing that the report does not review for consideration as good practices none of the several measures that TPB has taken for efficient technical assistance delivery, which have received appreciation from recipient and donor countries, such as the elaboration of technical assistance tools and publications, the placement of field experts or the specialized substantive briefings for TPB field experts and staff, held annually for the last four years.

Appendix 1 – Comments by the UNODC Representative in India

Mail sent by Mr. Gary Lewis to Mr. Backson Sibanda and UNODC senior management Thursday, 11 January 2007:

“Dear Backson,

Thanks for sending us the SMT Report for review and comments. The timing of its arrival was a little unfortunate since the deadline given for comments -- 15 December -- coincided exactly with the deadline for finalizing all our expenditure requests to UNDP. Naturally, the latter took priority. Thus, the reading of the IEU's report had to compete with the activities of the holiday period. Perhaps understandably, the latter took priority again. This is my poor excuse for not having provided comments earlier. I hope the ones I give below are not too late to be considered along with the others which you may have received.

I enjoyed reading the fresh look which the report gives on a number of long-standing issues. Having worked in UNODC for almost a decade and a half, it was interesting to see how little some of the what we thought were critical problems back in the mid-1990s have not diminished as concerns. If I may be permitted, I would say that the organization -- as a whole -- has improved in terms of internal systems and control mechanisms when compared with what existed earlier. And your report, to some extent, captures this. As a body of internal investigation, therefore, it offers much food for thought and I hope its findings will be discussed in the appropriate forums.

There is, however, one area where I disagree strongly with its conclusions. This pertains to the observations on HRMS. Although you may plausibly say that your report's writers were simply reflecting views from the field, I would have expected a greater degree of perspicacity, taking everything into consideration. I would therefore like to offer a perspective from this office on the work of HRMS which does not seem to have found a voice in your report, even though we were one of the offices visited by your consultants.

When I say above that our systems and controls have improved overall from what they were a decade ago, I feel strongly that this includes HRMS as well. I cannot comment on what other field offices are reported to have said to your consultants, but I would like to state for the record that we get prompt, inclusive and effective support from our colleagues in HRMS.

Your report's critique of HRMS appears aimed at two levels: the routine and the strategic.

Routine: On day-to-day support, for each of the examples you cite of HRMS's reported slowness and implied officiousness, I can cite counter examples of proactive, clear, accurate and collegial guidance. Your report says that "FO staff say that everything in HRMS takes forever". That's a pretty sweeping statement. From personal experience, I have found the Staff Administration Unit, for example, to be one of the most efficient operations in HQ in terms of timeliness and quality of response. But even if there are delays, we should not misinterpret proper procedure for sloppy attention to timelines. Since all ROSA staff (except me) are local/regional recruits, we handle much of our own personnel action here, and I can tell you that when we are in full control at the field level, things do not move at lightning speed either. And maybe this is not such a bad thing. Long experience has taught me that cutting corners on personnel action in the interests of speed usually causes more problems in the long run. You speak of "salary disparities and hiring practices" at the field level. In my opinion, responsibility for standardization in the duty station lies in the hands of the UNODC Representative who ultimately determines the level of salary to be paid in accordance with the locally-assigned (by UNDP) benchmark scales. It is not an HRMS issue. I smiled when I read your observations on the perennial favourite whipping boy of ideas, the Consultants Roster. I cannot recall the number of times this idea has been floated, usually to be accompanied by the notion that "at the click of a button" we will have access to the world's finest human resources. Well, this notion has been around for at least 15 years in UNODC, as elsewhere. And it always founders on the false assumption that people will feed the roster with details and CVs of these "finest resources". What actually happens is that offices tend to hoard information on the really prized talent for themselves. If you can figure a way around this problem, then you will have your fully-functioning Consultants Roster. Don't place the blame on HRMS.

(I recall that when I was in HQ back in 1994, we did a thorough review of the existing consultant's roster only to find out, inter alia, that three of the consultants were deceased.)

Strategic: At what I would call the strategic level, your report cites problems which are not really the fault of HRMS, but with UNODC as an organization. Especially in the current cash-crunch situation, laying blame at their doorstep is thus unfair. Example #1: "lack of induction or staff training to the UNODC". At the field level, this is essentially my responsibility, and one which I must admit I am not performing properly enough. It is not really a "lack of resources" problem either, but more one of a lack of time. This is a poor rationalization, I know, but it is true. Example #2: "HRMS does not provide UNDP with guidance when issuing and administering contracts". Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, HRMS has on several occasions, had to guide the UNDP offices in our region on appropriate contract modalities and HR decisions because of the knowledge base which HRMS has in-house, especially in the person of Khurshid, who knows the rules inside out. This level of expertise is, quite frankly, unrivalled by UNDP -- at least at the field level, which is all I can comment upon. Example #3: "because financial resources are not guaranteed... staff is left unsure about their future professional career... the situation creates stress, low morale..." etc. How can this be HRMS's fault? Rather it is the responsibility, at field level, of the Representative to build up an adequate funding pipeline which will ensure the office has a future and people keep their jobs. It works like this in the private sector, why not the UN?

I'll probably stop at this point with a request that you review what you have said in the report on HRMS and try to convey the sense that you have considered the broader context in which you situate your report's findings. Once again, thanks for the opportunity to contribute and I hope that my observations are taken in the helpful spirit in which they are intended.

Best regards. Gary

PS: You may wish to adhere to the standard form of field office abbreviations used in UNODC to avoid confusion. You can find these most easily in the UNOV/UNODC telephone directory. Hence, the Pretoria Office = ROSAF (not ROSA) and the Delhi Office = ROSA (not RSA). (This will remove the possibility of our being misrepresented on page 19 as having said something which we did not say.)

Gary Lewis
Representative
Regional Office for South Asia
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
EP16/17 Chandragupta Marg, Chanakyapuri
New Delhi, India
Ph: 0091-11-24104970-73
Fax: 0091-11-24104962
gary.lewis@unodc.org"

I. Introduction

A. Background

1. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is the main institutional arrangement of the United Nations responsible for supporting or assisting Member States to fight crime and drugs. Formerly called the Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (ODCCP), UNODC was established in 1997. Headquartered in Vienna, it has a liaison office in New York and 21 field offices (FOs) worldwide. The organization employs approximately 500 staff members hired through the Human Resources Management Section (HRMS) of the Division for Management (DM), as well as approximately 800 staff members recruited through FOs.
2. The programme of work of UNODC is organized around three core areas: (a) research and analysis to build a knowledge and information base on drugs and crime issues and improve understanding of the issues; (b) assistance to Member States of the United Nations in the ratification and implementation of international treaties through the development of domestic legislation on drugs, crime and terrorism; and (c) provision of field-based technical assistance to enhance the capacity of Member States to counteract illicit drugs, crime and terrorism.
3. Structurally, UNODC is organized into the following four divisions: the Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs (DPA), the Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), the Division for Operations (DO) and the Division for Management (DM). Each of the divisions has branches, sections and units that are dedicated to specific tasks or responsibilities.
4. FOs are located throughout the world. UNODC has four kinds of FOs: regional offices, country offices, project offices and regional centres. The following are the regional offices visited for this evaluation: the Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa (ROMENA) in Cairo; the Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSAF-Pretoria) in Pretoria; the Regional Office for Eastern Africa (ROEA) in Nairobi; the Regional Office for Mexico and Central America (ROMEX) in Mexico City; the Regional Office for Brazil and the South Cone (ROBRA) in Brasilia; the Regional Office for West and Central Africa (ROSEN) in Dakar; the Regional Office for Central Asia (ROCA) in Tashkent; and the Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA) in New Delhi. The following are the country offices visited for this evaluation: Colombia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nigeria and Viet Nam. The Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific (RCEAP), in Bangkok, was also visited. For a full list of field offices, see annex V.
5. FOs constitute part of the Partnership in Development Branch (PDB) of UNODC, which is one of two branches in DO. At headquarters, PDB is organized into four geographical sections: Africa and the Middle East Section (AMES), Eastern Europe and West/Central Asia Section (EWCAS), Latin America and the Caribbean Section (LACS), and South/East Asia and the Pacific Section (SEAPS).
6. According to their terms of reference, the field offices' responsibilities include (a) keeping UNODC fully informed of existing economic and social conditions in the countries and/or regions; (b) analysing trends in drug abuse, trafficking and production; (c) analysing crime trends in transnational organized crime, corruption, trafficking in human beings (mainly women and children), and terrorism; (d) assisting Member States in the assessment of drug and crime problems, and the identification of countermeasures, the formulation of national plans and the preparation of programmes/project proposals; (e) preparing periodic updates of country profiles on the drug and crime situation; and (f) developing country and/or regional programme frameworks and project proposals in line with their Strategic Programme Frameworks (SPFs). They are also expected to liaise with donors to secure financial resources for the implementation of regional and/or country projects. Additionally, FOs must strive towards financial self-sustainability.

B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

7. In May 2006 the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of UNODC began the evaluation of Support Mechanisms for Technical Cooperation (SMTc). The evaluation focuses on administrative, financial and technical support services provided to UNODC FOs and relevant units at headquarters to enable them to effectively and efficiently implement programmes and projects. It reviews administrative and substantive or programmatic mechanisms that have been established at UNODC headquarters as well as through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Office of Project Support (UNOPS) to support FOs.

8. The evaluation builds on earlier evaluations conducted by IEU in 2004 and 2005. Past evaluation findings and recommendations often touched upon various aspects of SMTc – administrative, financial and human resources management services, information and communication technology (ICT) services, and technical support that UNODC headquarters, UNDP and UNOPS provide to FOs – which have directly or indirectly influenced the efficiency and effectiveness of FOs and hence their ability to deliver assistance to Member States. IEU decided to include the evaluation of SMTc in its workplan for 2006. The decision was made in response to the findings of evaluations carried out in 2004 and 2005 which suggested that the delivery of technical assistance to Member States was greatly impacted by SMTc, thus suggesting that the success of technical cooperation delivery depended not only on the ability of programme managers, but also on the important role played by service providers.

9. The main purpose of the evaluation is to identify appropriate ways of strengthening SMTc to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of FOs, which are the main vehicles for UNODC to deliver technical assistance to its Member States. SMTc addressed in the evaluation includes, among other things, substantive or programmatic backstopping, management of human and financial resources, provision of ICT services and strategic planning. The evaluation also assesses how administrative and financial issues, as well as information technology, influence technical units and experts in their endeavours to provide technical expertise to FOs and/or deliver technical assistance to Member States.

C. Evaluation methodology

10. The evaluation was carried out through an interactive and participatory process. At the beginning of the exercise, the external consultants recruited for the evaluation visited UNODC headquarters in Vienna to have in-depth discussions with IEU staff members in order to get a clear interpretation of the terms of reference (TORs). Senior officials of UNODC were invited to comment on the TORs. After having built consensus on the TORs, an extensive review of various relevant documents on the operations, programmes, organizational set-up and management of UNODC headquarters and FOs was conducted. Emphasis was placed on identifying those aspects or issues that pertain to SMTc.

11. IEU, together with lead consultants, prepared detailed questionnaires for staff based at FOs and at headquarters. The two sets of questionnaires contained open and closed questions aimed at gathering vital data on SMTc. They were sent to all FOs through the regional representatives and to all relevant staff at headquarters.

12. The team of consultants and IEU spent one week, in May 2006, conducting interviews at UNODC headquarters. The evaluation team conducted face to face in-depth interviews with a total of 155 informants both at UNODC HQ in Vienna and in Field Offices. Of that number (155), 127 were UNODC employees, 22 were UNDP staff and 6 were UNOPS staff. A further 80 UNODC staff responded to questionnaire that was sent to HQ and field staff electronically. In total therefore 235 persons provided information to this evaluation. These interviews were preceded by preliminary interviews conducted by one team member and the evaluation team manager who interviewed heads of divisions and sections and then compiled an overview of emerging issues.

13. The evaluation team made site visits and interviewed UNODC staff in the following FOs: Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Senegal, South

Africa, Thailand and Uzbekistan. Thirteen of 21 FOs were visited during this evaluation. UNOPS and/or UNDP staff were interviewed in the offices where they have representation.

D. Report structure

14. The rest of this report is organized as follows. Following the introduction, section two provides the overall context, including national/regional priorities and FO programmatic orientations as articulated in SPF. The third section looks at the support mechanisms at headquarters, while the fourth section is about the evaluation's major substantive (programme related) and administrative findings. It provides findings that are common and then highlights issues that are unique to particular FOs. Section five discusses lessons learned and best practices of SMT. The last two sections are dedicated to recommendations and overall conclusions of the evaluation.

II. Overall context

A. Background and overview

15. UNODC is organized into four divisions: the Division for Management – which includes Human Resource Management Section, Financial Resources Management Services (FRMS) and the Information Technology Section (ITS); the Division for Treaty Affairs; the Division for Operations – which includes the Human Security Branch and the Partnership in Development Branch; and the Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs – which includes the Research and Analysis Section, the Laboratory and Scientific Section, the Advocacy Section, the Co-Financing and Partnership Section, the Strategic Planning Unit and the Independent Evaluation Unit.

16. While the Division for Management has other functions that fall under the United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV), this evaluation has only examined HRMS, FRMS and ITS since these are parts of UNODC that provide services that directly impact programme delivery. FRMS provides the following financial services: budgeting, expenditure monitoring, financial reporting and ensuring sound management of finances in UNODC. HRMS is responsible for overall policy formulation on human resources management and provides relevant services to managers. HRMS further provides the following specific services: recruitment and placement, staff administration, staff development, staff assistance and human resources tools such as links to Galaxy and e-PAS etc. ITS is at the heart of UNODC efforts to foster innovation and make effective use of technology investments. As well as supporting and maintaining existing core IT services (telecommunications, network infrastructure, electronic file and mail servers, desktop equipment, enterprise resource planning systems and office automation applications), ITS performs the following functions for UNODC staff based at headquarters and field offices: supports the development and deployment to competent authorities of IT tools assisting Member States in anti-money-laundering and drug control areas; drives the development of substantive information management tools to support the strategic Centre of Excellence concept; fosters the provision of planning/monitoring/reporting/accountability tools (like ProFi) to support the strategy of UNODC and to continue enhancing the ability of Member States to review the Office's work at any time; further supports the streamlining of the organization's administrative work by using online real-time workflow applications; trains users at headquarters, field offices and in Member States to make effective use of UNODC information systems.

17. The Division for Operations has two branches: the Human Security Branch (HSB) and the Partnership in Development Branch (PDB). HSB provides technical expertise, specialized skills and programme response for a wide range of drug control, crime prevention and criminal justice reform operations. The branch is comprised of three sections: the Anti-Trafficking Section, the Global Challenges Section and the Rule of Law Section. PDB, on the other hand, provides support to FOs in programme development, programme implementation monitoring, headquarters liaison and policy guidance. It is composed of four geographical sections and a network of 21 FOs. Thus, PDB is responsible for most of technical assistance delivery to Member States through the network of FOs, while HSB has substantive

know-how, which it also delivers to Member States primarily through global programmes.

18. The Division for Treaty Affairs provides technical cooperation assistance and advice to Member States on the implementation of treaties, conventions, other instruments and intergovernmental decisions and resolutions on drug control, crime prevention, criminal justice and reform. Further, this division promotes the ratification and implementation of and adherence to the international treaties on drug control, crime prevention and terrorism by Member States and provides the necessary legal and institutional capacity-building support services in collaboration with other divisions of UNODC.

19. The Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs undertakes research and strategic analysis as a basis for developing policy options and drug and crime control measures; provides scientific advice and support for national, regional, international and UNODC activities; evaluates UNODC programmes and projects; promotes the image of UNODC, including through partnerships with donor countries, the private sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and organizations of the United Nations, and develops UNODC strategy and priorities in consultation with other divisions.

B. Regional outlook and priorities

20. As stated earlier, UNODC has organized its field operations into regional and country activities. The 21 FOs are distributed throughout the world in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. In each of the continents regional offices are distributed in locations to ensure that multiple countries are well served. Generally, however, the location of the regional offices tends to be determined by existing regional economic communities and related geopolitical blocs.

Africa and the Middle East Region¹

21. In Africa and the Middle East, this evaluation covered the Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa (Cairo), the Regional Office for Eastern Africa (Nairobi), the Regional Office for Southern Africa (Pretoria), the Regional Office for West and Central Africa (Dakar), and the Country Office for Nigeria (Abuja). The North Africa and Middle East Regional Office has a project office in Jordan.

22. The Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSAF), based in Pretoria, was established in 1998 and covers 11 countries of the Southern African Development Community (SADC). These countries face a number of common challenges, including a high prevalence of HIV and AIDS, social and economic inequities, and high levels of corruption. Social and economic inequities generate organized crime in the region. In some of these countries, drug trafficking is increasing.

23. ROSAF has 16 staff members. Of these, 3 are international, 1 is an Associate Expert and 12 are national staff. It is funded largely, if not exclusively, through voluntary contributions.

24. The Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa (ROMENA) is based in Cairo, and covers 19 countries. These countries have considerable differences in terms of their economic development status and needs, politics and culture. Some of the countries are dependent on external donors to finance their development programmes while others are not. However, they share a number of challenges associated with drugs and crime, such as the illegal cultivation and consumption of cannabis, trafficking in heroin, money-laundering and corruption, increasing terrorist activities, increasing HIV and AIDS infections due to the abuse of drugs, and smuggling of migrants to Europe. ROMENA employs 37 professional and support staff members.

25. The Regional Office for West and Central Africa (ROSEN) in Dakar was established in 1995 and covers 23 countries. Most of its activities are concentrated in West Africa and it has scant coverage of Central Africa. There is general acceptance that both regions (west and central) cannot be effectively served by one office. ROSEN employs 19 staff members (in Dakar and the programme office in Praia, Cape Verde). It has developed SPPs for West Africa and national SPFAs for Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau and

¹ Because of security restrictions the evaluation consultant was not able to visit and interview staff in Amman.

Mauritania. There is no SPF for Central Africa. ROSEN's projects in Central Africa are developed on the basis of specific requests from individual countries.

26. ROSEN activities have focused predominately on combating drugs. In 2004, 60 per cent of its budget was directed at projects on drugs control while 40 per cent targeted crime-related projects. There has been a shift in ROSEN programmatic emphasis, with 70 per cent of staff time and resources in 2006 being devoted to crime issues. This shift is an indication of the importance now being placed on organized crime, irregular migration and terrorism issues.

27. The Country Office for Nigeria (CONIG) employs 7 international and 19 national staff members. Its programme of work focuses on support to the Federal Government of Nigeria to fight corruption, drugs and other forms of crime. Almost 80 per cent of the office's budget is now dedicated to projects that focus on crime control.

28. The UNODC Regional Office for Eastern Africa (ROEA) is based in Nairobi and covers 13 countries in Eastern Africa. The office employs 13 staff members (two are international staff, one is an Associate Expert and the rest are recruited locally on the basis of fixed-term contracts, special service agreements or as individual contractors). ROEA has a programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 of US\$ 4,239,950 and a support budget of US\$ 984,900. The region is characterized by worsening social and economic conditions, including high rates of HIV infection, crime and corruption. ROEA has focused predominantly on the prevention of illicit drugs. Two years ago it started focusing on crime matters as well, a change prompted by a decision by the Executive Director requiring all FOs to include crime prevention in their programmes.

Latin America

29. The UNODC Regional Office for Brazil and the South Cone (ROBRA) mainly covers Brazil. The office employs 8 core personnel but only the field representative was contracted through HRMS. The three administrative-finance assistants, the driver, the communications assistant and two national programme officers hold UNDP fixed-term contracts. Twenty-one project staff hold ALD contracts and most of them are working in the Ministry of Health on the National AIDS programme. One member of the project staff is managing two South Cone regional projects with its base in Buenos Aires. The office is well endowed and focuses on supporting the Government to combat crime and drugs. Its counterparts in the Government are the Ministry of Justice (for projects on crime prevention), the Ministry of Transparency and Integrity (for combating corruption) and the Ministry of Health (for HIV/AIDS and drug prevention and treatment). The Government of Brazil has put special emphasis on projects for preventing illicit drug production, trafficking and use. ROBRA has an SPF (2006-2009) with an estimated budget of US\$ 40 million, 90 per cent of which has already been covered by Brazilian Government pledges. The office has been operating its own bank account since April 2006 and only relies on UNDP for the administration of its locally recruited human resources.

30. ROBRA works mainly with the Federal Government but also through decentralized operations at the local level that reach more than 5,000 municipalities through approximately 800 NGOs, local government organizations and the private sector. This UNODC presence at the grass-roots level, mainly through the project with the National AIDS programme, offers the opportunity to add a violence and urban crime prevention dimension. The main challenge is how to deliver at the municipal level given the relatively small human resource base.

31. The Regional Office for Mexico and Central America (ROMEX), in Mexico City, employs 16 staff members, six of whom hold fixed-term contracts while the rest have service contracts or SSAs. Only the field representative was contracted through HRMS. The programmatic focus of ROMEX is largely on drugs although there is increasing emphasis on issues of combating crime as well as preventing HIV and AIDS. ROMEX has an annual budget of US\$ 300,000 for operating costs.

32. The UNODC Country Office for Colombia (COCOL) was established to support the Government of Colombia to combat the production of illicit crops, stop the growth of drug abuse, particularly among youth, strengthen the criminal justice system, combat corruption and build capacity to implement domestic

and international treaties pertaining to crime, drugs and terrorism. It is also assisting the country to promote alternative development approaches, such as the conversion of illicit crop production to agroforestry and other economic activities. COCOL has an SPF (2004–2007) with an estimated budget of US\$ 21 million, with at least half of it unsecured at present.

Regional Office for Central Asia

33. The UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia (ROCA), in Tashkent, covers five countries: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. It manages six project offices outside Tashkent, including two in Kazakhstan and one in Azerbaijan. The region is a primary transit corridor for opium and heroin from Afghanistan. There is also increasing drug abuse and drug-related crime, and HIV and AIDS transmission is increasing at an alarming rate. High levels of corruption and an increasing risk of terrorism also characterize this region. The Tashkent office is organized in substantive units, all of which are supported by a Programme Support Unit (PSU) covering financial and human resources, procurement, visa support and related administrative matters. The PSU also provides support to the project offices.

34. The five countries of the region covered by ROCA have relatively low or limited institutional and technical capacities to address the challenges of crime, drugs, terrorism and the spread of HIV and AIDS. They also have limited legislative capacity and, with the exception of Kazakhstan, the economic means to effectively deal with corruption. ROCA was established to support the countries to build national capacities to address these problems.

35. ROCA has a total staff of 94, including in project offices. Virtually all are engaged in drug control or HIV-related projects and there are no experts on crime prevention activities. In Tashkent, there are 38 professionals working on drugs and terrorism, one trans-regional legal adviser from the Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), a regional adviser for the Global Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse (GAP) and a regional HIV/AIDS expert. A money-laundering mentor is based in Almaty because the World Bank funds the project in conjunction with the Global Programme against Money-Laundering (GPML) and the expert works out of that facility. The project offices account for another 16 professional staff members, including seven who are international.

36. ROCA has developed an SPF (2004–2007) with an estimated budget of US\$ 43 million, much of which is fully funded, and puts emphasis on supporting countries to develop and enforce laws to curb drug and human trafficking, corruption and terrorism. ROCA has tried to prioritize thematic areas in its SPF. It uses its SPF more as a framework for setting priorities than as tool for cooperation. The ROCA SPF complements other strategy documents including the Paris Pact. The design of the SPF had input from headquarters through EWCAS. The development of the SPF was a consultative process involving experts in different areas. All ROCA projects are reflected within priorities of SPF. ROCA is one of the few offices that earns more through projects than is spent by headquarters on its support budget, including international core staffing.

37. ROCA plays a coordinating role with donors in the region through the Paris Pact database, the Foreign Antinarcotics Community and, in future, the CARICC regional law enforcement mechanism. ROCA coordinates all human resource and administrative issues for the project – called sub-offices. Sub-offices are primarily implementers of programmes, so all coordination and authority comes through ROCA. ROCA programme activities focus mainly on law enforcement and demand reduction although there is increasing emphasis on HIV and AIDS as well.

38. ROCA operates its own bank account through ProFi, for which it is the pilot office and which has been given high marks by FRMS and the auditors. ROCA staff have provided training to other UNODC offices in setting up bank accounts. FRMS and ITS at headquarters have provided training to ROCA staff in the use of ProFi. They are also backstopping ROCA to help solve problems on a day-to-day basis. When ROCA makes suggestions, FRMS and ITS are supportive and responsive. ROCA finance staff use the ProFi field office ledger for tracking day-to-day finances. Management expenditures, narratives and forecasts are done regularly through ProFi's online workflow processes, with the results then posted in ProFi reports and applications.

Country Office for Iran

39. The Country Office for Iran (COIRA), based in Tehran, was established in 1999. It employs a total of 13 national staff members, all of whom (except the representative) are locally recruited on fixed-term contracts, service contracts or SSAs. Under new leadership that began in 2004, COIRA has instituted a range of management and programmatic initiatives to increase its efficiency and effectiveness. One of the initiatives is the separation of administrative support functions from thematic project management, with assignment of clear roles and responsibilities among staff: the creation of a Programme Support Unit (PSU) to deal with personnel, finance, procurement and IT, and that of a Programme Management Unit (PMU) responsible for project management, project/programme cycle, joint programming, information, research and analysis. In addition, the internal programme monitoring system has been strengthened through a “joint programming monitoring table” which tracks all projects and corresponding activities with the time frame.

40. COIRA has developed an SPF (2004-2007)² with programmatic activities under three thematic pillars: Drug Demand Reduction (e.g. prevention, treatment, HIV/AIDS, advocacy and policymaking, DDR in Bam), Drug Supply Reduction (e.g. border control, combined interdiction, intelligence-led investigations, international and regional cooperation projects) and Crime Prevention (e.g. projects on corruption, judicial reform, organized crime/money-laundering and trafficking in humans). Its portfolio is growing in the area of crime (e.g. cyber crime, trafficking in humans).

41. With the introduction of the management and programmatic initiatives, many COIRA staff members reported increased self-motivation to contribute to the work of the office. They also reported a growing sense of “responsibility” and “ownership”.

42. COIRA is reported to have a good working relationship with branches and sections at headquarters. COIRA works closely with PDB/EWCAS on a daily basis and submits its quarterly reports to those offices. The line of authority is clearly defined at the FO, where most of the communication with headquarters goes through the representative and/or deputy representative.

43. COIRA plays the role of a key “broker” in the country by bringing together bilateral and multilateral donors to sit together with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Some staff members were of the view that the office enjoys the trust of the national government and is often consulted on international security matters. The donor community also appreciates the mediation role played by COIRA, without which their direct access and dialogue with national authorities would be rather limited.

44. COIRA has established close partnership with many donor countries through the EU/Mini Dublin Group. The Group has been invited to participate and has been actively involved in all phases of the COIRA programme, from project conceptualization and formulation to actual implementation. The efforts made by COIRA to involve donors at early stages of the project development have produced several positive results, including improved awareness and understanding among donors about specific UNODC projects and activities, opportunities for increased resource mobilization and deployment of thematic expertise available in donor countries for COIRA projects.

45. The implementation of projects, and hence the operation of COIRA as a field office, has been extremely vulnerable to and often directly affected by the international political environment. At the time of the evaluation, two projects were awaiting the official signature from the Government. Although all parties agreed on these projects in late 2005 and the project documents were signed in early 2006, the process has stalled since then due to political uncertainty in recent months, e.g. United Nations Security Council resolutions against the Islamic Republic of Iran. This has caused “anxiety” among local staff over their contract extensions, as well as the office’s “low” implementation rates.

Regional Office for South Asia

46. The Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA), in New Delhi, employs approximately 30 staff members. In addition, it has a small office in north-east India staffed by three people. There are two

² COIRA SPF 2006-2008 has been finalized. In the design process, donors and local authorities were involved through various forms of consultations.

technical experts on global programmes operating from ROSA. These are the Global HIV/AIDS adviser and the ITS global team manager. This FO covers Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal and Sri Lanka. Most RSA projects aim at preventing drug abuse and HIV transmission through drug abuse, especially among vulnerable populations. Currently, it is designing a new anti-trafficking project.

47. The ITS at headquarters has an office based in ROSA that develops, manages and coordinates all ITS field-related applications. The office is run by one manager and six support staff members. The manager has travelled to 70 per cent of the field offices and thus understands his customers' needs, allowing him to develop responsive programming. The unit also provides training. The manager works closely with headquarters but has requisite autonomy to design and implement new IT initiatives based on the needs of the field offices.

48. ROSA has its own bank account but relies on UNDP to administer staff salaries and payments to consultants and implementing partner organizations. It manages a petty cash account and, according to financial and administrative staff, this has improved its operations considerably.

Country Office for Myanmar

49. UNODC and its predecessors, the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) and the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), have been active in Myanmar since 1978 to reduce illicit drug cultivation, production, trafficking and abuse. Myanmar is a signatory to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961, the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 and the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988. At the regional level, Myanmar is a member of the intergovernmental network dedicated to the fight against illicit drugs in the region and participates in the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT) process.

50. As Myanmar is the world's second largest producer of opium, the UNODC Myanmar country programme puts emphasis on the sustainable elimination of opium cultivation, with reference to the pursuit of alternative livelihoods for traditional growers of opium poppy. The Country Office for Myanmar develops and implements projects on treatment, detoxification and rehabilitation services for drug users. Finally, recognizing the escalating danger posed by the spread of HIV and AIDS in Myanmar, the office has focused on the prevention or reduction of HIV/AIDS transmission through injecting drug use.

51. The Country Office for Myanmar operates through two offices in Yangon and field offices in Wa-Shan State. It developed and adopted an SPF in 2003 and also utilizes a national country plan – which is a collaborative mechanism with the World Health Organization (WHO), UNODC, the United Nations and six international organizations – to guide its activities. It currently employs 6 ALD staff members, 72 field staff and 20 UNDP service contract staff members. The office has established partnerships with other United Nations agencies, international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the Government of Myanmar. In 2002, this collaboration with the Government led to the development of the Joint Programme for HIV and AIDS in Myanmar 2003-2005. The Joint Programme recognizes five main areas for intervention and is financed by a joint funding mechanism known as the Fund for HIV and AIDS in Myanmar (FHAM).

52. The Country Office relies on local expertise and networks to supply consultants and technical expertise instead of on headquarters' backstopping to implement programmes. Given language barriers and the rural locations of implementation, the office has to rely largely on experts with local language skills.

Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific

53. The Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific (RCEAP), in Bangkok, employs approximately 30 staff members. In addition, several posts need to be filled and the following positions for technical experts have been advertised: one terrorism expert (TPB), one legal adviser (DTA) and one HIV and AIDS expert (Global Challenges Section, GCS). RCEAP coordinates and facilitates regional cooperation against drugs and crime. It spearheads activities to strengthen law enforcement coordination in the region within

the framework of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). It services six UNODC country offices and the countries of the ASEAN region.

54. RCEAP has three regional frameworks for project design and implementation: the UNODC SPF, the ASEAN and China Cooperative Operations in Response to Dangerous Drugs (ACCORD) and the MOU/Action Plan between Cambodia, China, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam. The MOU is a rolling plan that is a binding mechanism. ACCORD was formulated at the International Congress in Pursuit of a Drug-free ASEAN 2015, held in Bangkok in October 2000. At that meeting, a comprehensive plan of action was endorsed as the sole regional drug control framework for ASEAN and China by 36 countries and 16 international organizations. It is more of a political process with set deadlines to be achieved by 2015. There is also the Pacific Forum for islands that fall under the responsibility of the RCEAP, but due to limited resources little is being implemented.

55. RCEAP is developing a training programme for the drug law enforcement community in Cambodia, China, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam. Front-line staff working against drug trafficking will be taught basic knowledge and skills through computer-based training.

56. There is a healthy relationship between the RCEAP and UNODC country offices in the region. However, some staff in the country offices "feel" the offices should be reporting directly to headquarters instead of to the regional centre.

57. As mentioned in paragraph 54, RCEAP activities follow three regional plans: the UNODC SPF, ACCORD and the MOU/Action Plan. Although they have to be approved by headquarters, the regional centre has some autonomy in relation to project development and is instrumental in providing backstopping to headquarters on crime activities.

58. The RCEAP team has established a regional database to coordinate information relating to amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS). The team has developed the database in collaboration with Member States to ensure that the desired information is available and accessible at the national level and useful to Member States and the region. Involving Member States during the initial design stage and throughout the life of the project has created ownership in the information and sustainability. The reports being generated are relevant, timely and accurate.

Regional similarities and differences

59. There are major similarities in the programmatic priorities of UNODC FOs. All of them focus on, or attempt to address, the core areas of crime, drugs and terrorism, providing technical assistance to strengthen judicial systems, promote regional cooperation to fight organized crime, develop national anti-corruption programmes, counteract drug trafficking and abuse, counter violence against women, combat trafficking in humans and fight HIV and AIDS. Fighting HIV and AIDS is increasingly becoming a major priority for all regional and country offices. There are, however, variations or differences in the emphases that each FO gives to these priorities.

60. There are also differences in the human, financial and infrastructural endowments of the FOs. Each office possesses different capacities to implement priority programmes. The differences in endowment are mainly due to the individual offices' abilities to design projects and raise funds.

C. Strategic programme frameworks

61. Most FOs have developed and adopted strategic programme frameworks (SPFs) and several FOs are in the process of finalizing their SPFs. SPFs have been developed mainly through participatory processes involving national governments, NGOs and potential funding agencies. From interviews with staff in most of the FOs it is evident that SPFs are important instruments for the operations of the offices. They are used to determine programmatic priorities and indicative budgets. However, it is clear that SPFs do not constitute negotiated contracts with the local government, but rather are indicative frameworks for UNODC activities. Indicative budgets of SPFs have no relationship with the approved biennial budget frameworks .

As repeatedly shown by CPS during PPC meetings, the SPF indicative budgets exceed by far any realistic funding targets. Confusion also exists in some FOs as they sometimes treat these indicative budget frameworks as their budgets.

62. Most FOs find it challenging to implement SPFs for a variety of reasons relating particularly to the availability of funds. The growing pressure to raise funds coupled with the absence of coherent resource mobilization strategies means that some FOs, if not most, tend to take on new projects simply because donors fund them. As discussed later in this report, UNODC and its FOs are increasingly being driven by short-term donor-determined projects. This is likely to dilute the focus and coherency of UNODC programmes. CPS however contends that the pressure to raise funds does not emanate from lack of a coherent strategy because CPS has developed a strategic approach to fundraising. This approach has been openly discussed. Fundraising should be an integral part of FO/SPF approach. In other words fundraising should be considered from the outset. The evaluation found that fundraising is considered too late during project design and approval processes. Most FOs do not have the expertise or capacity to fundraise.

63. It has been reported that UNODC headquarters has not been actively involved in the development of field office SPFs. Most FOs have noted that the input given by headquarters has largely been limited to editorial comments made by a few staff at headquarters on draft SPFs. They have felt that FOs have not received substantive technical input from headquarters on SPFs. This brings to question whether HQ considers SPFs to be important corporate documents. Questions may also be asked on whether SPFs are viewed as serious documents at the country or regional levels since they are not signed. How do UNODC SPFs fit in with the UNDAF approach. Once the UNODC strategy has been adopted thought must be given to how SPFs can link up with the UNDAF process.

64. In terms of receiving backstopping for strategic planning and programme development, many FO staff are concerned that the sections at the Partnership in Development Branch (PDB) are merely concerned with editing and formatting project documents. They suggested that it would be cost- and time-effective for FOs to send project documents and solicit technical input directly from sections that are directly engaged in research and programme delivery. Nonetheless, most field offices viewed PDB as an important source of information on specific issues at headquarters that they cannot easily get access to.

D. Support mechanisms and institutions

65. The main support services that FOs require are human and financial resources management, provision of information technology and communication services, and technical support in specific programme areas. UNDP, UNODC headquarters and UNOPS are the main institutions that FOs rely on to get the support services. The United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) provides ROEA with various services. The timely and efficient provision of these services impacts on the ability of programme/project implementers to effectively deliver assistance to Member States.

III. Headquarters support mechanisms

66. This section is based on interviews with senior management staff at UNODC headquarters. It is an analysis of emerging issues and concerns raised during the interviews. The interviews focused on such aspects as intra-institutional collaboration at headquarters (with an emphasis on how divisions support each other), the nature of the support that divisions receive from FOs, and the participation of divisions in the implementation of programmes administered both in the FOs and through headquarters. Emphasis was also placed on resource mobilization efforts and the overall strategic planning within UNODC as a whole. Below are the emerging issues.

A. Inter-divisional collaboration and backstopping

67. There is consensus that UNODC divisions are organized and operate without adequate collaboration

and backstopping. From interviews with senior management at headquarters, it is clear that more needs to be done to improve and strengthen collaboration within and among divisions of UNODC. The divisions tend to operate independently, to rarely interact or collaborate and, at times, in competition with one another. At least 8 of the 11 senior management staff interviewed stated that there was also a disconnect between substantive units at headquarters and FOs. Some members of UNODC management attributed this to the lack of a common, coherent strategy. Others blamed it on FOs having their own SPF without much input from headquarters. Often FOs have developed their own SPF and related projects without the substantive involvement of relevant divisions. At headquarters, divisions have adopted different approaches for delivering technical assistance. UNODC is developing an overall UNODC institutional strategy that emphasizes the enhancement of inter-divisional collaboration.

68. The tendency at headquarters is for divisions to blame each other. For example, staff in the Division for Operations claim that their ability to provide technical services is constrained by the Division for Management. DO further claims that DM does not delegate authority to FOs. There is also competition for scarce financial resources among divisions. The interviews revealed that there is open competition between DTA, DPA and HSB, as well as between headquarters and the field.

B. Strategic planning

69. UNODC is developing an overall institutional strategy. During this evaluation, there was no consensus among the organization's senior management on whether an overall strategy is needed, nor on what kind of issues such a strategy should address. When asked whether UNODC required an institutional strategy, some members of the management were of the opinion that it was unnecessary. Their view was that many of the challenges faced by UNODC were not due to the lack of a written strategy but to inadequate financial resources. These managers did not view the strategy as a necessary document to be used in resource mobilization.

70. An overall UNODC strategy is being finalized for adoption and a draft has been circulated to staff for comments. It emphasizes measures that will increase internal coherence and efficiency in the organization as a whole. Several senior management staff at headquarters have expressed concern about the way in which the strategy relates to SPF and how FOs will use it. Since the SPF were developed before the strategy, staff are concerned about how to align or harmonize the two. It is clear that once the strategy is adopted SPF and other planning documents will have to be aligned to it (see also para 63).

C. Resource mobilization

71. UNODC funding comes from the regular budget of the United Nations, voluntary contributions from donor countries, cost-sharing arrangements with assisted countries and voluntary contributions from the non-state sector. To coordinate fund-raising or resource mobilization efforts, management instructions were issued in May 2006. These spell out procedures to be followed in resource mobilization. At the time of this evaluation, the instructions were still very new and had not fully taken root in the organization. In practice, many still used their old approaches.

72. The Co-financing and Partnership Section (CPS) of DPA has the primary responsibility for coordinating fund-raising initiatives. It is expected to work with other headquarters entities, in particular PDB, HSB, DTA and FRMS. Despite the existence of the management instructions, there is agreement among management that there is inadequate coordination within headquarters and between headquarters and FOs, but there is disagreement on the main reasons for inadequate coordination. At least five senior staff members who were interviewed blamed the lack of coordination on CPS not sharing information and wanting to control instead of facilitate resource mobilization. DO feels that CPS has more decision-making authority than service providers. On the other hand, CPS believes that it has done an excellent job in developing this fund-raising strategy which, if followed, should create the necessary climate for coordination and collaboration among the various entities.

73. UNODC is experiencing financial constraints. In mid-2006, it experienced a shortfall of US\$ 10 million, mostly affecting its core operating costs. According to FRMS, this has raised anxiety within headquarters. FRMS has advocated cost-saving measures such as freezing recruitment and reducing travel for general purpose. There is, however, no overall support for these measures from other senior managers. Some divisions feel that FRMS is undermining their operations. FRMS has emphasized that a recent meeting of 21 donors stressed that UNODC must reduce its operating costs and develop a strategy to streamline its operations and eliminate overlapping functions. It is not clear whether the present strategy has taken these concerns into consideration or not.

D. Administrative support measures

74. DM provides three core support services. These are within ITS, FRMS and HRMS. Generally, other divisions feel that the services provided by ITS and FRMS enable them to provide technical assistance efficiently and effectively. However, there are concerns that HRMS is not as efficient as it should be. For example, according to DO there are often unnecessary delays and inflexibility in the recruitment of staff and consultants for funded projects. HRMS blames this on poor planning by DO and other divisions. HRMS claims that the divisions do not plan for their recruitment needs and then come to HRMS demanding immediate service and are angry when they do not get it. Another problem, according to HRMS, is that there are many layers involved in the approval process. According to HRMS, delegation of authority was given to DO, which means that HRMS cannot work directly with the field but must go through DO. DO/HSB, for instance, has cited UNOPS as flexible and efficient in the recruitment of mentors, which is why UNOPS is the preferred service provider. Other entities such as TPB also concur with HSB on UNOPS efficiency on recruitment. While there is no agreement about what causes delays in the recruitment process, HRMS clients are certainly dissatisfied with the quality and timeliness of services provided. Whatever the reasons, it is clear that a problem exists that management must address urgently. This evaluation offers management an opportunity to use the information gathered by this evaluation to revisit the issue of services provided by HRMS with a view of solving the problem.

E. General observations

75. There is general consensus that UNODC lacks an overall institutional strategy. However, there are divergent views as to whether a strategy is necessary and whether such a strategy will guarantee funding for particular divisions. Given that the development of the strategy is at an advanced stage, it is worrying that there is still no consensus about the need for it.

76. There is consensus that coordination, communication and dissemination of information at headquarters and between headquarters and FOs need improvement, but disagreement as to the best mechanisms to improve coordination.

77. There is disagreement as to the source of the administrative problems associated with human resource planning and recruitment. Some senior management staff say that poor planning by programme managers results in urgent needs that cannot be fulfilled in a timely manner. Others say that the bureaucratic and inflexible approach to render services of HRMS is the source of the problems.

IV. Major findings and analysis

A. Programmatic or substantive issues

78. UNODC field offices are expected to draw on headquarters' divisions for both technical expertise and administrative matters in their efforts to develop and implement technical cooperation programmes and projects. PDB is the focal point at headquarters through which field offices are expected to access technical backstopping. Generally, field offices interact well with their respective regional sections in PDB.

However, many staff in field offices are of the view that the sections are at the moment merely sources of information and post boxes for information from headquarters. The perception in FOs is that PDB primarily provides support in complying with the format of documents, in navigating headquarters' bureaucracy and in gathering information from their respective regions. The value added of PDB, as perceived by FOs, is in having a body to represent FO interests at headquarters.

79. The sections are helpful in assisting field offices to liaise with substantive units at headquarters. For example, according to interviews at the Country Office for Colombia (COCOL), the Latin American and Caribbean Section (LACS) provides assistance in the development of project ideas and products so as to improve the content (not substantive). LACS helps liaise with substantive units at headquarters in order to obtain their input as part of the project approval process. LACS and other sections in PDB have limited technical expertise in UNODC programmatic areas. They also operate independently, with the result that the different regional sections do not adequately collaborate to share expertise and experiences in support of the field offices.

80. FOs increasingly rely on consultants as sources of backstopping in the development and execution of projects. Even for areas or issues on which there is expertise at headquarters, FOs source outside expertise and use consultants. From all the field offices' evaluated it is estimated that at least 50 per cent of the technical input in the execution of technical cooperation with Member States comes from consultants. This is mainly because FOs do not have adequate technical expertise themselves and support from headquarters may not be readily available. Staff in at least six field offices reported that it is difficult to receive technical backstopping from headquarters in a timely manner.

81. Many of the field staff interviewed reported having had difficulties working with some of the Units of Human Security Branch (HSB). What seems evident is that the limited resources available to HSB has led to a situation where the Branch is unable to meet the demands and expectations of the FOs. This has led to perceived tensions and in some cases, disagreement, for example about where to locate members of HSB staff to the field.

82. There is increasing intra-institutional competition in UNODC. Field offices are increasingly in competition with headquarters' global programmes. According to ROMEX, an example of this was a project to develop a training centre in Panama for financial service providers in order to combat money-laundering. A funding source had expressed strong interest and the Panamanian Government was considering donating a building. ROMEX submitted the project idea as part of the Programme and Project Committee (PPC) process, but was not given clearance by the substantive unit – the Global Programme against Money-Laundering (GPML) – because the latter perceived a conflict with its e-learning initiative despite the major differences between the proposed centre's activities and GPML's work. There is a degree of competition for resources within the organization as well as the perception that encroaching on others' "substantive territory" leads to defensive reactions and does not foster collaboration.

83. Most of the field offices view HSB and, in particular, most global programmes as not respecting their SPF. In general, there is a tension between what FOs expect from HSB and what actually happens. The offices believe that HSB should be providing technical expert support to enable them to effectively provide technical support to Member States. HSB should not be implementing its own projects in the field but should work with and support FOs in implementing activities. However, according to the HSB Terms of Reference the Branch is mandated, not only to support the Field Office network, but also to directly implement programmatic activities and is in fact doing so in a number of regions. What seems clear is that more needs to be done to improve awareness and understanding of the role of HSB by the FO network and that two way communication flow between FO and HSB is in need of improvement. It is clear that relationships between HSB and the field offices would be greatly improved if HSB and other global programmes were to provide FOs with the much needed technical expertise. HSB should not be contacting Member States without consultation and informing the FOs. The following case demonstrates the tension that exists between some FOs and HSB: the UNODC mentor based at the Secretariat of the Eastern and Southern African Anti-Money-Laundering Group (ESAAMLG) in Dar-es-Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, sent a letter to the Government of Kenya which upset the government authorities. The ROEA representative based in Nairobi knew nothing about this, nor was the letter copied to staff of the Anti-

Money-Laundering Unit (AMLU) at UNODC headquarters in Vienna. Although the mentor is fully responsible to the AMLU, UNODC headquarters expected the representative in Nairobi to intervene, correct the situation and normalize relations with the Government of Kenya.

84. According to staff at the RCEAP, the ACCORD team has no formal interaction with headquarters other than to occasionally validate data or answer some questions. From a collaborative point of view, headquarters is not perceived as interested in ACCORD activities, which is unfortunate given that there appear to be many reasons why UNODC should consider the approach used in the development of the database on amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS) as a model globally. Given the concerns regarding data collection methods, timeliness of collecting data, accuracy and reach raised by the Global Demand Reduction staff in Tashkent, the RCEAP ATS data collection process may prove to be a model worth examining. A regional approach to capturing data may be a better model for many reasons: the data are more accurate, the process is quicker because online, it is possible to verify facts and trends and to tackle problems as they arise, data can be monitored and verified as they are entered, Member States are more involved and have greater ownership of the process, the data can be used to inform policy and help with fund-raising at the regional and global levels in part because they are more readily available.

Internal communications mechanisms and decentralization

85. In 2003 UNODC reorganized itself in order to better integrate its operations on drugs, crime and terrorism. Since then, policy statements by the Executive Director of UNODC have emphasized that the organization is to operate in a decentralized way with adequate resources, responsibilities and authority transferred to field offices. Most staff interviewed in the field offices are of the view that UNODC headquarters has transferred such responsibilities as project design, resource mobilization and project implementation to FOs but not decentralized decision-making on aspects such as project approval and fund management. In short, responsibilities have been transferred to the field without adequate human or financial resources. Recent initiatives, such as allowing some FOs to have their own bank accounts, are seen as positive steps. Some managers at UNODC HQ believe that FOs do not have a realistic perspective about the delegation of many responsibilities to the field as this would entail more resources which are not available.

86. The efficient operation of UNODC as a whole depends on good intra-institutional communications. The quality and intensity of communications within and between the different divisions, and between headquarters and FOs, are crucial for the delivery of technical assistance to Member States. Staff in FOs need to be continuously informed of activities being undertaken and decisions made at headquarters, and those at headquarters should be informed of FO operations. At least 67 per cent of respondents to the questionnaires stated that there is generally great improvement in communications between FOs and headquarters. According to the questionnaire responses, this can be attributed mainly to the introduction of ProFi.

87. At the time of this evaluation, UNODC was in the process of finalizing an overall institutional strategy. A draft strategy had been circulated to relevant in-house staff, including FO representatives. Regarding the institutional strategic planning which is currently under way at headquarters, most FO staff reported that they did not know of exercises or processes at UNODC. The development of the strategy had not adequately drawn on staff in the FOs. Staff referred to their FOs' SPFAs as their strategic frameworks and did not relate them to a UNODC-wide strategy currently being developed by the Strategic Planning Unit, since most SPFAs were developed before the draft strategy was developed. Currently, therefore, a gap still exists between the SPFAs being used by FOs and the draft strategy being discussed in-house.

88. Language barriers hamper communication and coordination between headquarters and some FOs. In some cases, headquarters does not use languages used by some of the FOs. An example is communication between headquarters and COCOL. The lack of knowledge of Spanish at headquarters is an obstacle to improving communication. COCOL administrative and financial personnel as well as some project staff need persons in FRMS and in IT who are fluent in Spanish. Many substantive units have not produced products in Spanish. Some key global programmes, like the one against trafficking in human beings, do not

have relevant staff who are able to communicate in Spanish. COCOL believes that more and better quality translations should be made.

89. Most FOs note that there is poor communication and coordination within headquarters. Various divisions and their branches are not communicating well. Often different FO staff get requests for the same information or receive several copies of the same report from units at headquarters. Headquarters has not devised ways to ensure that reports from FOs are well circulated between divisions or stored in a system that is accessible to all who need them.

90. Interviews at all the FOs and responses to the questionnaires show that there is generally good and frequent communications with FRMS at headquarters. Staff responsible for finance and accounting matters at the FOs frequently receive relevant information and guidance to enable them to conduct their operations efficiently. It is estimated that there is almost daily e-mail correspondence between FOs and FRMS. A review of copies of correspondence between some of the FOs and FRMS also show clearly that there is frequent and good communication between the two. FRMS is responsive to the needs of FOs. Client satisfaction surveys administered by FRMS also show that FOs are generally happy with FRMS support.

91. At least 80 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire view communication with FRMS and ITS as very good and consistent. They rate FRMS and ITS as the best at headquarters in initiating and/or responding to communication on a day-to-day basis. Both FRMS and ITS made strategic decisions to frequently visit FOs, meet staff face to face and assess FOs' capacities and needs. FOs say FRMS and ITS understand field conditions and hence can provide appropriate support and assistance to FOs.

92. There are serious communication problems between FOs and HRMS at headquarters. A large percentage of the staff interviewed and the responses to the questionnaire vividly show that communication between FOs and HRMS needs to be improved for the efficient functioning of the field offices. While HRMS staff claim that they frequently respond to mail and telephone calls from field office staff, those in the field were of the view that often HRMS responses come too late and are not really helpful to their field operations. HRMS does not know the exact number of field staff, although ITS has recently upgraded to overcome this problem. A new database includes information on local conditions including relevant contractual details, salary requests and contract expiration dates of field staff. At the time of this evaluation, 743 field staff had been entered into the database. HRMS rarely conducts missions to communicate to field staff personnel policies and procedures. Further, FOs claim that HRMS does not know field conditions and therefore is not able to provide relevant support or respond effectively to requests. The evaluation found that in the main frustration at the Field Office level was due to lack of information or lack of clarity about HRMS staff rules and the different employment conditions offered by different contracts. This evaluation contends that HRMS has a responsibility of ensuring that staff whether in the filed or at head quarters have a right to full information, and that it is HRMS's job to educate the staff on these issues.

Resource mobilization

93. All FOs have the responsibility of raising funds for their programmatic and core operations. FOs reported that headquarters has shortcomings in resolving the serious financial problems of UNODC. Field representatives and programme staff are expected to raise funds to cover a large portion of the FOs' budgets. Their fund-raising efforts tend to be project oriented. FOs are required to write project proposals that are then submitted to headquarters for additional input and approval by the Programme and Project Committee (PPC) before the field representative submits them to donors. As stated earlier, this procedure of the PPC approval has often not added value to many of the FOs' efforts to raise funds. In addition to the delays in getting approval from PPC, there is often limited technical input from headquarters. This raises doubts about the added value of processing projects this way.

94. Some FOs have been relatively successful in raising funds for specific projects from a wide range of donors. These offices are relying on their limited internal capacity to establish and maintain a good working relationship with interested donors. This, however, requires staff time and dedication. It was reported that sometimes fund-raising is the main preoccupation of FO staff in order for the offices to remain open. Several staff interviewed stated that they spend more than 25 per cent of their time writing project proposals. Though most of the FOs are trying to develop projects guided by their SPF_s, some staff

expressed concern that pressure on them to raise funds is such that priorities in the SPFs become secondary if funding opportunities are identified that lie outside the SPF's programme areas. Given the pressure on FOs to raise money to survive, it is understandable that staff feel compelled to accept donor-driven activities that fall outside the SPF. It is, however, difficult to determine the extent of this practice among all FOs of UNODC.

95. The increased demand on FOs to raise resources has led them to enter into new funding arrangements often involving multiple donors and partners. FOs see this as a trend that will continue and that presents some challenges in terms of synchronizing cooperation modalities, including operational agreements, technical partnerships and cooperation, reporting and disbursement requirements, synchronization and legal nuances. Some staff pointed to factors which they believe hinder their competitiveness, effectiveness and impact. For example, it takes an average of 6-12 months to get a project approved given the many review and approval stages, and it can take up to six months to identify and contract international experts through HRMS. In addition, there are problems due to travel restrictions and the unavailability of seed money, and implementation is sometimes delayed because of late funds, donor requirements and complicated implementation modalities. The Country Office for Myanmar provided several examples of the challenges being faced. Their first experience in the development and implementation of a joint proposal with the European Union (EU) was challenging because the country office was not familiar with EU funding modalities and did not anticipate what was needed. It took an additional six months to meet all requirements, which caused further delay in project implementation that led to a no-cost extension. Additionally, the Country Office for Myanmar receives (US\$ 1.7 million pledged) funding through the Fund for HIV and AIDS in Myanmar (FHAM, see paragraph 51), a national HIV/AIDS fund administered by UNDP and UNAIDS that is funded by EU, the EC and Scandinavian Governments. The FO formulates separate project documents to comply with separate requirements of respectively the FHAM and UNODC. In addition, UNODC Yangon reports to FHAM (UNDP monitored), UNAIDS (substantive monitoring) and UNODC headquarters individually. Also the funding cycles of each are not synchronized leading to funding fluctuations difficult to manage. Indeed, instead of being able to periodically receiving and handling the money locally, which is FHAM practice, UNODC rules obliges the money to be sent to the central UNODC account in New York after which it can return through UNDP Myanmar via allocation advises issued by UNODC headquarters. Since the FHAM started to operate on basis of 3-monthly disbursement within a maximum duration of a one-year framework, not fitting the calendar year, the lack of synchronization and timely disbursement of funds slows down the actual implementation of the project activities. The staff is, therefore, continually revisiting the project document and budget because they are unable to spend as anticipated, not due to their own inability to plan but because of funding and operational modalities. Therefore, staff want to see more streamlined processes and a coherent policy that ensure that mechanisms are in place to support the development and approval of quality proposals in a timely manner as well as their effective implementation.

96. FO staff reported that the PPC and CPS at UNODC headquarters are not as supportive as they would wish when it comes to resource mobilization efforts. Specifically, the concerns raised included lack of seed funds to enable FOs to work on fund-raising strategies and the absence of an overall UNODC strategy that includes fund-raising. Further, fund-raising is a time-consuming, knowledge intensive and specialized activity that cannot be undertaken without adequate training. FOs have often been left to navigate this increasingly crowded fund-raising arena.

97. Some FOs are becoming self-sustaining through their resource mobilization efforts. Examples include ROCA, CONIG and ROMEX. ROCA earns enough PSC income to more than cover its total support budget and has developed new funded initiatives with the European Commission, subcontracted through UNDP, the NATO-Russia Council and the World Bank, for which it is conducting a regional study on drug abuse and HIV. ROMEX has a core budget of US\$ 300,000 per year and had a surplus of 10 per cent, which was placed in the general-purpose fund. The Government of Mexico has contributed US\$ 2 million for ongoing initiatives. ROMEX has developed a strategic alliance with the Confederación Patronal de la Republica Mexicana (COPARMEX), an association of Mexican businesses. COPARMEX contributes funds to ROMEX under the cooperation framework it has with the Government of Mexico. Even though the source of the funds is from the private sector, they enter ROMEX as "national funds". ROMEX has

devoted a great deal of effort to pursuing sources of funding. ROBRA is also self-sustainable and has a surplus of US\$ 50,000 which it would like to invest in training and hiring experts. COCOL has set up its own fund-raising unit, which pays for itself from the donations it raises.

98. There seem to be different opinions, perceptions and practices within the organization as to who mobilizes resources and how it should be done. This has created confusion and the existence of competition among CPS, FOs and global programmes. While the terms of reference for FOs state that they are to play a role in fund-raising, FOs indicated that they have been directed to play a much more substantive role in resource mobilization due to the overall financial constraints of UNODC.

B. Human resources, finance and IT issues

Human resource management

99. The sustenance and development of human resources are two of the challenges that the FOs of UNODC face. In terms of the sustenance of staff, it is crucial that the FOs retain a critical mass of administrative and programme expertise. However, their current project funding orientation is inimical to the sustenance of staff on a long-term basis, in other words beyond specific short-term projects. Most FO programme staff are on short-term contracts, often valid for one year and renewable depending on the availability of project funding. Many staff, particularly those who have been recruited through UNDP and UNOPS, have not been properly informed of whether and/or when their contracts will be renewed. The short-term contracts and inadequate information on renewals of contracts cause uncertainty and anxiety to staff.

100. Another set of challenges pertaining to human resources management is the lack of induction or staff orientation upon joining UNODC, and that staff training opportunities are primarily limited to ProFi. FO staff holding UNDP and UNOPS contracts do not receive formal induction into the organization. With the exception of the in-house staff orientation exercises, which largely focus on the office's internal operations and SPF, carried out by some FOs, most field staff do not have the opportunity to build the necessary understanding of UNODC as a whole. They acquire knowledge of the organization and its working procedures on an ad hoc basis. A common comment received from field staff during the interviews was that "for headquarters, field office staff exist out there. We are not made to feel part and parcel of the institution". Staff said that it takes them 6-12 months to orient themselves. There was broad agreement in the East/South-East Asia offices that international experts/advisers and field staff with project and administrative management responsibilities should participate in headquarters based orientation for one or two weeks before being deployed to the field. The Legal Advisory Section (LAS) serves as a good example of taking induction seriously. LAS legal advisers are provided with a two-week orientation at headquarters before being deployed. Additionally, they are given programmatic autonomy and resources to enable them to execute their roles and to successfully integrate into regional offices.

101. The development and implementation of projects require field-based programme or project staff to be well informed on a range of new and emerging technical issues as well as changing conditions in the countries. Technical staff need to be at the cutting edge of their programmatic issues to be able to command the confidence and respect of government officials and partners. Success in resource mobilization also depends on the ability of staff to generate new project ideas. Training seminars or workshops can be important sources of new information and skills for FO staff. Currently, there seem to be limited training seminars or workshops organized for field-based technical staff. According to HRMS at headquarters, the lack of training opportunities for field staff are due to the lack of resources.

102. Staff in the East/South-East Asia offices said consideration should be given to formalizing regional focal points that can be trained on specific IT, HRMS and FRMS issues and serve as experts in the field to support other FOs. The ROCA financial analyst services are a good example of how the idea can be replicated. Staff that have received training from ITS and FRMS travel to other FOs in the two regions to train staff and provide technical backstopping. Everyone was very satisfied with this arrangement and with

the quality of the service, supporting the idea of a train-the-trainer HRMS project to ensure the ongoing institutional capacity development of FOs.

103. HRMS is only responsible for the recruitment and management of international staff. The FOs view this service to be of good quality. The recruitment and filling of national/local posts are the ones viewed by the field as being slow and this negatively impacts on the ability of FOs to deliver technical assistance to Member States.

104. As stated above, HRMS deals very little with the programme staff recruited through UNDP and UNOPS. There are no formal induction or staff training programmes for FO staff. One exceptional effort is the attempt made last year to have MENA staff interact with HRMS. A retreat was organized on 24-27 May 2005 in Ein Sukhna, Egypt. It was attended by staff from the Cairo office and the FO/outpost representatives from Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine and the United Arab Emirates. The Chief of Recruitment and Promotion from HRMS attended and facilitated the retreat, as did the focal point for North Africa and the Middle East in AMES/PDB, Division for Operations. The purpose of the retreat was to provide an opportunity for all staff members from the Cairo office to meet, coordinate and exchange information with FO staff members and HRMS.

105. Some staff at the Cairo office referred to the retreat as having been a useful opportunity for them to know more about UNODC operations and challenges. They appreciated the constraints associated with the declining financial base of the Organization. The retreat enabled them to “have some sense of what HRMS does at headquarters”. This experience shows that the approach could be replicated in other offices and would prove extremely useful in enlightening staff and making sure that the role of HRMS is better understood.

106. ROSA serves as an example of human resource challenges being faced in the field. ROSA is currently seeking to fill eight positions but, because neither ROSA nor UNDP has the capacity to manage the large volume of applications, it has been forced to contract external assistance. This is not working out well and is expensive, leading to delays in the process which have impacted on project implementation. ROSA would like to receive more support and training from HRMS to strengthen its internal human resource capacity to manage staff recruitment processes given the office’s frequent need for hiring people on short-term contracts.

107. UNDP also indicated that HRMS does not always provide UNDP with guidance when issuing and administering contracts for UNODC staff. While UNDP knows exactly what to do with its own staff as far as promotions and other benefits are concerned, it does not know how to treat UNODC staff, since issues such as promotion have budgetary implications. UNDP indicated that it would be more helpful if someone from UNODC/UNOV who understands HR issues would work closely with UNDP HR staff. UNDP said while UNODC representatives and their staff generally do their best, they however did not have sufficient HR expertise to be able to deal with all the issues pertaining to UNODC staff who hold UNDP contracts. Training UNODC administration staff was viewed as one solution to these short comings.

108. Another set of human resource management issues that FOs are faced with relate to salary disparities and hiring practices. From interviews in COCOL, for example, differences were identified in salaries for staff members who carry out similar functions. This often generates frustration. Also the four existing categories (international staff, fixed-term, service contracts and SSAs) create the impression that there are different classes of staff members. Some of the staff members interviewed expressed concern about what they perceived to be a lack of transparency in some selection processes, in particular in the composition of interview panels. Many COCOL staff members expressed dissatisfaction with human resource management because the system does not foster investing in training of staff members hired under the contractual modalities already mentioned (except international staff).

109. FOs that rely on HRMS for the recruitment of new international project staff members shared frustrations with the process. For example, ROCA has completed the selection process for a law enforcement adviser and has been waiting six months to get the person’s contract in place and sent to the field. Additionally, ROCA has had experiences with receiving lists of candidates who do not meet the minimum qualifications. Human resources field staff members also discussed the difficulty they have in

obtaining contractual details regarding international staff members from HRMS at headquarters. While they are required to provide backstopping, their requests go completely unanswered.

110. There is generally a sense of job insecurity among FO staff due to the current short-term project funding approach of UNODC. Because financial resources are not guaranteed, UNODC does not issue long-term contracts to most of its local staff. The issue of short term contracts affects HQ staff as well. Therefore, staff members are left unsure of the future of their professional career with UNODC. The situation creates stress and low morale and staff tend to be on the lookout for more secure employment opportunities. The consequences are many, particularly for long-term human resource planning that impacts on service delivery, wasted time with reissuing contracts and having to re-hire and train staff. UNDP staff interviewed commented unfavourably on the approach of using short-term contracts, especially SSA contracts.

111. The classification of staff was a problem in some of the FOs where staff reported that the terms of reference (TORs) and service contract (SC) grades were not always aligned. They explained that the decision to use SCs or SSAs and the grades were based on available project budgets and the duration of the project budget, while the TORs reflected the need for a person with higher qualifications capable of taking on more responsibility. Staff members at RCEAP indicated that for most administrative positions TORs did not correspond with their actual duties by two grades.

112. HRMS is tasked with maintaining a consultancy roster to assist with the identification of technical expertise globally. Most FOs have not used the roster successfully because they have not found it useful. The same is true for many at HQ who do not find the roster useful mainly because it is not regularly updated. Some FOs, such as ROCA and the Country Office for Myanmar, have tried to use it but reported that it is difficult to search for locally available people with specific skills, that the details are outdated and that consultants' past performances have not been assessed. Thus, FOs rely on word of mouth, although they reported that this is not ideal either because it is time-consuming and because it continues to deny FOs access to information on global expertise. The advantage of UNODC should be its ability to link global expertise to facilitate the sharing of best practices. The identification of consultants can be such a mechanism. RCEAP was not even aware that the roster existed until it was informed of it by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) during an audit. RCEAP then requested access, which took several months to obtain. FO staff claim that everything in HRMS takes forever. Head office staff who were interviewed and those who responded to the questionnaire also gave HRMS a very low rating. They often complained that HRMS was unresponsive, unhelpful and that everything took a very long time. The view was that HRMS was not being service-oriented and that it tended to "throw the book" at its clients. The lack of services provided by HRMS had a negative impact on the ability of staff at headquarters to efficiently service FOs and Member States. This position is however strongly contested by HRMS who believe that the service is client oriented. HRMS also argue that many of the problems experienced at HQ are due to poor planning by managers. HRMS further argues that staff who hold UNDP and UNOPS contracts are not administered by the service and that indeed many of them are not even UN employees. However, the staff do not understand this and they consider themselves UNODC employees. It is this situation that causes anxiety for field staff who do not understand these complex UN contractual arrangements. This evaluation contends that HRMS has a responsibility of explaining this to the field staff who work for UNODC whatever their type of contracts so that they can better appreciate their contractual arrangements.

Financial systems and management

113. UNODC FOs have well-established finance management systems and capacity, mainly due to the introduction of ProFi. With the support of ITS and FRMS, most FOs have developed capacity to use ProFi and its Field Office Management Ledger (FOML). Administrative assistants and project managers have been trained to access and use the systems. As a result of training by ITS and FRMS, most of the project staff are entering their own data into the suite of applications available in ProFi, including FOML, the Field Office Staff Information (FOSI), the Field Office Inventory (FOINV) etc.

114. FOs staff had many positive comments to make on ITS and FRMS, as well as on their support to ensure the proper functioning of ProFi and FOML. They stressed the importance of training both administrative staff and project managers.

115. A growing number of FOs have opened and operate bank accounts. These include COCOL, CONIG, ROBRA, ROCA, ROEA, ROSA and ROSEN. FRMS and ITS have been instrumental in assisting the offices to open bank accounts and build internal capacity to operate the accounts. From interviews with staff in these and other FOs, efficiency and effectiveness are greatly improved when the offices operate their own bank accounts (estimated savings from UNDP fees achieved so far is close to US\$ 800,000 since the start of the bank account execution modality through ProFi). For example, Colombia-based staff have reported that since COCOL has opened its own bank account, the execution of financial transactions has been more expedient and timely. It also appears that allowing FOs to have their own bank accounts will be a more cost-effective measure generating more savings than the previous arrangement did.

116. Between 2005 and mid-2006, FRMS assessed financial management systems of some of the FOs. The assessment showed that most offices were complying with financial regulations and rules. Expenditures were being properly monitored and the ProFi and FOML workflow was fluid. The assessment made specific recommendations that FOs are now implementing.

Information and communication technology

117. Generally, FOs of UNODC have good information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure. Staff at FOs are satisfied with the infrastructure and support services offered by headquarters, particularly with the training they get in ProFi. From interviews and responses to the questionnaires, ITS is rated very highly and is perceived as being capable and responsive to FO requests. At least 80 per cent of respondents to the questionnaire expressed satisfaction with ITS services.

118. As stated earlier, ITS maintains a sub-office in ROSA, with one manager and six support staff members, that develops, manages and coordinates all ITS field-related applications/initiatives. The manager has travelled to 80 per cent of FOs to assess FO needs and solicit recommendations that have been used to inform the development of new IT applications. ITS also has established a system to provide responsive technical help through an online Q&A, which is then used to inform continued improvements to the system. Most staff interviewed believe that ITS has taken training seriously and several FOs have actually paid for their staff to attend the training sessions. However, there is a need for more training globally, particularly for staff who have either missed training due to travel or have been newly recruited. Every FO should have qualified staff who are responsible for ongoing training.

119. A major concern emerging from interviews relates to a lack of training in the use of new ICT software and applications. Although ITS has been proactive in providing manuals and general guidance on various aspects of ICT and this has gone a long way to enhance productivity, training staff would greatly improve the efficiency and effectiveness of FOs. Project staff need training on the use of ICT to collect, collate, manage and share data. Training sessions have been organized and provided to staff in the Brazil office. Most staff in ROCA, ROSA, the Country Office for Myanmar and RCEAP have also received training, the exception being new staff members who arrived after the training sessions were given. ROCA and Myanmar CO have trained staff to provide assistance to colleagues. ITS strongly supports and advocates the need for ICT training, particularly if UNODC wants to remain at the cutting edge in terms of knowledge on how to make efficient and effective use of the investment that it has made in technology during the past few years and that it plans to make in the foreseeable future. ITS has been proactive in providing as much training as resources have allowed to users of the systems. FO budgets should make provisions for IT training for staff. ITS has been consistently frustrated in its ongoing efforts to raise significant funds for this purpose.

120. The outreach and profile of FOs can be enhanced by the proper development and maintenance of their websites. Staff interviewed expressed concern that the websites are not being properly developed and managed. For example, the sites for the Middle East and North Africa and ROSA do not provide information on recent projects or office events but instead report news and events that took place in 2004

and some in 2005. The lack of proper website development and maintenance were attributed to the absence of an adequate budget and a lack of support from ITS.

121. ITS has also been proactive in this area by providing training to website focal persons in the field who went to Vienna for a week and are now managing the content of FO websites from their respective locations. ITS has provided a content management system for them to be able to upload and maintain data and information they feel should be published on their websites, in compliance with the corporate look and feel enforced by the system. Given that UNODC web presence is a low-cost but essential instrument to advocate the UNODC message and present the work being done, ITS feels that FO representatives should be further guided on the importance of the UNODC web presence. Also, FO budgets should cover the costs of having one website content manager responsible and accountable for the quality, timeliness and relevance of the information posted on FO websites.

Support services providers

122. UNDP and UNOPS are, together with units at UNODC headquarters, the main providers of services to the FOs. The FOs largely use UNDP country offices as the principle providers of services such as banking, accounting, the procurement of office equipment and the issuance and administration of contracts for national staff and consultants. UNOPS is involved, albeit to a lesser extent, in the recruitment of international staff and consultants. UNOPS provides procurement services for projects to many FOs.

123. Interviews with staff at UNODC field offices and UNDP country offices revealed that major problems are experienced in the provision of support services. The problems can be summarized as follows:

(a) *Delays in UNDP processing payments to suppliers.* Suppliers of goods and services are paid late by UNDP and, as a result, have sometimes charged FOs interest. In general, UNDP offices acknowledged these delays, noting that they have occurred since the introduction of the Atlas system. Both UNODC and UNDP agreed that some improvements have been made, especially in UNDP offices where business centres have been established.

(b) *Inaccurate and late financial reporting by UNDP to both UNODC headquarters and FOs.* UNDP has tended to record expenditures late, sometimes as much as three months after they have occurred. Wrong financial data has sometimes been loaded into the Atlas system. In the absence of accurate data, it is impossible for FOs to do the reconciliations that are required at the end of the UNODC financial year. However, there were far fewer problems of this kind in offices where UNDP has given UNODC full access to Atlas, allowing the organization to upload the information itself.

(c) *Delays or lack of urgency with recruitment and contracting requests made by FOs of UNODC.* The recruitment of local staff and the issuance of contracts to consultants take an unnecessarily long time. Sometimes UNODC has had to send several letters and e-mails, as well as make numerous calls, to get positions advertised. However, in some offices UNDP indicated that FOs of UNODC make requests for consultants at very short notice, making it difficult for UNDP to meet the target dates.

(d) In offices without bank accounts, there are delays in bank reconciliations by UNDP, making it difficult for UNODC headquarters and field representatives to make decisions on the implementation of a project.

124. Generally, FOs of UNODC and FRMS are not satisfied with the financial and other services provided by UNDP. They cite many cases of lack of responsiveness and efficiency from UNDP. It is mainly because of this that FRMS is authorizing some of the FOs to open bank accounts and manage funds directly.

125. The relationship between UNDP and UNODC ROSEN in Dakar is very positive. While UNODC advertises the field positions for local staff, UNDP presides over the interview panel. UNODC has the final say on who gets hired. UNDP provides UNODC local staff with contracts, administers contracts and pays salaries on behalf of UNODC. UNDP has given UNODC full access to the Atlas system and has trained the Administration and Financial Assistant to use the system. UNODC staff members, therefore, enter all the UNODC projects in the Atlas system and manage them. UNODC staff members prepare all payments, raise

procurement requests and UNDP only certifies and approves payments. UNODC is able to generate all the reports it needs and is therefore not dependent on UNDP for meeting its reporting requirements.

126. While, in general, most FOs have good relations with UNDP, many staff members believe that UNDP is being paid for work that is done by UNODC. This cannot be viewed as a best practice, even if it does benefit UNODC. For this to be considered a best practice, the payments made to UNDP for the services provided would have to be revised downwards/pro-rated to reflect the fact that UNODC is doing most of the work.

127. As stated earlier, the in-depth interviews and the survey results rate UNOPS very poorly as a service provider. The interviews and the responses to the questionnaire indicate that similar problems to those experienced with UNDP exist when working with UNOPS. Poor financial records and delays in the issuance of contracts were repeatedly cited as examples. Most staff members, during in-depth interviews, stated that while UNDP has made significant adjustments to respond to UNODC needs (e.g. the establishment of a UNDP Business Unit in Pretoria, Dakar, etc. and frequent meetings with UNODC staff to improve UNDP service delivery), UNOPS is largely unresponsive. The exceptions were with AMLU and TPB who view the hiring of staff and consultants by UNOPS as efficient. These two entities are happy with UNOPS services.

C. Analysis

128. There are at least three clusters of issues that emerge from this evaluation. The first cluster relates to the organizational structure of UNODC and the role of FOs. The current UNODC structure does not really accommodate the evolution, operations and growth of field offices. FOs tend to operate as add-ons to the organization. They seem to have evolved far outside the organization and overall culture of UNODC headquarters. The very establishment of FOs may have been the result of an ad hoc decision and not based on an overall coherent strategy. This is not to deny major similarities in the operations, programmes and challenges of the FOs. What emerges from the evaluation is the lack of or at least inadequate co-evolution or organic coexistence between headquarters and the FOs. While some of the practices and values that exist at headquarters (e.g. finance and resource management) are embodied in the FOs, there appears not to be a common strategic framework unifying UNODC, apart from the overall programmatic areas of crime and drugs. Most of the challenges associated with limited communication between FOs and headquarters and between divisions in the headquarters are a manifestation of the absence of a common unifying framework and culture at UNODC.

129. The second set of issues pertains to the lack of a coherent strategy for mobilizing and managing human and financial resources for the efficient operation of the FOs and UNODC as a whole. The evaluation acknowledges that once the UNODC strategy has been adopted and is in place it should address this issue. The financial resource base of UNODC is weak. Its operations are increasingly based on extrabudgetary resources. This has made it difficult for FOs to receive adequate funds for both core and programmatic activities. UNODC does not have a coherent system or plan for supporting field offices to develop projects and raise funds for their implementation. FOs have been left on their own to wander in the complex and crowded field of fund-raising. As stated earlier, divisions and FOs within the organization tend to compete for funds from the same group of donors. On the whole, there is a lack of synergy between fund-raising efforts in FOs and at headquarters much as guidelines have been provided by CPS.

130. The third set of issues relates to the ability and flexibility of FOs and some divisions at headquarters to learn and adjust. The survival of most FOs and some HQ units/sections is due to the fact that they have been innovative and responsive to some of the constraints to their operations. Some FOs have devised really innovative ways of raising and mobilizing funds, directly engaging national governments and the private sector through a variety of mechanisms. The opening of bank accounts for some of the FOs is also an indication of how some field offices and FRMS have learned and adjusted.

131. UNODC does not have a strategy for building the human resource base of its field offices. FOs and HRMS have not really identified long-term staffing needs nor put in place a strategy for acquiring the best

available expertise. Technical staff are recruited around projects. Even for FO core operations, staffing is managed on an ad hoc basis around short-term needs. Without a long-term focus, it is unlikely that UNODC will attract and retain the best technical expertise in its FOs. This evaluation shows that most FOs do not have adequate expertise in drug and crime prevention.

132. Despite the above limitations, some commendable efforts have been made to support FOs so that they can deliver technical assistance. Two are worth singling out. The first is the proactive engagement of FRMS in ensuring that the FOs have the necessary systems and staff for financial management. FRMS is directly involved with the offices in establishing systems and training staff. It has good communications with field offices. FRMS is supporting the offices to address many of the limitations or problems associated with the support services provided by UNDP. The second is provided by ITS, which works with FOs to identify their needs and establish appropriate information and communication systems.

V. Lessons learned and best practices

A. Substantive or technical considerations

133. There are a number of best practices to be discerned and lessons to be learned from the findings of this evaluation. In terms of headquarters providing technical backstopping, one example of good practice of FO collaboration with units at UNODC headquarters is the engagement between ROMENA and the Criminal Justice Unit. This is a good example of how a unit at headquarters can respond to and support a field office to deliver technical assistance to UNODC Member States. The Criminal Justice Unit has established a good relationship with ROMENA because of its agility in responding to requests from the FO. It has also been proactive in working with the office to develop projects. This is the converse of cases in which divisions at headquarters develop and implement country projects without the involvement of FOs.

134. An example of good practice in resource mobilization is the effort made by COIRA. COIRA has been able to secure a significant portion of the resources it needs for its projects locally thanks to its very close partnership with donors. As a rule, before developing a project COIRA establishes a working group that involves potential donors and organizes joint missions – for example, to Pakistan for a border project and within the Islamic Republic of Iran for a prison system – to give donors the opportunity to observe situations first-hand. By the time a project proposal is drawn, interested donors are familiar with the project ideas and have a better understanding of the issues. Many donors are ready to make contributions well in advance. Other UNODC offices can replicate this. The key message is that FOs and headquarters should involve donors at an early phase of project development to facilitate resource mobilization activities.

135. Another good practice example is the policy adopted by COIRA for the dissemination of information. COIRA disseminates evaluation reports to local authorities and donors to inform them of programme status and performance, to keep them engaged in the office's activities and to build a sense of ownership among stakeholders.

136. There are very few cases of UNODC FOs attracting private sector support. Exceptional cases are the pioneer efforts made by ROBRA (already described above) and the strategic alliance between ROMEX and COPARMEX, an association of Mexican businesses. COPARMEX contributes funds to ROMEX under the cooperation framework it has with the Government of Mexico so that, even though the funds come from the private sector, they enter ROMEX as national funds.

137. Generally, FO efforts at developing SPF^s are characterized by good practices. The SPF^s are developed through consultative or participatory processes. The SPF of ROCA can be taken as a good example, for it is a document that was developed with the cooperation and input of various stakeholders, including donors, headquarters governments and NGOs. Different people drafted different parts of the SPF and then consulted together in-house. Experts in different areas were asked to participate. All ROCA projects are reflected in the priorities set out in the SPF.

138. An example of ensuring efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of technical cooperation is the approach adopted by ROBRA of including baselines, clear indicators and monitoring and evaluation

systems in all projects. These aspects are explicitly written in project proposals and carefully followed in their implementation.

139. A good practice in facilitating exchange of information and keeping stakeholders informed of UNODC activities is the Intranet for project H90 introduced by ROMEX, which connects all stakeholders, provides a useful platform for exchanging information and can provide online training. UNODC e-Learning staff in Bangkok could benefit from this experience. Similarly, the ROCA Coordination and Analysis Unit (CAU), funded by the Paris Pact project, maintains a database – with a built-in dynamic mapping facility – on assistance provided in the region and information on drug and crime trends that is open to donors, drug liaison officers, governments and others. The CAU concept will be replicated in other FOs under the revised Paris Pact project.

140. In the East and South-East Asia offices, there has been much discussion about the need to have a global data collection system that can capture and analyse information regardless of the theme. The RIM Expert in Myanmar and the ROSA project on trafficking in humans are both interested in linking up with the RCEAP ATS team to discuss data collection systems. They want to find out whether data collection systems and methods can be replicated or linked, thus providing an opportunity to begin monitoring and analysing regional and global trends regardless of the thematic area.

141. LAS management of field-based experts serves as a best practice for the placement of experts in FOs. LAS legal advisers are provided with a two-week orientation at headquarters before being deployed, programmatic autonomy and resources, reliable backstopping from LAS, and permission to integrate into regional centres/field offices. There is a need to develop a formal policy that provides a framework for the consistent placement of field experts. The policy should clarify both logistical and substantive issues, including criteria to determine when, where and how an expert is needed and used in a particular country or region.

B. Administrative arrangements

142. The creation by COCOL of a fundraising unit, staffed with two full-time employees, is considered a best practice because it has allowed the FO to increase its income. However, problems may result if headquarters does not provide an appropriate set of operational guidelines. Several offices have taken steps to hire staff tasked with advocacy, awareness-raising and coordinating technical cooperation partnerships to help strengthen their offices' external relations and resource mobilization prospects. The Myanmar CO and ROSA have appointed specific focal points to help raise their profile among partners in technical cooperation as well as among Member States.

143. The approach taken by some FOs to ensure that projects contribute resources to pay for common core communications and administrative services is innovative and a good practice. It enables FOs to exploit economies of scale and rationalize use of resources. ROCA and ROMEX have taken this approach. In addition, ROMEX pays part of the salary of an IT specialist originally assigned under the NDS project to assist the office in its own IT needs.

144. ROBRA makes a great effort in terms of ensuring quality control management. It has sub-contracted a company to certify that companies partnering with UNODC Brazil meet ISO 9001 criteria on quality control and ISO 23000 on social responsibility. These are lessons that other FOs and headquarters can draw from ROBRA.

145. FRMS and ITS approaches to backstopping FOs are best practices in UNODC. The two sections are very responsive to the needs of FOs. They visit FOs, assess needs, review the implementation of policies, provide training courses to FO staff and have put in place responsive support mechanisms, such as the ITS Q&A. There is good communication between these sections and FOs.

VI. Recommendations

146. Based on the empirical findings, this evaluation makes following recommendations:

Finding 1. Present communication and coordination mechanisms between and within divisions are weak and responsibilities are not well defined, and hence this undermines efforts by headquarters to support FOs in delivering technical assistance to Member States.

Recommendation. *Review and reform of UNODC organizational communication and coordination mechanisms.* In order to better support field offices in their delivery of technical assistance and cooperation, it is crucial for UNODC to carefully review and adjust its structure so as to improve communication and coordination between the various divisions at headquarters. The review should focus on identifying the best locus for coordinating operations at FOs. It should also aim at broadening inter-divisional cooperation in support of the FOs. Measures that will increase interactions and cooperation between the different regional offices should also be identified. These should ensure that there is decentralization – the transfer of responsibilities, resources, decision-making authority and accountability from headquarters to the FOs. Specific benchmarks or indicators of decentralization should be established and be well known to all in the organization. This should extend to the placement of experts in FOs. There is a need to develop a formal policy that provides a framework for the consistent placement of field experts. Policy should clarify both the logistical and substantive issues, including criteria to determine when, where and how an expert is needed and used in a particular country or region.

Finding 2. In general, staff from both headquarters and FOs do not view HRMS positively and were critical of the quality and consistency of services it provided. During the in-depth interviews, senior management at headquarters raised these views, which were reflected in the results of the survey carried out by staff at headquarters and in the interviews and survey carried out by field staff. The level of dissatisfaction was higher at headquarters, with 54 per cent rating HRMS services “good”, 23 per cent rating them “fair” and 23 per cent rating them “poor” (see annex). The following issues were specifically emphasized:

- *That HRMS is not client or service oriented and tends to “throw the book” at its clients instead of helping them understand the constraints posed by rules and regulations on the service.* The major issues raised here had to do mainly with efficiency and timeliness of recruitment.
- *That HRMS has not made adequate visits to FOs and hence does not fully appreciate the conditions and problems experienced by field staff.* Because of this, FO staff members believe that HRMS cannot provide relevant advice or support to the field. UNDP agreed that, when dealing with UNODC staff members, it does not receive adequate guidance from HRMS.
- *That HRMS does not take the time to explain the rules and regulations to its clients.* While HRMS is frustrated because it feels that staff members do not understand the limitations imposed on it by rules and regulations, most staff members view the problem as inflexibility or unwillingness on the part of HRMS to either help or provide guidance.

Recommendation. *HRMS needs to take steps to address these issues and reverse the negative image that its clients have.* Specifically, HRMS should:

- Be more client- and service-oriented and adopt a policy of spending more time properly orienting staff, explaining the meaning, implications and limitations of the rules, regulations and human resource policies that it administers.
- Devote time and resources to visit field offices in order to learn about field conditions, but also to provide adequate and accurate information on human resources issues and technical assistance/capacity development to FO staff in support of their human resources needs. Further, HRMS should create the opportunity to discuss with UNDP those issues that UNDP and the representatives currently struggle with and provide them with guidance.

- Adopt a more “people-centred approach” as opposed to the current over-emphasis on rules and regulations. HRMS should also spend more time explaining and interpreting the rules and regulations, which most staff find very complicated.

Finding 3. The roles and responsibilities of field offices in the design and implementation of technical assistance to Member States on the one hand and those of HSB in the design and implementation of Global Programmes on the other are not clearly defined. Further, these roles are equally unclear when it comes to relationships between the field and other entities at headquarters like the Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), the Anti-Corruption Unit and the Anti-Money-Laundering Unit. As a result, there seem to be competition and turf fights over who is responsible for delivering technical assistance to Member States. The competition between HSB and some FOs and that between FOs and TPB for funding and technical assistance provision to Member States is very pronounced. There is also a lack of clarity over the responsibility of technical experts at headquarters in providing technical expertise to field offices.

Recommendation. *Streamlining responsibilities and accountability.* There is a need to streamline responsibilities between FOs and headquarters, particularly with regard to the role of the FOs and HSB, as well as of other entities, in the design and implementation of technical assistance and global programmes and other interventions by TPB and others at the level of Member States. Streamlining responsibilities between HSB and FOs as well as with other headquarters entities that provide technical assistance to Member States will ensure that UNODC global programmes and others effectively support field operations by providing technical expertise, thus enabling FOs to deliver technical assistance more efficiently and effectively. This will also clarify how other entities provide technical assistance to Member States.

Recommendation. *Related to the above, UNODC management should urgently take decisions and clarify the roles and responsibilities of HSB and the FOs in the implementation of projects and provision of technical expertise.* These decisions should clearly articulate what kind of technical and expert support HSB should render to the FOs. Similarly, policies must clearly articulate what technical expertise the field can expect from other entities such as TPB and the Rule of Law Section, among others. Further, management should clearly articulate the division of labour between headquarters and the FOs in terms of providing technical assistance to Member States. This clarity would also reduce the current competition for resources and turf.

Finding 4. Most FOs do not have adequate staffing levels or the capacity to effectively deliver the volume and quality of technical assistance needed by Member States. Further, there is lack of effective communication between field staff and HRMS on issues of contracts, recruitment procedures and skills enhancement. All these negatively impact the ability of FOs to deliver services efficiently and effectively.

Recommendation. *Review FOs’ staffing needs and design a long-term capacity-building strategy.* A comprehensive field staff development strategy and staff recruitment and administration guidelines are required. Such a strategy and guidelines should articulate specific measures that will improve communication between field staff and HRMS. They should focus on aspects such as recruitment, skills enhancement and sustainability of staffing in the offices given that staff contracts are tied to project funding.

Finding 5. In general, field staff do not receive any orientation when they join the organization. They hardly receive any training and rarely participate in skills development activities.

Recommendation. *Orientation for new staff should cover, at minimum, the following four main sections:*

- UN and UNODC mandates, including UNODC conventions and protocols, drug and crime issues and the thematic areas including examples of national, regional and global projects.
- UNODC structures (organizational chart, including field structure), management and decision-making authorities and process, policies/procedures/systems and mechanisms.
- UNODC administrative support services provided by HRMS, FRMS, ITS (including ITS applications and systems), FRMS budgeting and reporting, and HRMS issues in relation to contractual mechanisms, benefits and rights.

- Field office roles and responsibilities, links to headquarters, authorities, etc.

Finding 6. Presently, there are many UNODC entities that are involved in fund-raising. These include FOs, CPS, global programmes and many sections and units. There seems to be lack of clarity as to which UNODC entities fund-raise for which activities. The role of CPS in relation to fund-raising by FOs is not clear. Further, there are no clear guidelines on which donors (country level missions/embassies or capitals) can be approached by FOs. Where such guidelines exist these are not understood by all those who are involved in fundraising. This causes confusion and frustrations at both UNODC and donor levels. While a management instruction has existed since May 2006, it is obviously not known or understood by all who are involved in fund-raising. Most field and headquarters staff are still unsure about which guidelines can be used, which is why the various actors continue to compete for funds in this increasingly crowded arena. However, CPS in 2005 initiated a process of “new partnerships” with its donors involving regular dialogue on many issues ranging from policy, management, funding and operational matters. Further, CPS has articulated its new funding approach at two successive FO Representative seminars. These efforts at the time of this evaluation had not as yet fully impacted the way the FOs fundraised.

Recommendation. *Articulate more clearly the strategy for fund-raising and make it known to all who are involved in fund-raising.* Mobilizing funds for core and project activities remains one of the major challenges facing UNODC. One of the objectives of the UNODC strategic plan must be to secure stable and predictable funding. Consequently, a comprehensive action plan to achieve this objective should be designed linking the organizational strategy, development of projects and fund-raising. UNODC must develop an overall strategy that goes beyond the management instructions to increase coherence and synergy in resource mobilization. Such a strategy should also aim to strengthen the capacity of FOs by making seed funds available to them, training staff in fund-raising and promoting the sharing of information on different donors' priorities, policies and procedures. Proper guidelines must be developed in order to regulate the operations of fund-raising units created by FOs. The roles and responsibilities of CPS versus those of FOs with regard to fund-raising must be clearly defined. Information and guidelines on fundraising should be uploaded and made accessible to all including the Field Offices. Training of field staff in fundraising should accompany these guidelines.

Finding 7. At present, there is no clear policy to guide FOs on their eligibility to open bank accounts. UNODC is handling the issue of opening bank accounts and transferring accounting responsibilities from UNDP to FOs on an ad hoc basis. The criteria used by FRMS is generally not known to most field representatives. FOs do not know the criteria being used to determine which FOs should open bank accounts and when. However, according to FRMS, if the saving accruing from opening a bank account exceeds what UNODC pays UNDP, then a field office is allowed to open a bank account.

Recommendation. *Develop a clear policy on opening bank accounts for FOs (as noted above).* These criteria should be consolidated and embodied in a clear policy that is written and made known to all the offices.

Finding 8. While many efforts have been made to improve the situation, weak communication between the field and headquarters continues to be a major challenge to UNODC.

Recommendation. *Promote the use of videoconferencing and other modes of communication to build strong links between FOs and headquarters, as well as among FOs.* Videoconferencing can greatly improve communication within UNODC. Field staff recommended that videoconferencing be used to involve FOs in the PPC project proposal review process to enable field staff to discuss their proposal and answer questions.

Finding 9. Efforts to streamline the Project Cycle Management (PCM) were proposed in the Diagnostic Report produced in 2005; not much headway was made till the middle of 2006. In the meantime, many field and headquarters staff said that UNODC continues to experience difficulties with project formats, review and approval processes. The evaluation acknowledges that as this report goes to print the Strategic Planning Unit have developed a new project template and a corresponding training module covering key aspects of the project cycle. Delivery of this training will be done in collaboration with the IEU starting in early 2007. It is important to note that efforts to streamline PCM are closely linked to the UNODC

medium-term strategy as well as with other planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation instruments within the UNODC. **Recommendation.** *Implement in full the recommendations of the Project Cycle Management Diagnostic Study.* In particular, the implementation should address the following recommendation, which is summarized as follows: Streamline PPC procedures – to increase efficiency and effectiveness in project development, it is necessary to improve formats for project documents and to reduce the number of stages and people involved in the project review and approval process. This also relates to the role of the CPS. CPS can help FOs to be better prepared for what to expect, to manage multi-donor and partner collaborations and ensure the synchronization of all funding and partnership modalities.

Finding 10. UNODC is not linked horizontally, regionally or thematically. Therefore, knowledge, data, expertise, lessons learned and best practices are not captured, disseminated and utilized at a global level.

Recommendation. *UNODC should consider undertaking an exercise that ITS used in developing the existing ITS systems.* A data collection mechanism/system could be developed based on consultation with staff (actual project staff) from all four regions and headquarters to assess the perceived needs as well as identify the specific types of information that is available at the country and FO levels. The long-term objective should be the development of integrated thematic databases that capture information at the regional level so that it can be integrated to provide global perspectives and regional trends on specific programme/thematic areas. This database should form part of the electronic-based Knowledge Management Platform.

VII. Conclusions

147. This evaluation has clearly demonstrated that UNODC SMTC can be greatly improved if specific reforms are made in the organizational structure of UNODC to better integrate FOs. There is a need to decentralize decision-making authority to FOs and to clarify the roles and responsibilities of FOs and headquarters. It is, however, acknowledged that decentralization has cost implications and that such a change should be planned as part of the overall organizational strategy and the comprehensive fund-raising plan. The organization needs to finalize and adopt the draft organizational strategy and establish ways and means of building its human resource base through staff induction, in-house training courses and better organized mentorship. There is also a need for a UNODC resource mobilization strategy that will ensure that FOs efforts are coherent with and supported by approaches at headquarters and that decentralization efforts are linked to fund-raising. Undertaking these reforms will require executive leadership and an open, inclusive participatory process in UNODC as a whole. It is also clear that for many of these reforms to succeed, the support of donors and Member States will be paramount.

Annex I

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Support Mechanisms for Technical Cooperation (SMTC) Evaluation: Terms of Reference, May 2006

A. Background information

1. In 1997, the Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (ODCCP) was established combining the Organization's drug programme and crime programme in an integrated manner. In October 2002, the ODCCP was changed to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Other structural, management and policy decisions were taken during this period, such as the delegation of authorities and decentralization, all of which have had an affect on how the UNODC operates today. The consolidation of these entities, combined with other management initiatives aimed at reform, has put in place new structures as well as operational opportunities and challenges for UNODC in relation to the implementation of technical cooperation.

2. At present, UNODC employs approximately 500 staff members hired through the Recruitment and Placement Unit (RPU) of the Human Resources Management Service (HRMS), Division for Management (DM), as well as approximately 700 field-based staff members and personnel recruited through UNOPS and UNDP. UNODC is mandated to assist Member States in their struggle against illicit drugs, crime and terrorism. The three pillars of the work programme of UNODC include: research and analytical work, normative work and field based technical cooperation. The organization's interventions are designed to achieve the following outcomes:

- Governments will be better equipped to fulfil and implement their obligations under international treaties, particularly through effective judicial cooperation, prevention and countermeasures against illicit drug production, trafficking and abuse, trafficking in humans and other forms of organized crime, money-laundering, corruption and terrorism.
- Decisions by policymakers will be more evidence-based, relying on a more extensive and intensive knowledge of illicit drugs, crime and terrorism issues.
- Civil society and public opinion will be more firmly committed to action against illicit drug and crime problems, relying on greater awareness and understanding of the issues.

3. In 2002, UNODC undertook an exercise to re-examine its operations and released a plan of action and guidelines. Since 2003, a number of operational priorities and guidelines have been developed to facilitate and enable UNODC to pursue its priorities fully and rapidly and in an integrated manner. The guidelines are intended to provide guidance to the UNODC governing bodies in relation to prioritizing action. Its objectives include improving governance, funding, operations, staff-management relations and communications. This was to be achieved in an efficient, coherent and creditable manner. Such governance initiatives reflect the desire of UNODC to reorganize the institution to achieve its outcomes.

B. Evaluation purpose

4. The initiatives mentioned above were designed to provide more practical, integrated technical assistance in relation to the interrelated issues of drug control, crime prevention and terrorism. The purpose of this evaluation, therefore, is to assess if enabling conditions have been exploited within UNODC with a view to exploring what provisions for administrative and substantive services have been operationalized and to determine their efficiency, effectiveness and coherence. Through this exploration, the evaluation also seeks to identify areas that need to be reviewed further in relation to strengthening UNODC and its capacity to deliver technical assistance.

5. The evaluation will review UNODC administrative and substantive support mechanisms that are currently in place at headquarters and in the field, as well as the administrative support mechanisms provided by other inter-agency organizations, including UNDP and UNOPS, with a view to strengthening these mechanisms in order to provide a more comprehensive, cohesive, efficient and effective delivery system that contributes to organizational improvement; hence enabling the delivery of technical cooperation.

6. The evaluation will examine UNODC structures and mechanisms including systems, strategies, practices and procedures, and how they affect the implementation of technical cooperation initiatives. It is expected that the evaluation will contribute to UNODC organizational improvement.

7. In addition, the evaluation will assess UNODC initiatives beginning in 2004 with a view to drawing lessons and best practices that can be used to improve organizational operations as well as to make recommendations for existing and new initiatives, and priorities for further consideration.

C. Evaluation scope

8. The evaluation will focus primarily on strategic measures that have been taken since 2004 to introduce new structures, systems and mechanisms to strengthen UNODC through enhanced administrative and substantive planning, coordination and communication within UNODC structures at headquarters and in the field as well as between the field and headquarters. The evaluation will also examine existing mechanisms. Mechanisms such as the UNODC Project Cycle Management (PCM), the establishment of an Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), Strategic Programme Frameworks (SPFs), and the introduction of several initiatives to streamline financial management are but a few examples. The evaluation seeks to identify such mechanisms and assess their application, reach and effectiveness. In this process, the evaluation will highlight shortcomings and areas that are in need of further review and consideration. The evaluation will take into consideration the role of decentralization in relation to improving the delivery of technical assistance to Member States and any efforts that have been initiated and their effectiveness. Finally, the evaluation looks at the swiftness, consistence of application and impact that such initiatives have had to date.

9. While primarily taking into consideration the historical context of UNODC, the evaluation will particularly focus on initiatives from 2004 to the present. However, the scope will include existing mechanisms initiated before 2004 that remain operational today.

10. The geographical coverage is global and will include site visits to regional centres and offices and country offices in Africa and the Middle East (CO Nigeria, RO Eastern Africa/Kenya, RO Southern African/South Africa, RO Western and Central Africa/Senegal, RO Middle East and North Africa/Egypt and CO Jordan), Latin America and the Caribbean (RO Mexico and Central America/Mexico, RO Brazil, CO Colombia), South/East Asia and the Pacific (CO Myanmar, RC East Asia and the Pacific/Thailand, RO South Asia/India) Europe and West/Central Asia (RO Central Asia/Uzbekistan).

11. While the aim of the evaluation is to help strengthen UNODC as a whole, the primary stakeholders include UNODC field offices, Division for Operations (DO) (HSB/PDB), Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA) (TPB/TLAB), Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs (DPA) (PARB/PAIB), Division for Management (DM) (FRMS, HRMS, ITS) and the Executive Committee.

12. The evaluation will address two levels of operations within UNODC. It will review and assess the administrative support mechanisms including finance, IT and human resources. This review will include the UNODC DM as well as UNDP and UNOPS, within their limited roles. Second, the evaluation will address substantive support provided by UNODC both at headquarters and in the field. This will include DO (HSB/PDB), DTA (TPB/TLAB) and DPA (PARB/PAIB), as well as their respective sections and units.

13. The evaluation will examine, among other items, the following:

Administration support provided by UNODC DM (FRMS/HRMS/ITS), UNDP and UNOPS

- What administrative services and support are provided by UNODC, UNDP and UNOPS to UNODC field offices and headquarters?
- What is the justification for using different service providers and how is the quality and efficiency of the services?
- What systems and mechanisms for strategic planning, management, monitoring and evaluation do DM sections and units utilize?
- What mechanisms and systems are in place for recruiting and hiring UNODC staff and other personnel (consultants, service contractors, interns, etc.) both at headquarters and in the field?
- How has the role of IT evolved since 2004? What role has it played in helping to design and operationalize new systems to improve communications, documentation and consistency in relation to information management and dissemination both at headquarters and in the field, and between the field and headquarters? Who utilizes ITS? Is there scope for expanded utilization of ITS to strengthen the delivery of technical assistance?
- What measures has FRMS taken to improve service delivery to UNODC as a whole, which can demonstrate a direct impact on the delivery of quality technical assistance?
- What is UNODC's understanding of the role and responsibilities of administrative "service providers" within UNODC?
- What new mechanisms have been introduced in the past two years? What areas of improvement can be identified? What can be done to continue strengthening UNODC in relation to the delivery of technical assistance?
- What type of induction programmes are provided to new staff joining UNODC? Are they mandatory, comprehensive and timely?

Substantive support provided by DO (HSB/PDB), DTA (TPB/TLAB), DP (PARB/PAIB), field offices

- Does the current UNODC structural framework provide an enabling environment in the delivery of technical assistance to Member States?
- What mechanisms exist to support coordination between the field and headquarters? Are they utilized and by whom? Are they relevant, efficient and effective?
- What systems to support planning and programme management exist? Are they coherent and uniform throughout the organization? Do they ensure (require) adequate collaboration between headquarters and the field?
- What systems for strategic planning, management, monitoring and evaluation do the divisions, branches and units utilize? Are they uniform? Are the systems complied with?
- Do staff at all levels understand what is expected of them? Are roles, responsibilities and expectations clearly defined and understood? What type of induction programmes are provided to new staff joining UNODC? Are they mandatory, comprehensive and timely?
- How do the divisions, branches and units based at headquarters interact? How do these same entities interact with the field? Is the framework for cooperation and engagement clearly defined and understood? Are they uniformly followed?
- What operational improvements have been experienced since the introduction of new management guidelines in the past two years? What areas of improvement can be identified to support the continued strengthening of UNODC in relation to the delivery of technical assistance?
- What is the process for resource mobilization?

- What proportion of time is spent in relation to administration of programme delivery and technical assistance? Are there any efficiencies that can be proposed?

D. Evaluation methods

14. The evaluation methods will include the following:

- The evaluation will be participatory in nature, engaging a broad representation of the stakeholders.
- A draft TOR will be developed and disseminated as a tool for the generation of discussion and inputs into its finalization. Contributions will be gathered through interviews with key stakeholders and in written form. A finalized TOR will be distributed to all stakeholders.
- The evaluation will make optimal use of already available information. A review and analysis of documents will take place including, but not limited to, evaluations, audits, self-assessments, management documents, intranet documents and other materials gathered throughout the evaluation. Evaluations conducted by the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), United Nations Advisory Committees and other entities such as Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) will be reviewed to assess reoccurring issues and to determine if and how recommendations have been operationalized.
- The review will also include exploring other IT-related tools that have been developed or are in the process of being developed to improve programme planning and implementation, including PCM and ProFi.
- Interviews will be held with stakeholders at UNODC headquarters and field offices, and with UNDP and UNOPS.
- Participatory observation and rapid appraisal will be used at field offices to ensure the broadest range of inputs.
- Field visits will be organized to regional centres and offices and country offices to conduct in-depth evaluations of the above objectives. The selection of regions was based on available funding and designed to provide a global perspective as well as a perspective from the various levels of field operations, for example country offices, regional offices and regional centres. The global distribution is as follows: AMES CO (2) and RO (4); LACS CO (2) and RO (1); SEAPS CO (1) and RO (2); EWCAS RO (1) and CO (1).
- In advance of the field visits, evaluation instruments, such as questionnaires for written and verbal inputs, will be developed to assist in gathering relevant, consistent data. An electronic questionnaire will be designed and distributed to all field representatives and field personnel. The questionnaire will enable all field staff who did not participate in the verbal interviews to provide input. A second questionnaire will also be designed and distributed to staff based at UNODC in Vienna. The intention is similar in that not all staff will be interviewed orally, so the questionnaire provides an opportunity for them to provide input. The responses will be consolidated and shared in the final report.
- Upon completion of the evaluation process, the evaluation team, in collaboration with the IEU, will organize a presentation of the final report findings for interested stakeholders as a means of social and factual verification.
- The final report will be produced by the team leader and handed over to the Chief of IEU, who will assume responsibility for its distribution.

E. Team composition and qualifications

15. The evaluation team will consist of the following members:
 - (a) The Chief of IEU is responsible for planning, managing and providing guidance throughout the evaluation process. The Chief will also oversee some of the field visits.
 - (b) One evaluator/leader is responsible for coordinating the work of the team members and preparing the final evaluation report.
 - (c) Three evaluators/team members are responsible for visiting designated regions and preparing country reports that will provide input for the preparation of the final evaluation report. One of the evaluators will take the lead in the preparation of evaluation instruments, TOR and workplan.
 - (d) One IEU staff will work with and provide guidance on the fieldwork and the preparation process as well as oversee some of the field visits.
16. The team members will have the following minimum qualifications:
 - At least a Masters degree in Social Science, Economics, Political Science, Planning, Evaluation, Programme Project Design or other relevant subject area and experience.
 - Minimum of 10 years of working experience.
 - At least 5 years of experience working in the field or knowledge of organizational development.
 - At least 3 years of experience in conducting independent programme/project evaluations.
 - Experience in institutional evaluation or policy development.
 - Knowledge of the United Nations or international organizations is an asset.
 - Fluency in the English language and excellent writing skills.

F. Team tasks and deliverables

17. The IEU will provide technical and logistical support as well as participate in the evaluation process. The Chief of IEU will provide overall guidance and participate in various activities as outlined below. A single team member will perform the following tasks in preparation for carrying out the evaluation.
 - In collaboration with the IEU, develop a detailed evaluation workplan.
 - Review existing IEU evaluations and other relevant documentation to identify common issues and recommendations that are within the scope of the SMTCA evaluation.
 - Conduct interviews with key stakeholders at headquarters and use the inputs in the development of evaluation instruments.
 - Incorporate stakeholder comments and finalize TORs.
 - Prepare and finalize the evaluation instruments, including questionnaires and discussion issues to be used by the team.
18. At the conclusion of the above tasks, the team member will have produced the following deliverables:
 - Finalized TOR.
 - Finalized evaluation plan.
 - Finalized evaluation questions.
 - Finalized evaluation instruments, questionnaires and discussion issues.

19. Using the deliverables mentioned above, the team will conduct the SMTCA evaluation. The team leader will lead the fieldwork, provide guidance on the preparation of individual country reports to be prepared by team members and prepare the final SMTCA evaluation report. The final report will integrate the responses received from the electronic questionnaires distributed to staff at UNODC in Vienna and in the field. The following activities constitute the team's responsibilities and deliverables based on the SMTCA workplan:

- The team leader will coordinate the work of other team members.
- All team members will attend briefing meetings and interviews at UNODC headquarters in Vienna at the beginning of the process, prior to visiting the field.
- All team members will carry out field work as outlined in the TOR.
- Each team member will produce a country report for each regional centre/office and country office visited.
- The team leader will receive report inputs of acceptable quality from other evaluation team members. He/she will analyse and synthesize the reports and produce the first draft SMTCA evaluation report.
- The first draft report will be shared with the Chief of IEU and all evaluation team members for verification. All team members will provide feedback to the team leader within one week of receiving the draft.
- The second draft SMTCA evaluation report will be presented in a seminar at headquarters. It will then be distributed to stakeholders at headquarters and in the field for comment.
- Comments from stakeholders will be collected and incorporated as inputs into the report.
- The final SMTCA Evaluation Report will be submitted by the team leader to the Chief of IEU.

G. Planning and implementation arrangements

When	What	Who	Where
April	Draft TOR disseminated to HQ and field for comments	IEU	UNODC HQ (Vienna)
2-16 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with stakeholders • TOR finalized • Evaluation instruments developed and finalized • Workplan finalized • Field visits organized • Electronic questionnaire distributed to field 	Team member 1 IEU	UNODC HQ (Vienna)
22-26 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team briefing and interviews • Electronic questionnaire distributed at HQ 	Team members 1, 2, 3, 4 IEU	UNODC HQ (Vienna)
27 May-1 July	Field visits	Team members 1, 2, 3, 4	Africa and the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean, South and East Asia and the Pacific, and West and Central Asia.
1 July-7 August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of country reports and first draft SMTCA report • Consolidated electronic questionnaire responses • Seminar held to distribute first draft SMTCA report and solicit stakeholder input at HQ • Draft report disseminated to field for input 	Team members 1, 2, 3, 4	From individuals' home base
		Team leader	UNODC HQ (Vienna)

<i>When</i>	<i>What</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>Where</i>
7 September	Final SMT report distributed	Team leader	Submitted electronically to UNODC IEU
September	Final SMT report distributed to all stakeholders	IEU	UNODC HQ (Vienna)

Appendices

The following definitions are provided to clarify the TOR and ensure that everyone has a common understanding of the terms used. The definitions have been taken from the official definitions provided by the United Nations and have not been prepared by the evaluation team.

For purposes of the SMTCA evaluation, the following definitions are provided:

Technical cooperation: the provision of expert advice, skills or assistance in the form of specialist personnel, training and /or capacity-building measures in areas of UNODC competency.

Support mechanism: an action carried out to assist the implementers of technical cooperation in achieving desired outputs for which they are accountable.

Participatory evaluation: the active involvement in the evaluation process of those with a stake in the programme (providers, partners, customers/beneficiaries) and any other interested parties. Participation typically takes place throughout all phases of the evaluation: planning and design; gathering and analysing the data; identifying the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations; disseminating results; and preparing an action plan to improve the performance of the initiative being evaluated.

Capacity assessment: the diagnostic process to determine institutional capacity to implement and sustain a policy. The assessment can be conducted at various levels and cover single or multiple institutional functions.

Effectiveness: the extent to which development intervention objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Efficiency: a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time etc) are converted to results.

Benchmark: reference point or standard against which performance or achievements can be based.

Stakeholders: agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation.

Annex II

Results of field and headquarters surveys

Table 1: Distribution of responses by service providers

Service Providing Agencies	Human Resource		Financial Admin		Procurement		Project Management	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
UNODC-HRMS	22	29						
UNODC-FMRS			34	41			0	
UNODC-DO					19		39	66
UNOPS	8	10	5	6	14	23	7	12
UNDP	47	61	44	53	27	45	13	22
Total	77	100	83	100	60	100	59	100

Table 2: Rating of support service providers by staff (HQ and Field) expressed in percentage

Support Service Providers	HQ			Field			Total					
	Good	Fair	Poor	Total % (n)	Good	Fair	Poor	Total % (n)	Good	Fair	Poor	Total % (n)
Recruitment	53	23	23	100 (43)	74	21	6	100 (34)	62	22	16	100 (27)
Procurement	52	24	24	100 (25)	62	31	8	100 (26)	57	27	16	100 (51)
Personnel	66	25	9	100 (44)	87	13	0	100 (30)	74	20	5	100 (74)
Admin of Office	88	0	12	100 (17)	84	8	8	100 (25)	86	5	10	100 (42)
Admin of Projects	74	26	0	100 (23)	88	12	0	100 (33)	82	18	0	100 (56)
Financial Office	66	28	7	100 (29)	77	17	7	100 (30)	71	22	7	100 (59)
Financial Projects	63	25	13	100 (24)	79	18	3	100 (33)	72	21	7	100 (57)
Infor Technology	85	13	2	100 (48)	84	13	3	100 (32)	85	13	3	100 (80)

Note: Overall rating: Good (80%-100%), Fair (60%-80%), Poor (below 60%)

Table 3: Headquarters staff response about timeliness of support services

Support Service Providers	Timeliness of support services (HQ)			
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not rated (%)	Total % (n)
Recruitment	33	62	5	100 (42)
Procurement	40	60	0	100 (20)
Personnel	72	21	8	100 (39)
Admin of Office	54	42	4	100 (26)
Admin of Projects	81	19	0	100 (26)
Financial Office	76	24	0	100 (29)
Financial Projects	67	33	0	100 (24)
Infor Technology	85	11	4	100 (46)

Table 4: Headquarters staff response about harmonization of reporting obligation and rules**Harmonization of reporting obligation and rules**

	n	%
Yes	10	19
No	43	81
Total	53	100

Table 5: Field staff response about impact on work

Response	n	%
Relatively minor impact	3	7
Impact to the extent that one must have monitoring and planning systems	27	59
Significant impact that negatively impacts on the delivery of technical assistance	12	26
Other	4	9
Total	46	100

Table 6: Field staff rating of admin and systems/tools

Admin and Systems/Tools	Efficiency and Utility of System (% of response)					Total % (n)
	Very Good	Good	Poor	Inadequate	Not rated	
ProFi	51	36	4	7	2	100 (55)
HRMS Consult Roster	0	67	11	11	11	100 (9)
UNDP Atlas	9	70	4	9	9	100 (23)
PCM	21	54	8	8	8	100 (24)
Galaxy	7	60	20	7	7	100 (15)
HR Handbook	13	88	0	0	0	100 (16)
Other	20	80	0	0	0	100 (5)

Table 7: Field staff rating about level of support received from the HQ service providers

Support Provided by HQ Service Providers	Level of Support (% of response)					Total % (n)
	Very Good	Good	Poor	Inadequate	Not rated	
Admin	30	48	7	15	0	100 (27)
HR	28	44	12	8	8	100 (25)
Finance	21	58	6	9	6	100 (33)
Coord sub input	19	62	14	3	3	100 (37)
PCM	26	52	10	10	3	100 (31)
Resource Mob	14	34	38	10	3	100 (29)
Info Dissem Field/HQ	21	50	24	3	3	100 (34)
General info bwt field and HQ	31	56	6	3	6	100 (36)
Other	25	0	25	50	0	100 (4)

Table 8: Percentage distribution of field staff responses about efficiency, accuracy, timeliness and impediments of information technology

	Efficient			Accurate			Timely			Impediments		
	Yes	No	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Total % (n)
Computerisation contributed to delivery services and info												
HR Mgmt	91	9	100 (32)	91	9	100 (32)	77	23	100 (31)	46	54	100 (24)
Procurement	68	32	100 (25)	74	26	100 (27)	75	25	100 (24)	53	47	100 (17)
Financial Mgmt	89	11	100 (45)	80	20	100 (41)	83	17	100 (41)	45	55	100 (33)
Prog/Proj Mgmt	90	10	100 (42)	90	10	100 (41)	84	16	100 (43)	31	69	100 (32)

Table 9: Rating of field staff about level of services from HQ support areas (response in %)

HQ Support Areas	Level of Service					
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not rated	Total % (n)
Project Design	15	56	21	5	3	100 (39)
Consult/Inputs	15	51	20	12	2	100 (41)
Project Approval	28	40	26	2	5	100 (43)
Proj Imp/Mgmt	14	38	28	17	3	100 (29)
Reporting	11	50	22	14	3	100 (36)
Proj Monitor/Eval	14	46	26	11	3	100 (35)
Proj Budgets/Amends	18	45	25	10	3	100 (40)

Table 10: Percentage distribution of field staff rating by communication mechanisms

HQ/F Communication Mechanisms	Very Effective	Effective	Not Effective	Not rated	Total % (n)
Exchange Work Plans	12	68	18	3	100 (34)
SPF Consultations	30	63	7	0	100 (30)
Travel Sched/Approvals	25	50	25	0	100 (28)
Integrated Retreats	44	44	11	0	100 (9)
Other	33	33	33	0	100 (3)

Table 11: Percentage distribution of field staff responses according to field support for HQ activities

Field Support for HQ Activities	Frequency				Quality					
	Regularly	Occasion-ally	Rarely	Total % (n)	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not rated	Total % (n)
Project Design	48	38	14	100 (29)	21	55	21	3	0	100 (29)
Consultation with field stakeholders	52	30	19	100 (27)	19	59	15	7	0	100 (27)
Project Implementation	59	41	0	100 (29)	23	65	10	0	3	100 (31)
Project Management	64	32	4	100 (28)	29	61	7	4	0	100 (28)
Reporting	84	14	3	100 (37)	38	49	11	3	0	100 (37)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	62	38	0	100 (9)	31	59	10	0	0	100 (29)

Table 12: Percentage distribution of responses of HQ staff about use of admin system/tools

Admin System/Tools Used	Efficient				Frequency Use				
	Yes	No	Used but not rated	Total % (n)	Routinely	Occasion-ally	Rarely	Not rated	Total % (n)
ProFi	73	20	7	100 (41)	50	36	7	7	100 (42)
Consult Roster	17	70	13	100 (23)	9	55	36	0	100 (22)
HR Handbook	44	39	17	100 (18)	0	61	33	6	100 (18)
Workflow Apps	75	20	5	100 (44)	62	31	4	2	100 (45)
ePAS	52	44	4	100 (48)	42	46	8	4	100 (50)
IMDIS	19	75	6	100 (16)	38	38	23	0	100 (13)
ATLAS	0	100	0	100 (4)	0	25	50	25	100 (7)
GALAXY	64	31	6	100 (36)	22	54	24	0	100 (37)
IMIS	47	47	6	100 (17)	38	31	25	6	100 (16)
Other (intranet)	100	0	0	100 (1)	100	0	0	0	100 (2)

Table 13: Percentage distribution of HQ staff ratings according to Financial Service Provisions

FRMS Services Provisions	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total % (n)
Payroll	56	41	4	0	100 (27)
Payments	24	56	20	0	100 (25)
Budgeting	12	52	16	20	100 (25)
Special Guidance	0	56	24	20	100 (25)
Mgmt Support	14	41	32	14	100 (22)
Admin Training	14	43	29	14	100 (14)

Table 14: Percentage distribution of HQ staff rating according to IT services

Computerisation contributed to delivery services and info	Efficient			Accurate				Timely				Impediments			
	Yes	No	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Not Rated	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Not Rated	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Not Rated	Total % (n)
HR Mgmt	71	29	100 (41)	70	23	8	100 (40)	53	43	5	100 (40)	70	23	7	100 (30)
Procurement	44	56	100 (18)	65	18	18	100 (17)	41	53	6	100 (17)	60	20	20	100 (15)
Fin Mgmt	89	11	100 (27)	73	23	4	100 (26)	81	15	4	100 (26)	38	43	19	100 (21)
Prog/Proj Mgmt	84	16	100 (31)	77	17	6	100 (35)	74	23	3	100 (31)	58	29	13	100 (24)
Other	0	100	100 (2)	0	100	0	100 (2)	50	50	0	100 (2)	100	0	0	100 (2)

Table 15: Percentage distribution of HQ staff responses according to usage of IT applications

IT Apps Used	Routinely			Efficient			Effective			Impediments		
	Yes	No	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Total % (n)	Yes	No	Total % (n)
ProFi	79	21	100 (38)	74	26	100 (35)	79	21	100 (33)	60	40	100 (25)
HRMS Consult Roster	28	72	100 (25)	47	53	100 (17)	36	64	100 (14)	87	13	100 (15)
Workflow Apps	84	16	100 (43)	76	24	100 (38)	83	17	100 (35)	55	45	100 (31)
Lotus Notes	100	0	100 (49)	87	13	100 (46)	95	5	100 (43)	38	62	100 (29)
IMDIS	55	45	100 (20)	40	60	100 (10)	11	89	100 (9)	80	20	100 (10)
IMIS	50	50	100 (20)	50	50	100 (12)	46	54	100 (13)	75	25	100 (8)
UNDP Atlas	0	100	100 (10)	0	100	100 (1)	50	50	100 (2)	100	0	100 (1)

Annex III

Factors of technical cooperation delivery

1. Adequate resources. Effective fund-raising. Firm commitments. Support to manage donor requirements.
2. Job security.
3. Staff development.
4. Staff induction: understanding of UNODC mandates, issues, context and rules/regulations.
5. Consistent organizational policies and guidelines, and mechanisms to expedite activities. UNODC ability to be responsive. Functional autonomy.
6. Effective leadership and managerial efficiency.
7. Institutional arrangement for how FOs are set up, relationship and structures to ensure consistency from FO to FO.
8. Consistent awareness and understanding by all staff of UNODC rules and regulations. Updating staff of policy and rules as they change.
9. Improve awareness-raising and advocacy of field offices.
10. Supportive colleagues and management. Good working environment.
11. Good relationships with partners. Good relationship with Government.
12. Knowledge of what is expected of staff members. Clarity of roles. Make managers responsible and staff accountable. Clear goals. Functional autonomy. Internal field office coordination.
13. Manage upward. More autonomy of FOs to be responsive to the needs of Member States.
14. Acknowledgment of contributions made by all staff at headquarter and field levels, particularly administrative staff, to the delivery of technical cooperation.
15. Worldwide knowledge sharing. Forum for communication between staff in other FOs globally and at headquarters on all issues: administrative, financial, IT, substantive and expertise. Sharing of best practices and global perspectives. Corporate memory. Information sharing.
16. Advocacy. Knowledge of NGOs working with UNODC.
17. Decentralization to the field, less micro-management from headquarters. Development of a code of ethics to govern work. Less bureaucracy. Functional autonomy.
18. More support and interaction between the field and headquarters, particularly with substantive units and HRMS.
19. Work planning. Information sharing, planning and collaboration.

Annex IV

Summary of contract types in field offices¹

Field offices	UNODC contracts						UNDP contracts						UNOPS contracts						
	Permanent contracts		Fixed-term contracts				Permanent contracts		Fixed-term contracts				Permanent contracts		Fixed-term contracts				
	100 Series	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	SC	SSA	100 Series	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	SC	SSA	100 Series	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	SC	SSA	
1 Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa	1	1	2	4					6			9	3				1		2
2 Regional Project Office for South Eastern Europe				2					2			11							
3 UNODC Iran									4			9	1						
4 Regional Office for West and Central Africa			2	5					4			8	5						
5 UNODC Brazil²			9					1											
6 UNODC Lao PDR		1	1					5	6			15							
7 Regional Office for Central Asia			2	8					2		1	76	1				2		
8 UNODC Myanmar		1	1						5		3	89	4						
9 UNODC Colombia				3					8			45	40						
10 Regional Office for Russia and Belarus				2					6			2	1						
11 UNODC Peru		5	1		13										1	1		54	15
12 UNODC India					15														
13 Regional Office for Southern Africa			3						5	1		11	1						
14 Regional Office for Eastern Africa			2	2					2	1		5							1
15 UNODC Beirut³				1															
16 UNODC Afghanistan		2	2						9		7	73	12						2

¹ Information reflected in this table was provided by individual FOs. FOs not included in this table have not provided the required data.

² 18 ALD

³ 2 NPPP contracts

Annex V

UNODC field offices

UNODC regional offices

1. Caribbean, Bridgetown, Barbados
2. Brazil and the South Cone, Brasilia, Brazil
3. Bogotá, Colombia 
4. Middle East and North Africa, Cairo, Egypt
5. South Asia, New Delhi, India
6. Eastern Africa, Nairobi, Kenya
7. Mexico and Central America, Mexico City, Mexico
8. Russia and Belarus, Moscow, Russian Federation
9. West and Central Africa, Dakar, Senegal
10. Southern Africa, Pretoria, South Africa
11. Central Asia, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

UNODC regional centre

1. East Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand

UNODC country offices

1. Kabul, Afghanistan
2. La Paz, Bolivia
3. Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran
4. Vientiane, Lao People's Democratic Republic
5. Yangon, Myanmar
6. Abuja, Nigeria
7. Islamabad, Pakistan
8. Lima, Peru
9. Hanoi, Viet Nam

UNODC project offices

1. Tirana, Albania
2. Buenos Aires, Argentina
3. Praia, Santiago, Cape Verde
4. Almaty, Kazakhstan
5. Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
6. Beirut, Lebanon
7. Tripoli, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
8. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
9. Chisinau, Moldova
10. Rabat, Morocco
11. Belgrade, Serbia
12. Dushanbe, Tajikistan
13. Ashgabat, Turkmenistan

UNODC regional project offices

1. South-Eastern Europe, Sofia, Bulgaria
2. South-Eastern Europe, Ankara, Turkey

UNODC liaison offices

1. New York, United States
2. Brussels, Belgium

ANNEX VI

List of persons interviewed

Brazil

Giovanni Quaglia, Field Representative, UNODC- Regional Office Brazil
Sandra Faria, Office Manager and Administrative Assistant, UNDOC-Brazil
Gisele Kitayama, Finance Associate, UNDOC-Brazil
Ingrid Silva, Finance Assistant UNDOC-Brazil
Cintia Freitas, Programme Coordinator UNODC Brazil
Reiner Pungs, Programme Coordinator UNODC-Brazil
Oreste A. Brandi, Accounts and Finance Manager, UNDP Brazil
Carmen Lucia, Finance Associate, UNDP-Brazil
Vera Lucía Germano Severo, Remunerações e Benefícios. Unidade de Apoio Operacional, UNDP-Brazil
Wilson P.Soares, Gerente de Operações, UNDP-Brazil
Sara Fracchia, Procurement Coordinator, UNDP-Brazil

Columbia

Sandro Calvani, UNODC Field Representative, COCOL
Diego Alvarez, Communications Specialist, COCOL
Javier Amaya Gómez, Analista de Seguimiento Financiero, UNDP Colombia
Carlos Arturo Carvajal, National Programme Officer, COCOL
Maria Mercedes Dueñas- Demand Reduction, Management and Evaluation Advisor, C81
Guillermo Garcia, AD Programme Officer, COCOL
Andrea Ghisays, Human Resources Associate, UNDP Colombia
Mario Gomez, Administrative Assistant, R52.
Clara Guzman, Assistant to the Representative and focal point for HR, COCOL
Kristian Holge, Regional Legal Advisor, LAS.
Rodolfo Llinas Rivera, Project Coordinator, H45
Andrea Molano, Programme Manager Officer and Coordinator of Programmes
Martha Eugenia Murcia, Programme Assistant, COCOL
Stella del Pilar Rodríguez, Administrative Associate, COCOL
Thierry Rostan, Responsible for Relations with the Private Sector and Fundraising, COCOL
Roberto Vidal, Consultant

Mexico

Jose Vila del Castillo, UNODC Representative, ROMEX

Greta Spota, NPO, ROMEX

Lourdes Aquino, Administrative Assistant, ROMEX

Rubi Blancas, H90 Project Coordinator, ROMEX

Antonio Rendon, UNDP Operations Manager

Arturo Fernandez, UNDP Finance Officer

Myanmar CO

Shariq Bin Raza, UNODC Representative

Khyn Hla Munn, Assist. Rep.

Xavier Bouan, Regional Illicit Crop Mon. Expert

Nwe Yin Han, Finance Assistant

Khyn Pyi Sone, Finance Assistant

Soe Yin, Office Assistant

Camila Vega, Information Officer (Advocacy)

Selwyn Hpu, IT specialist

Ye Swe Htoon, National Programme Officer

S. Mohammadi, UNDP Dep. Res. Rep

ROCA

James Callahan, UNODC Representative

Zhuldyz Akisheva, DRR/PMO

Tofik Murshudlu, Supply Reduction Unit-PO

Olga Zudova, SRU – PO

Babu Soni, SRU – PO

Dilmurod Mirkamilov, SRU – PO

Farkhad Sabirov, SRU – NPO

A. Natalini-Manfredi, SRU - NPO

Kamran Niaz, Demand Reduction Unit (Global)

Marks Khalmuratov, Admin Assistant

Sayora Azizova, Admin Assistant

R. Menibaev, Admin Assist

M. Isakova, Procurement Assistant

Olga Kogay, Finance Staff

Eldar Khalitov, Accountant

Darkhon Abutalipov, Treasury Assistant

Albina Yakubova, Regional Terrorism Expert (TPB)
Olga Zudova, Senior Legal Advisor (DTA)
Shavkat Muminov, Finance Manager/Deputy BC Manager, UNDP
Dono Khusankhodjaeva, Finance Associate/Agencies, UNDP
Natalya Akhrarova, Human Resource Associate, UNDP

Bangkok RC

Akira Fujino, Representative, UNODC RC
Burkhard Dammann, Senior Programme Management Officer
Soe Yee Saing, Programme Management Officer
Sanong Chinnanon, HR Development Specialist
Arpaporn Chomcherngpat (Nukki), Prog/Admin Assist
Ratchadaporn Sommeneewan, Finance Assistant
Michel Bonniew, Senior Legal Advisor (DTA)
Olivia Sylvia Inciong, Project Coordinator/Public Awareness
Manjul Khanna, Project Coordinator/Drugs/HIV/AIDS
Vipon Kittitasnasorchai, Regional Terrorism Expert (TPB)
Sonia Bezziccheri, Demand Reduction Associate
John Doyle, Project Coordinator (accord)
Jeremy Douglas, ATS Data Collection
Qianrong Wang, Law Enforcement Adviser

ROSA

P. Kumar, Project Coordinator, ROSA
A. Sethi, Communications/Networking Consultant, ROSA
P.M. Nair, Project Coordinator , ROSA
A. Gupta, Project Officer, ROSA
Jyoti Mehra, HIV/AIDS Focal Point Advisor, ROSA
Shveta Aima, Admin & Fin Associate, ROSA
Poonam Bhambri, Programme Associate, ROSA
Kamal Gupta, Admin. & Fin. Assistant, ROSA
J. Verghese, Admin. & Fin. Assistant, ROSA
Anand Chaudhuri, Project Coordinator, ROSA
Haresheth Virik, Project Officer, ROSA
Suruchi Pant, Project Coordinator, ROSA
Jayadev Sarangi, Consultant, ROSA
Stella Thomas, Treasury/Admin/Admin/Finance, ROSA

A. Khera, Management Associate/HR, ROSA
Chand Kaushil, Team Leader, Global ITS, ROSA
Joyce Zinyu Angami, NE Project Officer, ROSA

Kenya

Carsten Hyttel, Representative, UNODC ROEA
John Gathecha, National Programme Officer, UNODC ROEA
Jane-Marie Ongolo, National Project Manager, UNODC ROEA
Riham Saleh-Mughal, Administrative Assistant, UNODC ROEA
Nancy Okita, Project Assistant, UNODC ROEA
Jane Wanjau, Project Assistant, UNODC ROEA
Veronica Nderito, Project Assistant, UNODC ROEA
Bilha Kiama-Murage, National Project Manager, UNODC
Innocent Kayihura, DRR (O), UNDP, Kenya
Cecilia Karagu, Head of Finance, UNDP, Kenya
Margaret Mbugua, Administrative Officer, UNDP, Kenya
Betty Ambundo, Head of Personnel, UNDP, Kenya
Robert Livingstone, Anti-Money Laundering Expert, UNODC
Charles Emer, Chief ITS, UNON
Robson Mutandi, Senior Portfolio Manager, OIC UNOPS
Sheila Yieke, UNOPS
Paul Gomis, Portfolio Manager, UNOPS
Pradeep Sood, Deputy Chief, Information & Comms. Technology Services, UNOV
Frederic Claus, Portfolio Manager, UNOPS
Mark R. Townshend, Operations Manager, UNOPS

Nigeria

Paul Salay, UNODC Representative
Cyriaque Sobtafo, Programme Management Officer, UNODC
Bisi Arije, National Programme Officer, UNODC
Stephen Nwoaboli, Admin and Finance Assistant, UNODC
Pius Otuno, National Project Coordinator, UNODC
Kubra Abdullah, National Project Coordinator, UNODC
Anthony Buckingham, Office at the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), UNODC
Chantel Marais, Office at the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), UNODC
Reno Laurence, Deputy Representative (Operations), UNDP

Senegal

Antonio Mazzitelli, UNODC Representative

Amado Philip de Andres, Deputy Representative, UNODC

Flemming Quist, Law Enforcement Adviser, UNODC

All staff

Bassirou BA, Assistant au Représentant Résident, UNDP

South Africa

Jonathan Lucas, UNODC Representative

Thomas Zeindl-Cronin, Programme Manager, UNODC

Sophia van Rensburg, National Programme Officer, UNODC

Charles A. Elem-Ogwal, Project Manager, UNODC

Eric Hubbard, Manager – Business Service Center, UNDP

Thulile Khanye, Human Resources Associate, UNDP Business Service Center

Tarirai Isaac Chivore, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP

UNODC Vienna

Bo Mathiasen, Chief, Office of the Executive Director

Sumru Noyan, Director, Division for Operations

Franz Baumann, Director, Division for Management

Bob Boone, Chief, Human Security Branch, Division for Operations

Bernard Frahi, Chief, Partnership for Development Branch, Divisions for Operations

Kuniko Ozaki, Director, Division for Treaty Affairs

Koli Kouame, Secretary of the Board and Chief of Secretariat

Francis Maertens, Director, Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs

Sandeep Chawla, Chief, Policy Analysis and Research Branch

Khurshid Bhimani, Chief, Human Resources Management Service

Victor Kisob, Chief, Recruitment and Placement Unit

Ken Erickson, Chief, Financial Resources Management Service, Division for Management

Al-Mulla Mohammed, Programme Officer, PDB-SEAP

Hans-Ulrich Ugo, UNOPS

Himmet Singh Kahlon, Chief, Budget Section, Division for Management

Cristina Albertin, Chief, Latin America and the Caribbean Section, Division for Operations

Chris Van Der Burgh, Chief, Africa and Middle East Section, Division for Operations

Jean-Luc Lemahieu, Chief, Europe and West/Central Asia Section, Division for Operations

Timothy Lemay, Rule of Law Section, Division for Operations

Maurizio Gazzola, Chief, Information Management Unit, Division for Management

Muki Daniel Jerneloev, External Relations Officer, Co-financing and Partnership Section

Philip Kruss, Chief , Information Technology Service, Division for Management

Kathrine Volz, Chief, Treaty and Legal Affairs Branch, Division for Treaty Affairs



UNITED NATIONS
Office on Drugs and Crime

Vienna International Centre, P.O. 500, 1400 Vienna, Austria
Tel.: (+43-1) 26060-0, Fax: (+43-1) 26060-5866, www.unodc.org