

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna

In-depth evaluation of the
Integrated Programming Approach

Independent Evaluation Unit

October 2012



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2012

This evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of an Independent External Evaluator, Camino Kavanagh, with the support of Alexandra Capello from the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

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

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 500
1400 Vienna, Austria
Telephone: (+43-1) 26060-0
Email: ieu@unodc.org
Website: www.unodc.org

© United Nations, October 2012. All rights reserved.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication has not been formally edited.

CONTENTS

Rationale for the evaluation.....	vii
Executive summary	xi
Management response	xxi
Summary matrix of findings, evidence and recommendations.....	xxv
I. Introduction.....	1
Background and context	1
II. Evaluation findings.....	9
Design	9
Efficiency.....	18
Relevance.....	20
Partnerships and cooperation	24
Effectiveness.....	26
Impact	27
Sustainability	28
III. Conclusions.....	35
IV. Recommendations.....	37
<i>Annexes</i>	
I. Terms of reference	43
II. Evaluation tools	59
III. Desk review list	71
IV. Timeline.....	77

GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

CCPCJ	Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice
CEB	Corruption and Economic Crime Branch (UNODC)
CLP	Core Learning Partners
CN	Concept Note
CND	Commission on Narcotics Drugs
CP	Country Programme
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DHB	Drug Prevention and Health Branch (UNODC)
DO	Division for Operations
DPA	Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations
DTA	Division for Treaty Affairs
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
ED	Director General/Executive Director
ExCom	Executive Committee
EU	European Union
FINGOV	Standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC
FO	Field Office
FRMS	Financial Resources Management Services
GRULAC	Regional Group for Latin America and the Caribbean
HQ	United Nations Headquarters
HRMS	Human Resources Management Services
IDTTs	Inter-Divisional Task Teams
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
IFA	International Financial Institutions
IMPP	Integrated Mission Planning Policy
IPA	Integrated Programming Approach
IPB	Integrated Programming and Oversight Branch
IPU	Integrated Planning Unit
ISF	Integrated Strategic Framework
ITS	Information Technology Service
JIU	Joint Inspection Unit
JS	Justice Section (UNODC)
LPO	Liaison and Partnership Office
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MTSP	Medium Term Strategic Plan (UNICEF)
MSU	Monitoring and Support Unit
NIP	National Integrated Programme
OCB	Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking Branch (UNODC)
OED	Office of the Director General/Office of the Executive Director
OHCHR	United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

OIOS	United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services
OPPBD	Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts OR Programme Planning and Partnerships Division
PRST	Presidential Statements (UN Security Council)
PSOU	Programme Support and Oversight Unit
RP	Regional Programme
SPU	Strategic Planning Unit
SGB	Secretariat to the Governing Bodies Section
TOCTA	Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessments
ToR	Terms of Reference
TP	Thematic Programme
TPB	Terrorism Prevention Branch
UN	United Nations Organization
UNCAC	United Nations Convention against Corruption
UNCT	United Nations Country Teams
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDPA	United National Department of Political Affairs
UNDPKO	United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNSG	United Nations Secretary General
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNRT	United Nations Regional Teams
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNTOC	United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime,
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
WACI	West Africa Coast Initiative
WDR	World Development Report
WEOG	Western European and other Group
XB	Extra Budgetary



RATIONALE FOR THE EVALUATION

Introduction and Background

In 2010, the UN Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) conducted a Review of UNODC.¹ In the Review it took note of the implementation of the integration of thematic and regional programmes driven by the Integrated Programming Approach (IPA) and highlighted some of the expected benefits of the approach, including:

(a) Enhanced dialogue with Member States, which would lead to an increase in ownership via the involvement of regional actors at the drafting stage and their participation in the steering committees at the implementation stage.

(b) The potential the IPA provided in terms of resource mobilization and softer earmarking at the programme rather than at single project level.

(c) Increased administrative effectiveness by dealing with a number of management activities at the programme level.

(d) The creation of a reinforced oversight framework in which headquarters and field offices would contribute to increased accountability.

At the same time, the 2010 JIU Review also shed light on some initial challenges regarding implementation of the IPA, recommending they be addressed so as to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the approach. The Report noted that UNODC should “strive to better manage the transition and the phasing out of existing projects into programming; manage the coexistence in its portfolio of programmes and national projects developed according to local situations; adjust current managing and reporting corporate tools to meet the full requirements for financial and administrative support of more comprehensive programmes (such as reporting, tracking down information, monitoring pledges, expenditures, etc.); and reconcile the alignment of various programming layers that are not developed, drafted and endorsed at the same time.”² Above all, and with the aim of enhancing the efficiency of the Office, the Inspectors recommended that the “Executive Director (...) present an independent evaluation of thematic and regional programming and report on its implementation status, impact and lessons learned to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice by the end of 2013.”³ This recommendation coincided with corresponding requests from UNODC Member States.

As noted, the current evaluation represents one of the steps towards meeting this recommendation, and is part of a broader evaluation process consisting of three phases:

¹ Review of Management and Administration in UNODC, Joint Inspection Unit, JIU/REP/2010/10, recommendation # 9, http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2010/JIU_REP_2010_10Final.pdf

² See JIU Review of UNODC (2010)

³ See JIU Review of UNODC (2010), Recommendation 19

(a) Phase I: The evaluation of the soft earmarking instrument (project GLOU46, called “Support for the Integrated Programming Unit to promote multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral technical cooperation”) established to support initial implementation of the IPA.

(b) Phase II: The current evaluation of the Integrated Programming Approach, which seeks to i) assess the actual intent behind the IPA and the institutional arrangements that were put in place to implement it; and ii) how the integration of Thematic and Regional Programmes is being translated into practice.

(c) Phase III: The evaluation of UNODC Regional Programmes (the first one to be evaluated will be the Regional Programme for East Asia and the Pacific in September-December 2012), followed by subsequent evaluations of the other Regional Programmes.

The evaluation process should be considered as a “continuum” aimed at understanding the policy intent of the IPA, the institutional arrangements that were put in place to implement the approach, and its related impact. The current evaluation, which covers the period August 2008 (when the IPA was launched) through March 2012, focuses on the policy intent and the institutional arrangements put in place to implement the IPA, and provides a conceptual framework for the development of the Regional Programme evaluations, which will be better placed to assess results. The findings and recommendations from the Regional Programme evaluations will be merged with the first two phases of the process, and will inform future decisions on the IPA. The current evaluation

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation team used both qualitative and quantitative analysis to inform the evaluation. In the absence of clear benchmarks and indicators for assessing the implementation of the Integrated Programming Approach, the evaluation team used the external and internal IPA goals (page 13) as benchmarks against which progress has been assessed. This process was backed up by in-depth questionnaires (see Annex II) that were adapted to each specific target group (Field Representatives; Headquarters based staff and Donors).

Data Collection Instruments

Building on the desk review, the evaluator conducted a series of face-to-face interviews with Senior Management at UNODC headquarters in Vienna; phone interviews with a broad selection of Field Representatives; and face-to-face interviews with a number of donors.

The core evaluation questions were developed in three separate questionnaires. The interview findings will be assessed in conjunction with the initial home-based desk review; and a review of the relevant documentation submitted to the evaluator during the interview process in Vienna.

Sampling Strategy

As noted in the UNODC Evaluation Guidelines, UNODC evaluations are not developed on the basis of rigorous scientific research; rather they are “selective investigations aimed at collecting and analyzing data, formulating conclusions and making recommendations of practical relevance to the operations of UNODC and its partners.” Bearing the latter in mind for the purpose of this evaluation, and in order to keep it as manageable as possible, a simple categorization of

interviewees was developed: HQ staff (policy; operational; management support); Field Representatives; and Donors. This categorization, developed on the basis of the roles each category plays in relation to the implementation of the IPA rather than on the basis of random selection, helped ensure proper representation in the overall research sample.

Another objective of the evaluation process is to elicit inputs from a number of stakeholders through a range of consultation processes. As such, the evaluation team will use the Standing open-ended working group on governance and finance (FinGov) as a platform for collecting comments and additional in-put from Member States before finalizing Phase II of the evaluation process.

Limitations to the Evaluation

(a) The phasing of the IPA evaluation has resulted somewhat unwieldy not least because Phase II takes place before the evaluations of the Regional and Thematic Programmes and therefore cannot report on operational level results. In this regard, this phase of the evaluation should be regarded as a form of “introduction” to the evaluations of the Regional and Thematic Programmes. Any review or revision of UNODC’s current integration strategy should be conducted once the first batch of Regional Programme evaluations is conducted in order to ensure that findings from these evaluations are merged with those of phases I and II of the process; and that findings from the field in particular, inform future decisions on integration.

(b) Another key limitation was the fact that national/ regional counterparts (both governmental and non-governmental), UN and other international partners were not included as interviewees in this phase of the evaluation. In order to overcome this limitation, strong emphasis should be placed on interviewing counterparts and partners in Phase III of the evaluation process.

(c) The timeline for the conduct and processing of interviews resulted insufficient. Indeed, some 70 interviews were arranged over a period of 10 working days with an average of only 45 minutes set aside for each interview. The latter made it difficult for the evaluation team to fully use the interview guides developed or broaden the scope of interviewees to include Core Learning Partners (and others mentioned in point b)), let alone discuss the outcome of each interview or set of interviews within the evaluation team as is recommended practice.

(d) Finally, the background documentation for this evaluation grew exponentially as the evaluation has progressed, shedding light on some core knowledge management challenges within the Organization as well as certain challenges the IEU faces due to serious under-staffing. These challenges should be seriously considered so as to ensure the efficient and manageable conduct of future evaluations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

UNODC's decision to embark on the current evaluation process comes at a pivotal time. The development landscape is changing: new centres of economic dynamism are emerging as are new development actors. Global challenges, including organized crime, illicit trafficking and illicit financial flows are intensifying, and in more and more contexts fuelling violence, thus calling for a scaling-up and leveraging of development assistance around common goals and agreed actions. The relationship (both formal and illicit) among states, markets and individuals is also undergoing continuous change, suggesting that much thought has to be afforded to the manner in which development assistance is delivered, and that greater emphasis be placed on the 'qualitative' dimensions of development and policy change. These developments are influencing discussions and debates around the post-2015 development agenda and related policy processes, some of which have identified organized crime, illicit trafficking, illicit financial flows, corruption and other UNODC-mandated areas of work as important impediments to development, peace and security for all. It is an opportune moment for UNODC and its governing bodies to review the relevance and effectiveness of its integration efforts to date, including the objectives of the Integrated Programming Approach (IPA) and related implementation mechanisms established in 2008, and determine whether they should be modified or strengthened through an invigorated corporate-wide integration policy. There is broad consensus across UNODC that while the IPA represents an innovative and interesting approach to dealing with many of the internal and external challenges the Office was facing in the late 2000s, its real effectiveness has been stymied by inconsistent commitment and action from management and member states to support such wholesale change. Notwithstanding, evaluations such as the current one can help UNODC identify and act on challenges, and determine how its integration efforts can be of greater benefit to member states and for the functioning and effectiveness of the UN system as a whole.

Background

UNODC's Division of Operations (DO) introduced the UNODC Integrated Programming Approach (IPA) in August 2008. It was conceived with the objective of meeting existing and emerging global challenges, and responding to United Nations (UN) and broader international policy developments (see Annex IV). It had the objective of responding to a range of internal challenges, particularly those related to fragmentation of effort across the Office, and weak integration of UNODC's normative and operational work. The shift from project to programmes was also made in consideration of the fact that a shift to programming had already been undertaken by other UN development agencies such as UNDP as a means to increase coherence and effectiveness.

UNODC's efforts were also designed to ensure better coherence with the work of UN partners and the broader international system, and to serve as a platform through which more effective regional and national responses to its mandated areas of work could be achieved. Through the IPA, UNODC would, on

the basis of its work at the global, regional and country levels, and its comparative advantages in specific areas of expertise help Member States and the broader international community respond more effectively to complex challenges in a range of different settings. Combined, these efforts would help allay concerns of Member States, and serve to rally much needed financial support for the Office, which had waned due to donor confidence in the organization. The shift coincided however with increased calls for donors themselves to develop more coherent approaches to development assistance, including the manner in which it engaged with the UN system and national stakeholders.

More specifically, the IPA includes a range of policy and operational objectives:

IPA Core Objectives

(a) Promote regional entities and partner countries' "ownership", mutual responsibility and accountability for results.

(b) Enhance cooperation with UN partners, multilateral bodies and civil society by mainstreaming UNODC mandates in an increasingly integrated global agenda (i.e. development, rule of law, security and human rights).

(c) Maximize UNODC comparative advantages in upstream policy and normative support, and in promoting strategic cross-border initiatives.

(d) Promote an integrated approach among member states in addressing organized crime and illicit trafficking (e.g. human beings, arms, drugs, firearms, natural resources and money) and corruption.

(e) Align with UNDG strategic priorities calling for a shift from project implementation to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions.

IPA Internal Objectives

(a) Better cohesion

(b) A move away from a project-based approach

(c) A simplified administrative structure

(d) More decentralization for the field.

The IPA comprises two instruments – Thematic Programmes and Regional Programmes, which cover the broad range of UNODC mandates and activity areas both substantively and geographically. In order to support the approach, the Office undertook an internal "realignment" process in 2009, grouping the existing expertise under five Thematic Branches (i.e. Transnational Organized Crime, Corruption, Criminal Justice, Health, Terrorism) and created the Integrated Programming Branch. The realignment was intended to enable the Office acquire an integrated regional and thematic perspective, and achieve benefits in terms of improved linkages between UNODC policy, strategic planning, programmatic work, mobilization of resources, and partnerships with all relevant stakeholders. In addition to establishing six Thematic Programmes (TPs), since 2008, the Office has established seven Regional Programmes (RPs) and is in the process of developing two others⁴. In 2010, the Division for Policy Analysis and Public

⁴Thematic Programmes (TPs): Action against Transnational Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking (2011-2013); Corruption (2010-2012); Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform ((2010-2011 and 2012-2015); Addressing Health and Human Development Vulnerabilities in the Context of Drugs and Crime (2009-2011); Terrorism Prevention (2008-2011); Scientific and Forensic Services (2010-2011).

Affairs (DPA) also proposed a realignment process (within that specific Division) to “bring it into consonance with the new approach of thematic clusters and integrated programming.” The DPA realignment focused on putting in place institutional arrangements that would make management of the “five sections, one unit and one office scattered across DPA” more feasible. It was expected that the consolidation of these sections, units and offices under three separate branches - Public Affairs and Policy Support; Research and trend Analysis and the NY Liaison Office, which would be led by D1 level staff would lead to a strengthened management structure and “enable systematic attention to the services provided by the three sections to the whole UNODC” and “facilitate internal coherence.”⁵

In 2010, and in response to a range of challenges identified by Member States and the Joint Inspection Unit’s (JIU) 2010 Review report, a recommendation was made to conduct an evaluation of UNODC’s Regional and Thematic Programmes.⁶ This evaluation assesses progress on IPA implementation to date against UNODC’s established evaluation criteria, serving as an introduction to the Regional Programme evaluations, which will be conducted subsequently.

Relevance and Ownership

To date, much progress has been achieved in the implementation of the IPA, although the lack of coherent and consistent guidance and processes regarding the actual approach and how it links to other policy and planning functions and initiatives continues to foster some confusion within the Office. Member States’ have supported UNODC’s integrated approach, and this support has been marked by an increase in funding to Regional and Thematic Programmes in the past years, the soft earmarking of funds by some donors (through the GLOU46 project) to kick-start some of the Regional and Country Programmes, and greater member state participation in the design and implementation of Programmes.

The IPA, and particularly the Regional Programmes, have helped UNODC advocate for the ratification and implementation of the UN Conventions on crime, drugs and terrorism at the country and regional level, as well as increased regional cooperation and strategic cross-border initiatives.

UNODC has also enhanced its efforts to integrate its work with the work of the broader UN and international community. Of particular relevance in this regard is its inclusion as co-chair with the UN Department of Political Affairs of the UN Task Force on Organized Crime and drug trafficking established by the United Nations Secretary General (UNSG) in NY, and its increased participation in a range of Security Council and General Assembly discussions and debates on topics that relate to its mandate. Indeed, the IPA is serving as an important tool through which UNODC has, and can continue, advocating for more integrated global development, peace and security agendas and thus support efforts to respond to the complex challenges posed by organized crime, illicit trafficking and other related phenomena. Since the inception of the IPA, the Office has systematically highlighted the connection

Regional Programmes (RPs): East Asia and Pacific (2009-2014); East Africa (2009-2012); Central America/Caribbean (2009-2012); Eastern Europe (2009-2011); West Africa (2010-2014); Arab States (2011-2015); Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2011-2014).

⁵ Internal Note, Adjustments in DPA structure, HS, SC, April 2010.

⁶ Review of Management and Administration in UNODC, Joint Inspection Unit, JIU/REP/2010/10, recommendation # 9, http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2010/JIU_REP_2010_10Final.pdf

between the rule of law and poverty reduction, and called on Member States and the broader international community to devote greater attention to the joint pursuit of justice, security and development.

UNODC is using its Regional and Country Programmes as a mechanism through which greater integration of its mandated areas of responsibility with the work of UNDG Country and Regional Teams can be achieved, and it is engaging in similar system-wide initiatives in certain conflict and fragile settings. An important next step will be to continue strengthening work with UN partners, as per recommendations laid down in the Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (A/67/93-E/2012/79), while simultaneously determining how the combination of these efforts can inform important policy process such as the post-2015 development agenda and the Civilian Capacity review process. In this regard, UNODC should also build on the momentum provided by the UN Secretary-General's Five Year Plan of Action in which he noted the "heightened threat of organized crime, piracy and drug trafficking" and the type of integrated responses required to respond to these threats.

The IPA has provided UNODC with a range of policy and operational modalities (particularly the Thematic and Regional Programmes) that have allowed for a better reflection of UNODC stakeholder needs and priorities. Regional Programmes have provided an important mechanism for ensuring "ownership" of efforts to counter organized crime, illicit trafficking and other related phenomena. Although the degree of engagement of national and regional stakeholders at each stage of the process still differs from region to region, Steering Committees have been developed within some Regional Programmes to accompany and monitor implementation of the programmes. It is unclear at this stage whether these have been effective in sustaining ownership and ensuring mutual responsibility and accountability of results. The latter will however, be assessed by the envisaged evaluations of the Regional Programmes. A better understanding of these arrangements and their impact would be of strategic use to UNODC, the UN system and the broader international community.

The development landscape is changing and new development actors, including middle-income countries and emerging economies are taking on more responsibility for efforts to counter organized crime, illicit trafficking, corruption, terrorism etc. including through the funding of UNODC operations, the development and strengthening of inter- and intra-regional and national capacity, and the inclusion of related projects and initiatives in public policy formulation and implementation. The Regional Programmes provide an important platform through which this work can be facilitated, although in certain middle-income settings, national counterparts have demonstrated a preference for working at the country rather than at the regional level. UNODC has demonstrated flexibility in this regard, and is currently developing new kinds of strategic partnerships at regional and country levels in which needs and priorities are jointly defined, and responsibility and accountability shared.

UNODC provides support in a range of conflict-affected, fragile transitional settings. However, in contrast to many other settings where it operates, countries in transition are "complex environments in which linear progression from one set of activities to another is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Complex processes in transition settings simply do not progress linearly; such contexts are characterized by unpredictable shocks and weak institutions may be vulnerable to regional economic and political distortions, creating highly unpredictable environments."⁷ Indeed, the UN Secretary-General identified support to nations in transitions as one of the top five priorities for the United Nations for the period 2012

⁷ Advance draft of the Secretary-General's Report: Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (2012)

to 2016. UNODC often has limited capacity and even less leverage to meet the IPA and other related UNODC goals in these kinds of settings. It is also hard to differentiate in the current programme design how the Office considers these complexities in its analysis, planning and programming. Notwithstanding, as noted in the 2011 World Development Report, UNODC could however, build on its regional presences and comparative advantage in specific areas to support countries in transition respond to these challenges.⁸

In doing so, UNODC will need to work more strategically with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), the Department of Political Affairs (DPA), UNDP's Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR), the broader international community, including the International Financial Institutions (IFIs), and a broader base of national and regional stakeholders. UNODC's participation in the Task Force on Organized Crime and Trafficking is a small step in this direction, as is its participation in a range of joint programmes and initiatives at the country and regional level. Understanding the impact of these efforts on broader goals will be an important next step.

At the same time, UNODC must also be realistic in terms of what it can achieve given its limited human and financial resources and field operations. UNODC does have a global normative role, which is unique and needs to be preserved and possibly reinforced. In this regard, the real added value of UNODC's integration efforts lies at the global and "upstream" level, i.e. as a global and regional catalyst, supporting the international community in setting principles, norms, standards, know-how, good practices and tools. As noted in the 2011 WDR, global agencies such as UNODC can establish regional platforms facilitate dialogue between countries and regions on critical issues such as stemming the trafficking and illicit financial flows that fuel violence and negatively impact on development. It can also partner with Member States, the IFIs, academia and civil society to generate better data as a means to better inform risk and results management, particularly in transition contexts.⁹ To this end and moving forward, UNODC's integration efforts should be aimed at strengthening its role in policy research and advocacy work at the regional and global levels and in doing so, engaging more effectively with academia, think tanks and independent researchers.

Design

While there is broad awareness of the Integrated Programming Approach across UNODC, the evaluation found that due to funding imperatives most outreach related to the IPA was conducted externally with UNODC Member States as main targets. While a succinct overview of the vision, principles and objectives of the Regional Programming approach were laid out in several internal documents and reports of UNODC's governing bodies (see Timeline in Annex IV), many interviewees contend that the IPA was not sufficiently defined and explained to all concerned, not least in terms of how to state or measure its outcomes and how it could absorb existing country and regional strategic programmatic frameworks. No specific benchmarks were actually established for the implementation of the IPA, making it difficult to establish basic indicators for evaluating or assessing implementation. Standards in relation to programme outcomes, outputs, indicators and activities are continuously subject to change and development, although UNODC's operations manual has sought to address some of these challenges.

⁸ World Development Report: Conflict, Security and Development (2011), See Chapters 5 and 9 in particular.

⁹ Ibid

In the absence of such a document and process, to date the Integrated Programming and Oversight Branch (IPB) in the Division of Operations, and the Strategic Planning Unit (SPU) in the Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs, have produced internal guidance notes and also laid out its vision of the IPA in a series of internal documents, some of which are still pending final approval.¹⁰ The IPB also conducted a series of training exercises on implementation of the IPA that, according to some interviewees, only raised more questions about how it could be implemented in practice. The minutes of the Annual Field Representative seminar also highlight a series of challenges related to the design of the IPA that have largely remained unanswered.

At programme design level, the HQ-managed Thematic Programmes (TPs) were conceived to provide policy/ normative guidance to support regional and country level operations. However, in addition, these Thematic Programmes also manage “Global Projects” which are the main tools for the achievements of goals and objectives of the Thematic Programmes. However, they are not always fully integrated with Regional or Country Programmes. At the same time, it is important to recognize that not all Global Projects stemming from the Thematic Programmes can actually be integrated as they have specific targets, outputs and designated partners. Notwithstanding, the GLOU46 evaluation has stressed the negative impact of “stand alone” programmes on donors perceptions, not least because integration across programmes is what the IPA promises and thus what donors expect. Indeed, this situation has lent itself to a perception that Regional and Thematic Programmes (and related Global Projects) still have to compete for funding. It also lends itself to a perception that staffing requirements are not being met, especially at the field level. In this regard, Regional Programmes often face difficulties in recruiting expert thematic staff, with many suggesting that better use of resources would be made if staff at headquarters were to spend more time working at the regional level rather than “parachuting in” from time to time. More coherence and integration between the global projects stemming from the Thematic Programmes and the Regional Programmes is still required as is a more effective and targeted human resources strategy that matches existing UNODC expertise with regional and country needs.

Significant progress has been made in the design of the Regional Programmes, although some still represent a collection of existing projects and initiatives. In some regions it has been more difficult to integrate pre-existing Country Programmes with the newer Regional Programmes. Integrating national and regional stakeholders into the design process, including in the collection and analysis of baseline data, is also of vital importance for ensuring the sustainability of these efforts in the mid- to longer term. While the Regional Programme design process includes these steps, context and availability of funding have been influential in determining whether they can be followed to the letter. Efforts to reconcile these issues are ongoing. For example, general criteria for the design of Regional Programmes are included in a proposed internal Programme Development and Review Process to be overseen by the Office’s internal Programme Review Committee. The proposed Review process is still in draft format and it is expected that it will integrate existing programme development processes overseen by the Inter Divisional Task Teams (IDTTs). The latter were established to support programme development and to provide ongoing support for programme implementation. While in the early stages of their establishment the IDTTs provided much-needed multi-disciplinary support to field operations, and some Field Representatives view the IDTTs as very useful links to headquarters. However, they operate largely in an ad-hoc manner, and have limited oversight capacity vis-à-vis programme development and implementation. The proposed programme development approval process represents an attempt to address these concerns and provide more detailed guidance for programme staff regarding programme development and implementation. It is unclear however, whether the proposed process will replace the existing IDTTs, how it considers the

¹⁰ Two draft guidance notes on the implementation of the IPA from 2010 and 2011 respectively have never been approved.

support and oversight functions currently being provided by the IPB and field offices themselves, and how it intends reconciling the principle of national and regional leadership and ownership of programme development particularly since it is aimed at enhancing processes internal to UNODC.

Another challenge identified has been how to more effectively integrate UNODC's research and analysis, and monitoring and evaluation functions into the design and implementation of both the Thematic and the Regional Programmes. Integrating these functions is essential to ensuring not only integration within the Office, but also to ensuring that experiences from the field inform policy development and assist the Office in responding more effectively and timely to Member State needs and priorities. The latter can also help UNODC maintain a comparative advantage in its mandated areas of responsibility by ensuring that its work is underpinned by sound empirical evidence. This is crucial ahead of important policy debates such as the post-2015 development agenda, or the Civilian Capacity for Peace Operations in which UNODC should be serving as an authoritative voice on issues pertaining to organized crime, illicit trafficking, corruption and its other mandated areas of work.

UNODC's Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessment (TOCTA) reports are perceived to be helping strengthen the design of some Regional and Country Programmes. However, the team responsible for developing the reports at Headquarters is short-staffed, over-stretched and under-funded, and updating the TOCTAs on a regular basis remains a costly endeavour. Conversely, where research and analysis capacity is weakest is in UNODC's regional offices where the absence of research staff remains an important obstacle to effective programming, particularly if priorities are to be defined on the basis of sound analysis and broad consultation with different stakeholders. Moving forward, UNODC will have to ensure that from the outset, UNODC's research and analytical expertise is an integrated part of programme development and a human resource strategy that responds to these types of needs.

Institutional Arrangements to Support Implementation of the IPA

In 2009, UNODC launched a realignment process to support i) the Office's integration efforts, leading to the redeployment of posts and reassignment of staff within two of the Office's four Divisions – the Division of Operations (DO) and Division of Treaty Affairs (DTA); ii) the rationalization of existing normative and operational expertise under Thematic Branches; iii) the reorganization of the Division of Operations; and iv) the establishment of Regional and Thematic Programmes. The overall goal of the realignment process was to integrate normative and programmatic functions in the delivery of effective and efficient services to Member States, and in informing up-stream policy. The realignment was also intended “to better allocate the responsibilities and accountability of staff members, by eliminating any possible duplication, overlapping and internal competition for resources (...) and was in line with the Office's attempts to streamline strategic planning and implementation tools to ensure maximum consistency in its objectives, policy approaches and management arrangements, both at HQ and in the field, through the development of Thematic and Regional/Country programmes.”¹¹ The realignment of DPA in 2010 had similar goals, but it is unclear how these goals were integrated with those of DO and DTA.

As part of the DO/DTA realignment process, a series of Inter-Divisional Task-Teams (IDTTs) were also established to advise and assist Field Offices in the development of Regional Programmes. The IDTTs have not however, been fully institutionalized, in the sense that they still largely function in an ad-hoc manner.

¹¹ DO & DTA Realignment: Communication from Management, March 2010

While these institutional arrangements have enabled UNODC to make important progress, important shortcomings still persist. First, core functions within the Division of Policy Analysis and Public Affairs (DPA) such as research, analysis, inter-agency affairs, fundraising and advocacy that are central to the effective implementation of the Regional and Thematic Programmes were not considered in the realignment process. As noted above however, DPA did embark on its own realignment process in 2010, with the aim of bringing its internal structure “into consonance with the new approach of thematic clusters and integrated programming.” The DTA realignment process has only been partially implemented due in principal to funding constraints. Notwithstanding the realignment of DPA, there is still confusion within the organization regarding roles and responsibilities related to policy, planning and research and analysis and effective integration of some of DPA’s core functions such as research and analysis into Thematic and Regional programmes is still a challenge.

More specifically, despite the realignment of institutional arrangements launched in 2009 (DO and DTA) and 2010 (DPA), and IOS recommendations put forward in 2007, the Office still faces challenges regarding integration of core functions housed across the Division of Operations (DO), the Division of Treaty Affairs (DTA) and the Division of Policy Analysis and Public Affairs (DPA). This is specifically evident with regards to policy and planning. Indeed, it remains unclear who is ultimately responsible not only for setting and disseminating “policy” in UNODC, but also for overseeing implementation of policy, planning and reporting on results. Currently, this responsibility is covered by different units spread across DO and DPA, and increasingly, the Office of the Executive Director (OED).

Second, the initial design and implementation of the Regional Programmes did not give due consideration to the core administrative and support functions that would be necessary to establish the type of regional presence required to implement the Regional Programmes. Many of these challenges have been raised time and time again in different audits and evaluations but there appears to be an important stumbling block preventing the implementation of useful remedies.

Effectiveness

There is evidence that the IPA has met several of the objectives established in 2008. It has led to more coherence at the field level and to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions, particularly through the establishment of seven Regional Programmes (three more are currently being developed) and six Thematic Programmes¹². It has presented Member States and donors with a more coherent overview of what the UNODC can offer in terms of policy support and technical assistance. It has also opened up the possibility of engaging with regional entities and partner countries on a more strategic basis, and has allowed the Office to engage more strategically in international policy debates.

¹² Thematic Programmes: Action against Transnational Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking (2011-2013); Corruption (2010-2012); Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform (2010-2011 and 2012-2015); Addressing Health and Human Development Vulnerabilities in the Context of Drugs and Crime (2009-2011); Terrorism Prevention (2008-2011); Scientific and Forensic Services (2010-2011).
Regional Programmes: East Asia and Pacific (2009-2014); East Africa (2009-2012); Central America/Caribbean (2009-2012); Eastern Europe (2009-2011); West Africa (2010-2014); Arab States (2011-2015); Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2011-2014).

Meanwhile, several audit and evaluation reports have highlighted weaknesses in UNODC's knowledge management systems over the years. A report on knowledge management in UNODC was also prepared and submitted by the Strategic Planning Unit (SPU) in 2009. Management acknowledged the report but requested the SPU to hold off on implementation of the report's recommendations, which to date, are still pending. Knowledge management remains a serious challenge and impedes the collection, sharing, analysis and dissemination of information, (particularly innovative good practices and lessons/experiences) across the Organization. Lack of dedicated funds and capacity do not allow for the sustaining of these kinds of initiatives, which by extension, impact the Organization's integration efforts.

Impact

A series of OIOS and BOA audits, internal UNODC documents and reports, and interviews with staff have highlighted that impact assessment is one of the main challenges that the Office is facing today. Many of the audit recommendations are aimed at country-specific programming and efforts are being made to determine how best to approach and implement recommendations. At the same time, traditional approaches to impact or results monitoring and assessment are much more difficult to apply to complex cross-border, inter- and intra-regional programming of the type that UNODC is shifting towards. In this regard, certain consideration needs to be afforded to the fact that developing and monitoring impact indicators for cross-border, inter- and intra-regional programming purposes will require more effort, creativity and sophistication on the part of UNODC on the one hand (including through a strengthened strategic planning, research and analysis capacity), and increased investment of resources by donors and member states on the other. UNODC and its donors could make a significant contribution to on-going debates on cross-border monitoring and evaluation by investing resources in examining how results can be better measured and monitored in this field, also in the context of a UN system wide effort in this field.

Sustainability

As stressed continuously over the past decade, UNODC is seriously hampered by its funding modalities. Extra budgetary or voluntary funds earmarked for specific projects continue to make up the bulk of the UNODC budget (approximately 90 percent). It was assumed that the shift to regional programming, and integration in general, would generate increased financial support from donors who had been calling for both horizontal and vertical integration across UNODC's normative and operational work. As a first step, a Global Project - GLOU46 – was established to secure flexible "seed funding" from particularly supportive donors for the initial implementation of the IPA and donor interest was rallied.

A small group of donors has supported the integration process and is also supporting the Office's efforts to attain more visibility and influence on the international policy stage. In general, where donors have shown more flexibility, including through soft ear-marking, the results have been positive, at least at the process level. More recently (April 2012), UNODC launched its first Fundraising Strategy, which includes specific sections on the 2012-2015 Medium Term Strategy and UNODC's Thematic and Regional Programmes, and notes that in order to sustain the UNODC Field Offices, and field-based operations, a combination of resources will be required. At the same time, the Fundraising Strategy highlights a series of challenges both external and internal that unless addressed, will continue to represent a significant risk to the sustainability of the IPA.

Finally, UNODC needs to play a more strategic and advisory role, and above all, needs to be able to demonstrate and invest in maintaining its comparative advantage in specialized areas if it is to sustain its relevance.

There are strong indications that UNODC's senior leadership is committed to surmounting the various challenges thwarting the implementation of the IPA to date. In this regard, and stemming also from the findings of a range of audit and evaluation reports that have been collected in one document, the UNODC Internal Report - *Comparative Audit Analysis Report: Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits (May 2012)*¹³ - senior management have recently established a range of working groups and task-teams on different issue areas. More recently, the Office of the Executive Director circulated a discussion paper on elements for the development of a UNODC enhanced integrated regional and inter-regional drug and crime control approach. Before moving ahead however, and building on the momentum created by the shifting development context, the recommendations laid out in the attached matrix should be taken into consideration.

¹³ This report is the result of a comprehensive in-depth analysis of recent OIOS and BOA audit findings and recommendations originating from a number of audits conducted at UNODC Field offices between 2009 and 2012. Within the full range of the audits recommendations, this report focuses on those related directly to programme cycle management and applicable as system-wide lessons." It is expected that the analysis of the different findings and recommendations will lead to the "establishment of an evaluation culture within UNODC, based on the recognition that audit recommendations and findings are often underutilized and could be used more efficiently and systematically to enhance internal organizational learning and knowledge sharing processes."

(a) The audit review also aims at "providing a basis for engaging with Field Representative and Senior managers in an open and constructive dialogue towards the further development and/or refining of effective programme management frameworks both at field office and HQ level."

(b) In this regard, the report and planned consultations thereon are intended to:
Trigger a cultural change, whereby audits are increasingly seen as an opportunity to strengthen management practices and interventions;

(c) Contribute to horizontal information sharing within the FO network;
(d) Strengthen FOs' programme management capacity and encourage proactive anticipation/responsiveness to audits;

(e) Discover possible system-wide gaps and procedural weaknesses, which requires a corporate UNODC response;

(f) Strengthen our internal system of accountability at all level and raise awareness about the risk associated with certain practices.

(g) Share insights and reiterate the need to establish a structured and efficient risk management function.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

1. The Senior Management of UNODC thanks the independent evaluation team for the comprehensive report entitled “In-depth Evaluation of the Integrated Programming Approach” and wishes to thank the Permanent Missions to the United Nations in Vienna, as well as UNODC staff at Headquarters and in the field, for their active participation in the evaluation exercise.

2. UNODC is of the opinion that the report’s constructive assessment and recommendations provide critical guidance and insights to help UNODC overcome gaps and weaknesses in its systems and procedures. This is important to enable UNODC to consolidate achievements attained so far in the implementation of the “Integrated Programme Approach” (IPA).

3. The evaluation report notes that over the past four years, “much progress has been achieved in the implementation of the IPA” and that “there is evidence that the IPA has met several of the goals established in 2008”. The report further recognizes that the IPA has “led to a more effective alignment of functions at Headquarters,” and, in turn, to “more coherence at the field level and to more policy, sector, and programmatic interventions, particularly through the establishment of Regional and Thematic Programmes”. The report also acknowledges that “significant progress has been made in the design of the Regional Programmes” which has helped UNODC to “advocate for the ratification and implementation of the UN Conventions [...] at the country and regional level” and to promote “increased regional cooperation and strategic cross-border initiatives.” In fact, the IPA has enabled UNODC to launch six Thematic Programmes and eight Regional Programmes. The latter constitute a platform for action not only with regional entities and partner countries, but also with other UN system partners, multilateral bodies and the civil society, aimed at mainstreaming crime and drug control into wider security, governance and development initiatives.

4. Due recognition is given to the fact that the IPA has “...presented Member States and donors with a more coherent overview of what UNODC can offer in terms of policy support and technical assistance...”, “...opened up the possibility of engaging with regional entities and partner countries on a more strategic basis...”, and “...allowed for a better reflection of UNODC stakeholder needs and priorities.”

5. UNODC values the report’s comment that the IPA “...is serving as an important tool through which UNODC has and can continue advocating for a more integrated global development agenda.” In this regard, the report acknowledges that the IPA “has allowed the Office to engage more strategically in international policy debates”, “enabled better cooperation arrangements with the broader UN system, and is making greater contributions to upstream policy-making at global, regional, and country level.” Of equal importance, the report acknowledges that the IPA has strengthened UNODC’s role as a global and regional catalyst to develop guiding principles, norms, standards and best practices.

6. The report also notes that whilst “not all areas of UNODC’s work need to be integrated” (e.g., Global Projects of a specialized nature), the act of defining exactly what should be integrated would deepen synergies between operational and normative activities. In this context, UNODC agrees with the recommendation to develop a matrix of those Headquarters and field operations which lend themselves strategically to integration, with the understanding that this should not lead to an artificial separation

between operational and normative functions, particularly as these differences are not easy to be drawn within UNODC.

7. Some members of the Senior Management Team felt that Thematic Programme perspectives were not fully captured in the report and that the analysis implicitly gave more prominence to the "geographic " integration, at the expenses of the "substantive" one. Accordingly, it was noted that a further expansion of the analytical focus to cover the interaction between thematic and regional/country dimensions could help minimize the perceived disconnect between the two, and reveal good patterns of integration. One such example is the Review Mechanism for the United Nations Conventions against Corruption, which, starting from a thematic perspective (through the country reviews), trickles down into the regional/country programme level, with full involvement of Member States and other UN agencies at the regional/country level.

8. UNODC agrees with the report's recommendation to further strengthen its administrative systems to better support the IPA implementation, as well as with the underlying argument that "the systems should be made to fit the strategy and not make the strategy fit the systems. If integrated programming is a priority of the Office, then proper investment must be made in appropriate programme (not project) control, monitoring and evaluation systems". Existing and upcoming administrative and other delivery-support practices and tools will be adjusted or developed to enable managers to better plan, design, monitor and assess programme performance.

9. UNODC already started the review of operating procedures and processes for Regional and Country Programmes. A new standardized programme formulation and approval process is awaiting management approval. In this context, the roles and mandates of the Inter-Divisional Task Teams (IDTT's) as regards programme formulation, technical endorsement and implementation will be clarified and further strengthened. Further, as part of the comprehensive IPA evaluation process, UNODC has scheduled independent evaluations of all ongoing Regional Programmes over the next two years. The findings and recommendations to arise from these evaluations will guide the work already under way to develop a consolidated programming guide, bringing together various guidance notes produced in the past years into one single document, as recommended by the evaluation.

10. The report recognizes that, over the past decade, UNODC has been seriously hampered by its funding modalities. Extra budgetary funds earmarked for specific projects continue to make up for about 90 percent of the UNODC portfolio delivery. The Office agrees that "soft-earmarking" from some Member States has been instrumental in promoting the IPA and the development and initial implementation of Regional Programmes. Specifically, the global project GLO/U46 has served as the principal funding vehicle in this process and, as noted by the evaluators, proved to be an effective mechanism. UNODC hopes that Member States will continue supporting the soft-earmarking mechanism used for the global project GLO/U46, providing funding for action at the programme outcome level rather than for individual projects or specific components of integrated programmes.

11. UNODC agrees with the report's recommendation to clarify and streamline the corporate policy and planning functions, including knowledge management, in order also to provide a more efficient environment for the implementation of the IPA. Senior management review on how best to perform such corporate functions is already underway. Further, UNODC is developing a Thematic Programme on Public Affairs and Policy Support, which, coupled with a strengthened capacity in DPA, will provide the necessary structure to undertake policy and planning functions for the Office as a whole.

12. UNODC also concurs that the Office must continue to be relevant at the "upstream" policy level, playing an even more visible role in policy research and advocacy at the global, regional and national levels, including by engaging more strategically with academia and relevant think-thanks, and by integrating more fully its research and analysis functions into regional and country programmes. The

regional Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessments (TOCTAs) recently produced or under development --aimed at informing policy and programme development-- are an example of efforts being made by UNODC in this direction.

13. To sum, UNODC is committed to implementing the recommendations arising from this independent evaluation report, although it is important to recognize that some of the recommendations present financial implications which cannot be disregarded. In particular, challenges will arise as regards recommendation 5b on staff development policy and rotation, and recommendation 1f on IT financial and administrative systems, at a time of likely freezes or cuts in Regular Budget contributions for the biennium 2014-2015.

14. UNODC also agrees with the In-depth Evaluation as regards the need to build on the IPA's achievements so far, and to address the challenges identified, including some structural weaknesses, so as to be able to fully realize the IPA's potential and maximize its impact. The UNODC Senior Management views the IPA as a corporate priority and is determined to address these challenges through a truly corporate effort, ensuring that the IPA goals are fully owned and jointly promoted by all its Divisions.

15. As applicable, the implementation of recommendations arising from this report will be done with due regard to the recommendations emanating from the other audits and evaluations currently underway at UNODC.



SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings ¹⁴ : problems and issues identified	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations
1. GENERAL (cuts across all evaluation criteria)		
<p>The shift to IPA has in general been received positively. The policy has led to greater coherence, more efficient and effective modes of operating, and has enhanced UNODC's relations at the policy and operational levels. At the same time the approach lacks coherence in design and institutional ownership.</p> <p>Several challenges remain, including the question of whether the IPA goals and implementation mechanisms (particularly the Regional Programmes) established in 2008 remain a strategic priority of the Organization today or whether they should be modified on the basis of the current evaluation process (Phases I-III) and develop an invigorated corporate-wide integration policy, that also considers different global and regional realities.</p> <p>UNODC has still to ensure that effective administrative and support systems and mechanisms are put in place at HQ and field level to facilitate the implementation of the Regional and Thematic Programmes and integration in general. At the same time, the Office's funding arrangements hamper attempts to implement uniform systems that support operations.</p>	<p>Documentation and interviewees highlighted lack of management support and buy-in for the IPA, challenges posed by core staff turn-over, delays in approving core policy and guidance. Integration is viewed differently by different parts of the Office and exacerbated by the absence of a corporate-wide integration policy that can be monitored and adjusted on an annual basis.</p> <p>In-house stakeholders (GLOU46) coincided in highlighting that advocacy for ensuring ownership of IPA was more externally oriented, rather than directed at UNODC staff. Also noted challenges inherent in absence of a communications strategy to inform internal and external stakeholders of developments related to IPA implementation.</p> <p>Absence of a clear road-map for ensuring the adequate IT, administrative and support services to implement the IPA (especially the RPs).</p> <p>Absence of a single dedicated unit in the Office</p>	<p>(a) Along the lines of the 2012 UNODC Internal Report - Comparative Audit Analysis Report - Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits, UNODC senior management should initiate a process on the basis of this evaluation report, the evaluation of the first batch of Regional Programmes, and other relevant audits and evaluations, to discuss the findings with Field Representatives, relevant DO, DTA, DPA staff and the Governing Bodies. This process should lead to:</p> <p>(b) The confirmation or revision of the existing IPA, with full endorsement by the Executive Director and the relevant UNODC governing bodies, accompanied by clear high-level directives for the organization-wide adherence to the IPA.</p> <p>(c) Determination of clear roles and responsibilities for implementation, oversight and responsibility of the IPA, and the provision of clear guidance related to its implementation. If UNODC is serious about integration, in should take more steps to lay out the vision, objectives and principles of the broader IPA (or a revised integration policy) in one single corporate-wide internal policy document, accompanied with related benchmarks; and coherent and consistent implementation standards and modalities for both headquarters and field operations so the latter could be used as a basis upon which the policy could be reviewed on an annual or bi-annual basis. In this regard, and in the absence of a dedicated corporate wide Policy and</p>

¹⁴ A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement.

<p>It is unclear who is ultimately responsible for not only setting policy in the Organization, but also for overseeing implementation of policy, and reporting on results. The current institutional arrangements are ineffective as these functions (policy and planning) are spread across Divisions, create overlaps and confusion especially regarding ownership and accountability of the IPA.</p>	<p>responsible for policy and planning, and absence of a coherent policy cycle whereby lessons/ experiences are trickled up through a dedicated policy and planning unit and used to influence internal and external policy formulation.</p> <p>Absence until recently, of a corporate-wide fundraising strategy.</p> <p>Absence in the recently adopted fundraising strategy of a clear pathway for integrating or expanding the IPA soft earmarked funding mechanism (GLOU46).</p>	<p>Planning Unit, UNODC should seriously explore the possibility of strengthening its HQ policy function by establishing a dedicated Unit, that sits between the EOD and the Divisions (and not in one of the Divisions) which could fulfil this role. The Unit could be created by drawing relevant staff from the Programme Support and Oversight Unit in DO, the Strategic Planning Unit in DPA, and from DTA, thus ensuring an interdivisional approach. In addition to core policy functions (including trickling up lessons, experiences and evidence from the field to inform policy in UNODC and the broader UN and international system), the Unit would be responsible for developing clear internal procedures and guidelines for development and implementation of programmes, and enhancing communication and coordination between units in the different divisions and the field.</p> <p><i>(d)</i> Build on and refine the UNODC recently adopted Fundraising Strategy to promote a systematic effort in mobilizing donor resources in support of corporate-wide integration, including through soft-earmarked funding. In this regard, those Member States who wish to support the IPA in all its dimensions, should also consider alignment of their funding policies.</p> <p><i>(e)</i> Clarification of which IPA-related processes have been superseded or replaced by others and inform staff accordingly.</p> <p><i>(f)</i> Guarantees from senior management that effective IT, administrative and financial systems and support mechanisms are provided in a timely manner to support implementation of the IPA, particularly at the field level. This will include reviewing the operating procedures of the Inter-Divisional Task Teams and clarifying the role of the latter once the Programme Development and Review Process is approved; and putting in place effective and efficient knowledge management systems.</p> <p><i>(g)</i> Along the lines of the 2012 UNODC Internal Report - Comparative Audit Analysis Report - Lessons learned and</p>
--	---	---

		<p>good practices from FO audits, identify the core obstacles and risk factors that might impede the effective and efficient implementation of the IPA; and develop a plan identifying timelines and roles and responsibilities for overcoming these obstacles and working around the risk factors.</p> <p>(g) Given that the latter will also depend on renewed member state commitment to supporting an invigorated integration policy, UNODC's open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC (FinGov) should be fully engaged. As noted above, Member States who wish to support UNODC integration efforts (including via the IPA) should realign their funding policies accordingly.</p>
--	--	--

2. DESIGN & IMPACT

<p>Despite better integration of UNODC's thematic areas at the operational level, the Organization still faces challenges regarding integration between core functions housed across DO (and FOs), DTA and DPA. The latter has impacts directly and indirectly on operations in the field and as noted in GLOU46, requires further work.</p> <p>The HQ-based Thematic Programmes have developed as policy frameworks and operational tools rather than just the former, not least because in order to maintain expertise, relevance and administrative support, Thematic Programmes also have to secure funding. This has led to the continuation of existing and development of new "Global Projects" managed from headquarters, some of which are not necessarily linked to field operations. The Office still has to reconcile these Global Projects</p>	<p>Absence of a matrix that lays out all projects, programmes and policy initiatives currently being implemented by DO, DTA and DPA and other relevant units. Linked to recommendation 1. Of GLOU4, which notes: "a lack of clear, unambiguous, standard guidelines in areas such as participatory needs assessments, context analysis and baseline studies, indicator development and appropriate monitoring systems."</p> <p>Absence of clear guidance outlining whether Thematic tools are just normative or if they are also operational in nature.</p> <p>Absence of clear guidance as to whether UNODC's programmes are operational</p>	<p>(a) UNODC senior management should determine how more effective and deeper integration of programmatic, thematic, research and analytical work can be achieved both at the policy and operational levels as a means to avoid fragmentation of efforts and make more effective and efficient use of in-house expertise and resources. While not all areas of UNODC's work need to be integrated (some of the Global Projects stemming from the Thematic Programmes are very specialized and have specific targets that may not necessarily lend to integration), defining exactly what should be integrated through the development of a strategic matrix that includes all headquarters and field operational activities, could help clarify which activities are operational and which are normative; where overlaps exist between the normative and the operational activities (TPs and RPs), enable prioritization, and by extension, help strengthen the UNODC's comparative advantage, particularly in those areas where the rest of the system lacks capacity and expertise.</p>
---	---	---

<p>with Regional and Country Programmes.</p> <p>In addition, some of the Regional Programmes still only represent a collection of existing projects and initiatives, leading only to tactical level results. In some regions, there appears to be competition (including for funds) between pre-existing Country Programmes and the newer Regional Programmes. Efforts to reconcile these issues are on-going.</p>	<p>in nature or if they are 'frameworks' that can help guide operations.</p>	<p>(b) UNODC will have to ensure that from the outset, UNODC's research and analytical expertise is an integrated part of programme development and a human resource strategy that responds to these types of needs.</p>
		<p>2.3 As part of an invigorated integration strategy, the Office needs to place stronger emphasis on determining how to better monitor and assess the impact of the IPA at its different levels of implementation (policy/normative and operational) including through the development of 'usable' and realistic impact indicators. This will require a coherent and consistent decision on how UNODC sees its programmes – whether as operational tools, or as guiding frameworks for operations. The 2012 UNODC Internal Report - Comparative Audit Analysis Report - Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits as well as the foreseen evaluations of the Regional Programmes can help shed light on the range of current mechanisms and tools currently being used to assess impact, and make further recommendations in light of the on-going internal discussions on results-based management and budgeting.</p>

3. RELEVANCE, PARTNERSHIPS & COOPERATION

<p>UNODC has developed better cooperation arrangements with the broader UN system, has gained greater visibility in major policy making centers, and is making greater contributions to up-stream policy making at global, regional and country levels.</p> <p>Regarding upstream policy and normative support, over the past five years in particular, UNODC has increased its visibility in these areas, and the IPA, particularly the Regional Programme framework,</p>	<p>Absence of a clear strategy for influencing up-stream policy (targeting topics), developing partnerships and enhancing overall relevance of UNODC's work for international, regional and national stakeholders; and in which UNODC articulates the different type of integrated support required to prevent or respond to OC etc, in different contexts (conflict, post-conflict, transition, middle-income,</p>	<p>(a) UNODC should continue to increase its relevance at the upstream policy level by playing a more visible role in policy research and advocacy at the global and regional levels. In this regard, UNODC could engage more strategically with academia, think-tanks and independent experts to engage in, and disseminate the findings of independent, applied research and engage UNODC's field offices and regional and national research partners in these processes. Such efforts can also feed into important processes such as those aimed at influencing the post-2015 development agenda.</p>
--	---	--

<p>has helped promote strategic cross-border initiatives. Of particular relevance is UNODC's inclusion as co-chair of the UN Task Force on Organized Crime and Trafficking established in NY, and its participation in a range of Security Council and General Assembly discussions and debates on topics that relate to its mandate.</p> <p>The IPA is serving as an important tool through which UNODC has and can continue advocating for a more integrated global development agenda. Since the inception of the IPA, the Office has systematically highlighted the connection between the rule of law and poverty reduction, and called on member states and the broader international community to devote greater attention to the joint pursuit of justice, security and development (although it remains largely silent on the connection between its own mandated areas and politics). Notwithstanding, it remains unclear what the actual impact of this added visibility has been.</p>	<p>fragile middle income etc.). At present done mainly through different functions in different units or FOs but the combination of these efforts not articulated in any document in a way that demonstrates UNODC's added value.</p> <p>In the absence of such a corporate-wide strategy, UNODC has no means of assessing the impact that its efforts have on current upstream policy processes etc. The RP evaluations can provide some initial assessments of impact at the regional level.</p>	<p>(b) In light of the findings of the evaluations of the Regional Programmes, DO and DPA (or a new dedicated Unit as proposed in Recommendation # 1 above) should develop mechanisms to determine the impact of enhanced cooperation with/ and integration of UNODC's work within the UN system and broader international community, particularly in terms of helping meet the broader rule of law, peace, security and development goals at the country, regional and global levels. The evaluation of the Regional Programmes could provide initial insights into this process. UNODC could also use its position in the UN Task Force on Organized Crime and drug trafficking to also engage other UN bodies such as DPA, DPKO, UNDP and the World Bank in these processes.</p> <p>(c) UNODC also needs to develop mechanisms to address the requests of some upper middle-income countries to enter into a more strategic partnership (e.g. the establishment of i.e. Liaison and Partnership offices). UNODC should use this evaluation process to determine how it can best support DO, field offices and host countries to analyze these developments, and use the findings to influence broader international policy processes, particularly those related to the post-2015 development agenda.</p> <p>(d) A core issue to determine in the next phase of the IPA regarding effectiveness (as well as efficiency), is how the Regional and Country Programmes are integrated with other UN system-wide processes including One UN, Delivering as One, the Integrated Mission Planning Policy (IMPP) for peacekeeping and provide an initial assessment of the results of more effective coordination.</p> <p>(e) The foreseen evaluations of the Regional Programmes should focus on assessing the results of better integration with the UN Country and UNDG Regional Teams and the impact that the inclusion of UNODC mandated areas in UNDAFs, Integrated Strategic Frameworks (ISFs) and other strategic planning frameworks applied in different contexts are having. In addition, given the fact that UN (and other) Political Missions are increasingly taking into account transnational phenomena in their areas of operation, the Regional Programme evaluations</p>

		could also shed light on how UNODC is integrating its work with these operations, and provide an initial assessment of the perceived impact of this integration.
		(f) The evaluations of the Regional Programmes should help shed light on whether the IPA has helped UNODC enhance relationships with civil society actors and ensure their voices are represented in the identification of priorities and in the design of Regional Programmes.
		(g) Beyond the undertaking of TOCTAs, UNODC can help provide much needed research and insights on the impact of organized crime and illicit trafficking on rule of law and development and help the Office to develop better baselines upon which to measure impact and results which can be shared with the broader UN system (for example through the UN Task Force on Transnational Organized Crime and Trafficking). It could also provide analysis support to Field Representatives on challenges to implementing cross-border initiatives, building on experiences such as the West Africa Coastal Initiative (WACI).

4. EFFICIENCY

<p>Several audit and evaluation reports have highlighted weaknesses in UNODC's knowledge management systems over the years. Conversely, knowledge management remains a serious challenge and impedes the collection, sharing and dissemination of information across the organization. In addition, in 2009 the SPU developed a comprehensive report outlining the Office's main KM challenges and put forward a series of recommendations, implementation of which is still pending.</p>	<p>Absence of a user-friendly, knowledge management system that provides easily accessible information/ documentation/ data etc. on programmes, projects, staff expertise, collects lessons/ experiences/ practices for analysis, integration into the policy cycle and training. The existing Profi system was critiqued by the majority of staff interviewed.</p> <p>Absence of a systematic way to collect lessons and experiences and good/ innovative practice.</p> <p>Lack of dedicated funds and capacity do not allow for the sustaining of these kinds of initiatives.</p>	<p>(a) As already noted in the GLOU46 Evaluation, "systems should be made to fit the strategy and not make the strategy fit the systems. If integrated programming is a priority of the Office, then proper investment must be made in appropriate and efficient programme (not project) control, monitoring and evaluation systems.</p>
		<p>(b) As a means to support UNODC integration efforts, member states and donors need to support the establishment of more effective and efficient knowledge management systems and improve processes of information exchange, including through the developing of the intranet and the Office directory. This could also help ensure that regional and field offices are aware of, and can link up to activities managed from Headquarters that are relevant to their own operation. Internally, management should revisit recommendations already made regarding strengthening internal knowledge management and determine which can be acted on in short, medium and long-term.</p>

(c) UNODC's IT Service should investigate the possibility of developing an internal directory based on UNIDO's model, which includes a search function.

(d) Strengthen the IEU (or the Unit recommended in point 1 above) accordingly to enable it to analyze the outcome of audits, evaluations, internal reporting and establish a systematic system to collect lessons and experiences and good/ innovative practice related to programme implementation.

5. EFFECTIVENESS

There is evidence that the IPA has met several of the goals established in 2008. It has led to more coherence at the field level and to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions, particularly through the establishment of seven Regional Programmes, two Country Programmes and five Thematic Programmes. It has opened up the possibility of engaging with regional entities and national governments on a more strategic basis and has allowed the Office to engage more strategically in international policy debates. Conversely, while UNODC has made important progress in these areas, structural weaknesses related to strategic planning, monitoring and assessing of results, weak knowledge management systems as well as limited research and analysis capacity, prevent the organization from building on its comparative advantages to provide effective support to member states, and serving as an authoritative voice in international policy debates.

As noted in point 2 above, UNODC still lacks baseline gathering, analysis, assessment, monitoring and evaluation capacity. Again, the absence of clear guidance on what constitutes a 'programme' in UNODC does not help.

The RP evaluations can shed light on the extent of this challenge and channel findings into the relevant HQ Unit working on strategic planning and RBB.

Absence of an internal staff development and rotation policy.

(a) In addition to what is laid out in Point 1 above, the evaluations of the Regional Programmes should be used to identify why in some cases, the Regional Programmes have not been able to meet the specified goals of the IPA. The findings of these evaluations can help determine whether a different course of action is required, including higher-level political dialogue, whether an injection of resources is required to get the programme back on track, or whether the Programme should be terminated.

(b) To prevent competition among its operational vehicles (Global Projects, Regional and Country Programmes), UNODC should look into providing better incentives for [internal] integration. An effective staff development and rotation policy could help overcome these challenges.

6. SUSTAINABILITY

<p>As has been noted continuously over the past decade, UNODC is seriously hampered by its funding modalities. Extra budgetary or voluntary funds earmarked for specific projects continue make up the bulk of the UNODC budget (approx.90 percent).</p> <p>It was assumed that the shift to regional programming and integration in general would generate increased financial support from donors who had been calling for both horizontal and vertical integration across UNODC's normative and operational work. As a first step, a Global Project - GLOU46 – was established to secure soft-earmarked “seed funding” from particularly supportive donors for the initial implementation of the IPA and donor interest was rallied. A small group of donors have supported the integration process</p>	<p>Throughout the evaluation, the issue of sustainability of funding has been raised by internal and external stakeholders. This situation is bound to be aggravated by the on-going financial crisis and requires urgent attention by UNODC's member states, particularly at a time when OC and other related phenomena are recognized as an increasing threat for countries across the globe, notwithstanding their development status. UNODC's fundraising strategy was welcomed within the Office but concerns remain regarding how it will be used to support sustainability of the RPs in particular.</p> <p>See also GLOU46 recommendations 3 & 8</p>	<p>(a) The Organization has seen more involvement of member states in the development of programmes and the budgetary process. The development of some the regional programmes, and innovative thematic programmes and other initiatives such as the Counter Piracy programme in East Africa are the result of some of these shifting relations between UNODC, its member states and donors. This engagement should be further strengthened through the implementation of the Organization's first fundraising strategy adopted in April 2012¹⁶ and the corresponding realignment of donor funding policies where necessary. At the same time, the Strategy remains somewhat broad and should be revised to ensure a clear “roadmap” on how to mobilize funds for the sustainability of Regional Programmes and other field operations.</p>
--	--	--

¹⁵ April 2012

¹⁶ The Strategy aims to provide a multi-year framework for different layers of funding; an analytical base for developing a roadmap to reach a sustainable balance between core funding and programme funding; and an organizational framework that UNODC can use to ensure policy coherence and effective coordination of the Organization's fundraising function.

<p>within UNODC and are also supporting the Organization's efforts to attain more visibility and influence on the international policy stage. In general where donors have shown more flexibility, including through soft ear-marking, the results have been positive, at least at the process level. Despite the tabling for the first time of a corporate Fundraising Strategy,¹⁵ it remains unclear however, whether the overall integrated approach is sustainable in the longer term.</p> <p>UNODC member states and donors can help transform the Organization into a much more dynamic and responsive organization by ensuring it has sufficient resources, and that some of them can be used more flexibly to respond to shifting contexts and realities.</p>		<p>(b) As a means to anchor donor support (via partner countries, traditional and new donors) and demonstrate added value and comparative advantage, UNODC should focus additional effort on understanding, assessing and reporting on the impact of the IPA.</p>
<p>While the Regional Programme framework has provided an important tool for ensuring ownership of efforts to counter organized crime, trafficking etc. the degree of engagement of national and regional stakeholders in each stage of the process, differs from region to region. Steering Committees have been developed within the framework of some of the Regional Programmes to accompany and monitor implementation of the programmes, but it is unclear whether these have been effective in sustaining ownership and ensuring mutual responsibility and accountability for results.</p>		<p>(c) The evaluations of the Regional Programmes can help determine how the IPA has helped enhance national ownership (through consultation with both governmental and non-governmental actors), which mechanisms have been put in place to ensure mutual responsibility and accountability for results and of equal, if not more importance, what the overall impact attainment of these goals has had on meeting i) the overall programme goals and ii) the Organization's strategic priorities.</p> <p>(d) Awareness-raising of the IPA vis-à-vis internal and external partners would also be beneficial for its coherent and effective implementation.</p>



I. INTRODUCTION

Background and context

The United Nations' drug control, crime and corruption mandates have expanded over the past decades years, particularly following the adoption of the UN Single Convention on Narcotics Drugs (1961), as amended by the 1972 Protocol; the UN Convention on Psychotropic Substances (1972); the UN Convention on Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (1988); the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000); the UN Convention against Corruption, UNCAC (2003), and the expansion of the UN standard and norms on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.

Attempts to integrate these different mandates commenced with the process that led to the establishment in 1997 of the UN Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention by the UN Secretary-General, which, in accordance with his reform programme, led to the merging of the UN International Drug Control Programme and the Centre for International Crime Prevention;¹⁷ and the subsequent establishment, in 2004, of the current UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).¹⁸

In establishing the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Secretary-General emphasized that the objective was “to implement the Organization's drug and crime programmes in an integrated manner, [and] address the inter-related issues of drug control, crime prevention and international terrorism in the context of sustainable development and international security.”¹⁹ In practice however, a shift away from a predominant focus on the drug control side of the newly-merged mandates resulted difficult to achieve, leading to greater calls by Member States in the latter half of the 2000s for greater internal integration of UNODC's different mandates. A shift away from a project-based to a more programmatic approach in technical cooperation, anchored in evidenced-based policy and practice, was also encouraged.

These developments coincided with a range of existing and emerging meta-policy developments on aid effectiveness, and a push towards better integration of the international and regional peace, security and development agendas (see timeline in Annex IV). These include but are not limited to:

(a) UN System-Wide Coherence, Coordination and Integration: A large number of policies targeting internal United Nations coordination had already been developed prior to 2007. The report of the High-level Panel on United Nations System-wide Coherence in the areas of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment (A/61/583) and the Note of Guidance of the Secretary-General on Integrated Missions in particular, provided a strong foundation for integration.²⁰ Decision No. 2008/24 on Integration of the Secretary-General added extra impetus to the promotion of the system-wide coherence and coordination agenda particularly in post-conflict or violence transition countries.²¹ More

¹⁷ Part two, Section V of document A/51/950

¹⁸ Secretary-General Bulletin ST/SGB/2004/6

¹⁹ Ibid

²⁰ The report emphasized “One United Nations” as a driving concept for overcoming fragmentation of the United Nations system at both the Headquarters and country levels, while the guidance note emphasized the evolving nature of the integrated mission concept and sought to provide additional clarity on the roles and responsibilities within complex, multidimensional missions.

²¹ This Decision also established an Integration Steering Group, to be convened by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, to help ensure the implementation of the integration principles and mechanisms,

recently, “promoting internal coordination, both within and between agencies in transition countries was an important priority of resolution 62/208, requesting the United Nations development system to take measures, in line with guidance provided by Member States, that further strengthen the coherence, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of operational activities of the United Nations development system in countries in transition from relief to development.”²² The UN’s Policy Reviews of efforts to enhance the coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the United Nations operational activities for development continue to build upon and refine these policies.²³

(b) An increasing recognition that integration across the security and development fields is required to respond to 21st Century challenges. The latter has been articulated in a number of UN Security Council (UNSC) Presidential Statements (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012); the UN Secretary-General’s strategic priorities for the next five years; and the World Development Report 2011.

(c) Embracement of the guiding principle of ownership underscored in the Paris Agenda for Aid Effectiveness (2005); the outcomes of the subsequent meetings in Accra (2008) and Busan (2011); and the principle of collective responsibility underscored in core UN Resolutions and UN Security Council Presidential Statements.

(d) An increasing recognition that transnational organized crime and illicit trafficking pose significant threats to international and/or regional peace and security, and can impact negatively on peace and development, and that crime prevention and criminal justice reform are essential components of stability and developmental efforts

(e) An increasing recognition that while the latter require national responses, these challenges have inter-and intra-regional dimensions that the international system is not necessarily equipped to respond to; and therefore much more specialized knowledge and multi-faceted and innovative approaches are required.

(f) The shifting development context and strategic discussions regarding the post-2015 development agenda.

Until 2008, regional and national stakeholders had experienced limited consultation and interaction with UNODC field operations in the design, implementation, monitoring and assessment and/or evaluation of initiatives conducted within their borders. At a time when national ownership and shared responsibility had become standard principles across the international community via the endorsement of the Paris Principles for Aid Effectiveness, there was broad recognition that UNODC had to shift its mode of operations. In addition, connection to, and integration with the UN system and the broader international community on core UNODC mandated areas had not taken place in a comprehensive manner, and UNODC was not seen to be positioning itself strategically enough in core debates that were relevant to its mandate.

As the world entered a global financial crisis in 2008, UNODC was already facing significant challenges, including a lack of donor confidence vis-à-vis UNODC delivery capacity in certain regions, often due to fragmentation of efforts and the lack of a coherent and integrated strategy. UNODC had effectively experienced a serious decline in General Purpose funding, requiring the Organization to implement a

including instruments such as the integrated strategic frameworks and Integrated Mission Task Forces, and to align mission planning processes with existing United Nations system planning tools and other relevant country processes, such as the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, the Common Humanitarian Action Plan/the Consolidated Appeals Process, poverty reduction strategy papers, and results-based budgeting.

²² A/67/93–E/2012/79

²³ General Assembly resolutions 62/208 and 64/289 and Economic and Social Council resolution 2011/7

series of cost-saving measures. In some regions UNODC was experiencing serious funding and implementation challenges, leading to a certain lack of confidence on the part of donors. Indeed, in 2009, an increasing number of Governments expressed their wish to see better coordination and alignment in various parts of UNODC's work and a greater thematic focus. To that end, in the Report by the recently-established Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on Governance and Finance (FinGov), "[M]ember States expressed that creating thematic funding proposals not only would help increase communication between UNODC branches, but would also provide overall vision for the activities being undertaken in a specific region or on a specific subject matter. Thematic or pooled funding would also provide UNODC with greater flexibility as funds for these purposes are not as highly earmarked." Member States also suggested that a shift towards larger thematic and regional programmes, rather than individual projects, "would create additional incentives for funding partners to provide UNODC with more flexible funding. However, Member States also noted that this would require UNODC to build donor confidence in its ability to deliver."²⁴

The development of the "Integrated Programme Approach" (IPA), in 2008, represented a first operational level response by the Office to these challenges and to existing and emerging global developments.

Seeking better conceptual and practical coherence across UNODC and responding to recommendations made by the Office for Internal Oversight (OIOS) and UNODC's Independent Evaluation Unit's 2006 Annual Evaluation Report,²⁵ a realignment and integration' process was also introduced. The Divisions of Operations (DO) and Treaty Affairs (DTA) worked closely in the early stages to facilitate this shift. This included an initial attempt to co-locate both Directors under one unified division as well as other related measures. Notwithstanding, the Office of Programme Planning and Budget Division (OPPBD) and the Controller's Office in New York did not support some of these measures. In 2010, a new structure was finally approved, leading to the redeployment of posts and reassignment of staff within the two Divisions, the rationalization of existing normative and operational expertise under Thematic Branches; the reorganization of the Division of Operations, and the establishment of Regional and Thematic Programmes. The overall goal of the realignment process was to integrate normative and programmatic functions in the delivery of effective and efficient services to Member States, and in informing up-stream policy. The realignment was also intended "to better allocate the responsibilities and accountability of staff members, by eliminating any possible duplication, overlapping and internal competition for resources (...) and was in line with the Office's attempts to streamline strategic planning and implementation tools to ensure maximum consistency in its objectives, policy approaches and management arrangements, both at HQ and in the field, through the development of Thematic and Regional/Country programmes."²⁶

In addition, the existing Regional Desks were merged with the current Integrated Programme Unit (IPU) to form an Integrated Programme and Oversight Branch (IPB) housed within the Division of Operations "but providing services and advice across all thematic clusters, all field offices as well as to UNODC's

²⁴ (E/CN.7/2009/10-E/CN.15/2009/10, paragraphs 45 and 46.) DO&DT Realignment Doc. (2009).

²⁵ In 2006, the OIOS requested UNODC "to review its ToR and ST/SGB/2004/6 to clarify the functions of the respective Divisions, Branches and Sections, avoid duplication and highlight complementarities and comparative advantages between its different components. The role and functions of working teams should be incorporated in this review to allow inter-section/ branch and divisional collaboration for determined outputs and projects. The 2006 annual Evaluation Report of UNODC's IEU recommended a "comprehensive approach to fulfilling United Nations Drugs and Crime mandates, and a strategic approach in establishing the partnership required to ensure the effective and efficient fulfilment of its mandates." UNODC

²⁶ Internal note: Realignment to Commissions approved by ExCom, January 2009

management as a whole.”²⁷ Two additional cross-cutting groups; the Secretariat to the Governing Bodies Section (SGS) which provides support and works across all Divisions to support the governing bodies, and the Monitoring Support Unit (MSU) that provides administrative support across the two Divisions and Field Offices were also created.

Combined, realignment and integration were intended to “enable the Office to acquire a truly integrated regional and thematic perspective, and achieve benefits in terms of improved policy, strategy, programmatic work, mobilization of resources, and partnerships with all relevant stakeholders.”²⁸ As noted in a range of Resolutions, Member States welcomed this shift to a more integrated approach to UNODC’s normative and operational work²⁹

IPA Objectives and Principles

UNODC’s Integrated Programming Approach (IPA) was formulated in the course of 2008. The Medium Term Strategy adopted that same year provided an initial framework to guide UNODC’s programmatic work during the period of 2008-2011. The three key priorities of the Medium Term Strategy were: 1) Rule of Law; 2) Policy and Trend Analysis; and 3) Prevention, Treatment and Re-integration, and Alternative Development. Within these priority areas, the Medium-Term Strategy promoted a programmatic move towards a results-based framework, better consultation and coordination, and more efficient internal management. The IPA was designed as a logical next step to implement UNODC’s Strategy. Its main objectives, which responded to global developments and calls for greater internal coherence, included:

IPA Core Objectives

1. Promote regional entities and partner countries’ “ownership”, mutual responsibility and accountability for results.
2. Enhance cooperation with UN partners, multilateral bodies and civil society by mainstreaming UNODC mandates in an increasingly integrated global agenda (i.e. development, rule of law, security and human rights).
3. Maximize UNODC comparative advantages in upstream policy and normative support, and in promoting strategic cross-border initiatives.
4. Promote an integrated approach among member states in addressing organized crime and illicit trafficking (e.g. human beings, arms, drugs, firearms, natural resources and money) and corruption.
5. Align with UNDG strategic priorities calling for a shift from project implementation to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions.

IPA Internal Objectives

1. Better cohesion
2. A move away from a project-based approach
3. A simplified administrative structure
4. More decentralization for the field.

²⁷ Ibid

²⁸ DO & DTA Realignment: Communication from Management, March 2010

²⁹ Ibid

The implementation of these goals was to be guided by the following principles:

- (a) Ensuring alignment with the Paris Declaration principles on aid effectiveness
- (b) Implementing long-term programmatic and results-focused agenda
- (c) Addressing transnational and cross-border challenges
- (d) Building/ Strengthening partnerships
- (e) Facilitating strategic engagement with partners
- (f) Ensuring flexibility, creativity and customization of responses from across all UNODC mandate areas
- (g) Responsiveness to need
- (h) Positioning and promoting UNODC on the areas of its mandate vis-à-vis other stakeholders like UN agencies, Governments and CSOs
- (i) Simplifying the administrative burden for field offices.

Regional and Thematic Programmes

Thematic Programmes

Since the General Assembly adopted resolution 44/211 of 22 December 1989, a shift from an exclusive focus on project inputs and activities towards broader policy concerns and impact has been taking place. The United Nations development system has been active in this effort by promoting the application of programmatic approaches to its operational activities.³⁰ As early as 1993, a definition of the programme approach to development was agreed on by all United Nations agencies yet in 2008, UNODC was still operating on a project basis.³¹ The IPA would serve as the vehicle through which UNODC could align itself with its development partners and broader UN integration policy. A first step in this direction was the development of Thematic and Regional Programmes.

In 2009, and as part of the aforementioned realignment process, UNODC expertise was reorganized under five HQ Thematic Branches³² with a view to providing policy guidance and support to UNODC Field Operations and the necessary quality control of the programmes implemented in the field in the respective thematic sector. Since 2009, the following Thematic Programmes have been developed by the corresponding Thematic Branches:

- (a) Action against Transnational Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking (2011-2013);
- (b) Corruption (2010-2012);

³⁰

³¹ The programme approach is a process that helps governments to formulate national priority development objectives and to realize these objectives through corresponding national programmes formulated and implemented in a coherent, coordinated and participatory manner to ensure sustainability. The principle that such a programme should be multi-sectoral is based on the view that it is preferable to tackle only one development problem or objective but address it in all its dimensions.

³² Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking Branch (OCB), Corruption and Economic Crime Branch (CEB), Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), Justice Section (JS), and Drug Prevention and Health Branch (DHB)

- (c) Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform ((2010-2011 and 2012-2015);
- (d) Addressing Health and Human Development Vulnerabilities in the Context of Drugs and Crime (2009-2011);
- (e) Terrorism Prevention (2008-2011);
- (f) Scientific and Forensic Services (2010-2011).

Each Programme includes a summary of relevant UNODC mandates, the organizational context, guiding principles for technical assistance, and a listing of the services and products offered in each sector. The HQ Thematic Branches are responsible for supporting the Field Offices through the Thematic Programmes, which are intended to serve as policy guidance for programming in the field. In addition to policy guidance, they also provide “a global operational framework as well as tools for use in delivery of technical assistance in their respective sectors, integrating the various components of the Office’s expertise in the areas of advocacy, trends and threat analysis, legislative and legal support, norm setting and technical assistance.”³³ The Thematic Branches are also intended to i) support stronger advocacy at the international and interagency level; and ii) assist in the design of regional programmes.

Regional Programmes

In 2008, the Integrated Programming Unit (IPU) was requested to take the lead in establishing and coordinating Inter-divisional Task Teams that would work together to establish Regional Programmes. The Regional Programmes (RPs) would be the main vehicle through which UNODC would deliver technical cooperation in the field. They would also enable UNODC to adopt a more strategic approach, and allow the Office to gradually shift from project-based implementation to more coordinated and cost-effective sector and programme-based interventions. The Inter-Divisional Task-Teams were to be comprised of Field Offices staff, regional desks and thematic experts and were given the objective of:

- (a) Developing the outline of the Regional Programmes and aligning them with the UNODC Medium Term Strategy 2008-11.
- (b) Reinforcing UNODC policy coherence and overall quality of technical cooperation in the respective regions.
- (c) Providing the required conceptual and operational framework for transferring UNODC know-how and expertise at the regional and national level.
- (d) Facilitating the move from projects towards more integrated, multi-component technical cooperation programmes, linked to other UN programmes and fully aligned with Governments’ priorities.
- (e) Reinforcing strategic partnerships with the international donor community and mobilizing resources to respective regions.
- (f) Generating a working environment based on genuine collaboration, dialogue and mutual support, including a closer interface and substantive dialogue with field colleagues.

Since 2008 the following seven Regional Programmes have been developed:

³³ UNODC, Guidance Note for UNODC Field Offices, January 2011 (draft?)

- (a) Regional Programme Framework for East Asia and the Pacific, 2009-2012
- (b) Regional Programme for Promoting the Rule of Law and Human Security in Central America, 2009-2012
- (c) Regional Programme for Promoting the Rule of Law and Human Security in Eastern Africa, 2009-2012
- (d) Regional Programme for West Africa, 2010-2014
- (e) Regional Programme on Drug Control, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform in the Arab States, 2011-2015
- (f) Regional Programme for Promoting Counter Narcotics Efforts in Afghanistan & Neighbouring Countries, 2011-2014
- (g) Regional Programme for Promoting the Rule of Law and Human Security in South Eastern Europe, 2009-2011, and Regional Programme Framework for Countering Illicit Trafficking and Organized Crime for Improved Governance, Justice and Security, 2012-2015

Regional Programmes for Southern Africa, South Asia, and the Caribbean States are under preparation and/or finalization.

UNODC's governing bodies were supportive of these shifts towards better integration, noting it as "an important step in the process of continuous improvement of the Office which the Commission encourages."³⁴

³⁴ DO & DTA Alignment: Communication from Management (No date). See also

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Design

The Integrated Programming Approach was developed on the basis of UNODC’s 2008 Medium Term Strategy, which stressed the “need to improve horizontal integration” in the need to reflect “[the interrelationship between drugs, crime and terrorism, where appropriate and in accordance with established mandates of UNODC, in UNODC’s work in the provision of technical assistance.” The Medium-Term Strategy also promoted a programmatic move towards a results-based framework, better consultation and coordination, and more efficient internal management.

As noted above, the adoption of the Strategy coincided with an internal realignment process that would facilitate the implementation of the IPA. The latter also introduced two new types of programmes:

- (a) Thematic Programmes that would provide the framework for operationalizing the priorities laid down in UNODC’s Medium-Term Strategy;
- (b) Regional Programmes that would operationalize the Strategy geographically.

Since 2008, different entities have developed a range of guidance notes and other internal documentation to steer UNODC’s integration efforts (see Table 1 below). These efforts remain scattered though, and overlap with other strategic planning functions and processes has created confusion. The IPB conducted a series of training exercises on design and implementation of the IPA to overcome this confusion. However, according to some interviewees, the training programmes only raised more questions about how the IPA could be implemented in practice. The minutes of the Annual Field Representative seminar also highlight a series of challenges related to the design of the IPA that have largely remained unanswered.

Table 1: Documents relating to IPA

2008	2009	2010	2011
UNODC: Towards strengthened, coherent and integrated UNODC field operations (Sep 2008)	UN ECOSOC: Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice: UNODC Regional Programmes: A Strategic planning and implementation tool (Mar 2009)	UNODC Programme and Operations Manual	UNODC Guidance Note for Field Offices: Implementation of the IPA – Interim Phase. Draft (Jan 2011), IPB
Note on UNODC Regional Programme Guiding Principles	Concept Note Thematic and Regional Programmes: An integrated approach	UNODC, Guidance Note for Field Offices: Implementation of	Information Note: UNODC strategic alignment (Nov 2011), SPU and PSOU

	(Oct 2009), IPU/SPU	the Integrated Programme Approach- Interim Phase (Draft), October 2010, IPB	
Integrated programming Unit/Division of Operations: Note on UNODC Regional Programmes (Dec 2008)			

Design of Thematic Programmes

The Thematic Programmes are developed from the seven sub-programmes outlined as UNODC priorities in the 2008 Medium Term Strategy (and superseded by the priorities laid down in the 2012-2015 Medium-Term Strategy). Some of the Thematic Programmes run on a four-year cycle and provide a conceptual framework for UNODC’s work in each of its thematic priorities and an overview of UNODC’s expertise in the areas of advocacy, research, legislative and legal support, norm setting and technical assistance in the respective thematic area. No clear guidance document regarding the design of thematic programmes has been developed; however, documents are revised on the basis of what is considered good practice and are cleared through UNODC’s Programme Review Committee.

Design of Regional Programmes

The Regional Programme approach is outlined in a nine-page document presented at the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in 2009 (i.e. “UNODC Regional Programmes: a strategic planning and implementation tool”). The paper builds on earlier guidance notes prepared by the Integrated Programming Branch, and outlines the principles and the process of developing the Regional Programmes.

According to the 2008 Note on Regional Programmes developed by IPB, it was expected that the Regional Programmes would impact on five main areas:

- (a) Reducing illicit trafficking of people, drugs, arms, money and natural resources.
- (b) Reducing corruption.
- (c) Reducing serious crimes, including terrorism.
- (d) Reducing the incidence of drug abuse.
- (e) Reducing HIV/AIDS transmission among injecting drug users, prisoners and victims of human trafficking.

The Regional Programme evaluations will determine whether those goals have been met.

Linkages between Thematic and Regional Programmes

According to the documentation reviewed and the interviews conducted, the Regional Programmes are the vehicles through which the Thematic Programmes are implemented in the field. Flexibility in design of the Regional Programme was encouraged so as to allow local context determine priorities as much as possible, while also ensuring that a connection to UNODC’s Thematic Programmes. Field

funding. It also lends itself to a perception that staffing requirements are not being met, especially at the field level. In this regard, Regional Programmes often face difficulties in recruiting expert thematic staff, with many suggesting that better use of resources would be made if staff at headquarters were to spend more time working at the regional level rather than “parachuting in” from time to time.

Adding to the above confusion is the fact that the Division of Policy, Research and Analysis (DPA) has remained largely isolated from the integration process. Although the reorganization driven by the introduction of the IPA helped overcome some existing challenges, UNODC’s research and analysis functions are not yet fully integrated with the Office’s normative and operational functions. This design flaw is felt most by field operations, not least because research and analysis should be an integral part of the Regional Programmes, and capacity transfer in this area a core aspect of effectiveness and sustainability.

The original IPA design process includes the gathering of base-line data as one of the core first steps of programme development at the regional and/or country levels. The importance of collecting baseline data has been raised by several OIOS and BOA reports. As noted in an internal report, “[w]hilst auditors recognized that the countries’ capacity in some regions may represent a barrier to establishing clear baselines, the absence or lack of availability of baseline data is a recurrent challenge in programme design. Weaknesses or absence of data was noted for some outputs and corresponding indicators, which have implications on the objective measurement of programme impact and on the required basis for outcomes/outputs design.” According to the same report, “[t]he identification and use of baseline data has been mentioned as a critical area also by the BOA during a debriefing meeting with UNODC in April 2012.”³⁵

Interestingly, in the cases where soft earmarked funding has been provided (particularly through the GLOU46 project) and used by Field Representatives to gather baseline data, there appears to have been more buy-in at the national and regional levels, at least in the development of the programme components. Some regions such as West Africa have included base-line data gathering as a core dimension of the actual Regional Programme, as the lack of baseline data on all dimensions of organized crime and trafficking in the region remains a significant challenge. **This is a good practice.** If followed through with adequate funding, and if national capacity is developed along the way, and resources are gradually invested in the continuous gathering and up-dating data as a means to inform public policy, it can possibly be implemented in other regions where baseline data is lacking. The draft programme development and approval process described above may examine the possibility of ensuring that baseline data and/or research and analysis remain a core part of regional and country programme development.

In the meantime the aforementioned internal report on the findings and recommendations of different audit reports noted in relation to baseline data that:

(a) Programme Guidelines need to be updated to clearly reflect the aspects of baseline data.

(b) When the lack of national capacity prevents the ready availability of baseline data, programmes should be designed, to the extent possible, with planned interventions explicitly addressing the capacity building component to assist countries in building knowledge, strengthening data collection and creating effective databases (DO/FOs; DTA; DPA).

(c) Existing database and information to be better systematized and made more accessible to FOs for the purpose of programme and project design. (DPA/RAB in collaboration with DO)

(d) More consideration should be given to the enhancement of analysis tools and data gathering capacity in the field, to coordinate, collate and analyze indicators’ data being collected at programme and individual project level (DPA/RAB in collaboration with DO/FOs; DPA/SPU).

35

While the Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessment (TOCTA) reports developed by DPA do not fill the gap regarding collection of baseline data, they are perceived to be helping strengthen the design of some regional and country programmes. In addition to its first global TOCTA (2010) and the one planned for 2013, UNODC has developed two regional TOCTAs for Central Africa (2011) and Central America and the Caribbean (2012); two more (East Asia and The Pacific and West Africa) are currently being finalized, and one (East Africa) is at mid-point. The reports are generally produced by a combination of UNODC staff and external consultants. Of relevance is the fact that the more recent reports have been produced under the responsibility and leadership of the corresponding UNODC regional office, with headquarters-based researchers playing a key role in the preparation of the reports. At the same time however, the team at headquarters is short-staffed, over-stretched and under-funded; updating the TOCTAs on a regular basis and providing support to regional teams remains a costly endeavour and places a significant strain on resources. These challenges might be overcome were the regional offices to hire dedicated research staff. Indeed, where research and analysis capacity is weakest is in UNODC's regional offices where the absence of research staff remains an important obstacle to effective programming, particularly if priorities are to be defined on the basis of sound analysis and broad consultation with different stakeholders. Headquarters does not have the capacity to simultaneously cover the needs of all UNODC field offices, and is also not ideally located to closely study and monitor the local manifestations and impacts of transnational organized crime in all regions and countries that the field office network currently covers. Building such a dedicated capacity into UNODC's field offices, and particularly regional offices and centres of excellence would not only be of benefit to UNODC but also to the broader UN system and to member states. Moving forward, UNODC should ensure that from the outset, UNODC's research and analytical expertise is an integrated part of programme development and that UNODC's human resource strategy responds to these types of specialized needs.

In 2010 and 2011 attempts were made to introduce comprehensive guidelines for the implementation of the IPA. The latter draft provides much-needed guidance on IPA implementation, re-emphasizing principles and objectives, linkages between Thematic Programmes and Regional and National Integrated Programmes, questions related to securing national ownership, and monitoring and assessment of results. However, the document still remains in draft format and it is unclear whether it will be adopted and disseminated. It is also unclear how the latter links to other processes such as Results Based Budgeting that are being driven by DPA's Strategic Planning Unit or the proposed Programme Development and Approval Process for Thematic, Regional and Country Programmes (Table 2) that will be overseen by the Office's internal Programme Approval Committee.

Table 2

Step 1 Field Office develops concept note (CN)	Step 2 Endorsement of CN by the Executive Director	Step 3 Consultations held with IEU, SPU and substantive units as input to Expert Meeting	Step 4 Expert Meeting at Field Office level for drafting Outcomes and indicators	Step 5 Results of Expert Meeting are communicated to IEU, SPU and substantive units
Step 6 Drafting of the complete document	Step 7 Clearance and mandatory consultations	Step 8 PRC ³⁶ review and endorsement	Step 9 ED approval at ExCom	Step 10 Political meeting with final programme

³⁶ The Programme Review Committee (PRC) is the interdivisional body tasked with addressing strategic issues relating to the programmes: operational feasibility, substantive quality, coherence, and financial viability.

The proposed Review process is still pending final approval. It builds on UNODC's existing review process and is designed to ensure that a series of steps are followed before the Executive Director finally approves a programme. More specifically, it aims to ensure full ownership of the programme by UNODC staff by ensuring that the sequence of steps is clear to all staff and that all relevant units in headquarters and the field receive the proper information in a timely manner. It is expected that these changes will ultimately streamline and speed up the development and approval of programmes, while ensuring that national and regional stakeholder ownership is achieved along the way through the establishment of a Tripartite Review Process. Guidance and input from regional and national stakeholders through that process will inform ongoing programme development and implementation.

Again, it is unclear, how the latter will be achieved in practice and how the process will consider the work of other UN and international actors also providing support in a specific setting. Nor is it clear whether the proposed process, which targets Thematic, Regional and National Programmes, will replace the draft IPA Guidance mentioned above, and whether the Inter-Divisional Task Teams (IDTTs) will be superseded by this process.

Underpinning many of the aforementioned design challenges is the fact that UNODC does not appear to have a coherent policy cycle, whereby policy guidance (i.e. the Thematic Programmes) are developed not solely on the basis of mandates accorded to UNODC and drafting led by headquarters, but also on the basis of monitoring and assessing the impact of policy implementation in the field, including through the Office's field operations. Beyond the development of the thematic programme documents, dissemination of the latter appears weak, as is guidance and training on implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Funding constraints are an obvious limitation; however, limited functional integration between the Thematic Programmes and Regional Programmes also poses an important obstacle. There appears to be limited space within the Office to discuss how existing policy is responding effectively to on-going and emerging challenges on the ground, and good or innovative practices and experiences from field operations are not filtered up consistently through the Office. The absence of an effective knowledge management system that can collect these lessons for internal analysis and assessment only serves to exacerbate these problems. Moving forward, systems developed to collect lessons should be integrated into the existing IT infrastructure (i.e. the ProFi intranet).

As UNODC moves to evaluate its Regional Programmes, due consideration should be given to many of the issues already raised in a series of audits conducted by OIOS and X since 2009 regarding Programme and Project Design. An internal report gathered and analyzed the findings and recommendations of these audit reports and proposed several recommendations for moving forward and for capturing lessons.

Extent to which the Thematic and Regional Programmes are 'evaluable' and Extent to which the design of the Thematic and Regional Programmes lends itself to results-orientation

It is unclear what overall impact the IPA has had to date, particularly if measured against broader international goals (e.g. development, security, rule of law, peace building, state building or a blend of one or more of these). Since the development of its first Mid-Term Strategy in 2008 however, UNODC has been gradually shifting to a more rigorous system of measuring results, including through the development of a results-based management framework.

The individual evaluations of the Regional Programmes set to take place during phase III of the overall IPA evaluation process will help shed light on how the Regional Programmes are being measured and against which criteria (the same process should be considered for the thematic programmes). Already at the national level, measuring results against broader goals such as rule of law, peace building, state building and/or development is an extremely complex endeavour that the UN and the broader

international system are struggling to respond to. At the same time, UNODC faces M&E-related challenges that other UN and international entities do not face, as countering organized crime and illicit trafficking requires efforts that are developed on an intra- and inter-regional or even global scale and that must therefore be measured accordingly.

At the programmatic level, the Office is currently working to determine how to better align the various project and programme layers so as to allow for better monitoring and assessment of results and impact. This push stems from IPA design challenges, particularly the fact that the Regional Programmes were launched before the appropriate administrative and support functions were put in place to accompany implementation. This has meant that reporting has remained largely output-oriented, as the systems that are in place are not conducive to reporting on a broader programmatic and results basis. In order to surmount these challenges, some regional and country offices have designed innovative systems such as the Smart Sheet (implemented by UNODC Pakistan). However, administrative and finance staff in Vienna lament that while such ad-hoc systems are useful for Field Offices, as they allow for more programme-level reporting, they also create a significant amount of additional work since UNODC still has to report in accordance with UN and donor rules and procedures, which are more project oriented.

Regarding the involvement of national and regional stakeholders in programme monitoring and assessment of results and impact, interviews to date suggest that in some regions, the IPA has been effective in rallying the involvement of Member States in the design of the actual Regional Programmes from the outset. The establishment of steering committees in some regions to accompany implementation of the regional programme is also viewed as an important platform through which member states can participate on an equal footing in monitoring the implementation and making decisions related to the substance of the programmes. The draft revision of the Programme Review and Approval process mentioned above also lays strong emphasis on ownership – both internal and external – in the design phase of the programmes. Regional entities and partner countries will be invited to participate in a Tripartite Review Process, and their guidance and input will inform ongoing programme development and implementation. The evaluations of the Regional Programmes will shed more light on existing processes, and help determine the degree to which public policy is influenced by (or can better influence) support provided by UNODC.

The manner in which Country Programmes are embedded in the design of Regional and Thematic Programmes

Based on the documentation reviewed and interviews conducted for the purpose of this evaluation, the Division of Operations has endeavoured to ensure that Country Programmes are embedded in the design of the Regional Programmes. This proved more difficult when a Country Programme existed prior to the development of a Regional Programme (e.g. Pakistan, Afghanistan), or when a host government is reluctant to anchor the programme within a broader regional programmatic framework (e.g. Brazil, Mexico). The design of the Regional Programme does, however, allow for the establishment of selected country programmes under the broader Regional Programme framework. For example, in West Africa, five National Integrated Programmes (NIPs) have been developed within the framework of the Regional Programme. Phase III of the evaluation process will allow for a better assessment of alignment between Country, Regional and Thematic Programmes.

Institutional Arrangements to Support Implementation

Institutional Arrangements at Headquarters

The inception of the IPA in UNODC was accompanied by the realignment of functions within the Office, particularly at the Divisional level. The objective of this realignment process was to inter alia ensure more efficient use of resources and capacity across functions. To this end an Integrated Programme and Oversight Branch (IPB) was created, merging the original Integrated Programming Unit with the Regional Desks. The IPB is now composed of the Regional Desks and a small Programme Support and Oversight Unit (PSOU).

It is assumed in the literature underpinning the development of the IPA that the integration process would lead to more efficient and rationalized work practices across Thematic and Regional Programmes, which in turn would enhance efficiency in terms of the support provided to Member States at the regional levels. The realignment of the Division of Operations and the Division for Treaty Affairs was a first step in this direction, later followed by the establishment of the IPB and the regional Inter-Divisional Task Teams (IDTTFs). The realignment process undertaken by the Division for Policy, Analysis and Public Affairs in 2010 was also aimed at enhancing coherence and integration as well as strengthening management.

Combined, these institutional arrangements appear to have led to more efficiency. The Independent project Evaluation of the GLOU46 project noted that the Task Teams played an important advocacy role in helping inform HQ staff about Regional and Country Programme development. There is a general sense among Thematic staff and Field Representatives however, that the Inter-Divisional Task Teams are ad-hoc arrangements, are inconsistently used and do not necessarily receive adequate attention from senior staff, leading in turn to delays in discussion of substantive matters and in the design and adoption of programmes. In addition, staff based in the field lamented the fact that the engagement of thematic programme staff in the Inter-Divisional Task Teams represented more an exercise aimed at ensuring their specific thematic area is captured in the design of the actual programme, rather than a discussion on substance, context, strategic prioritization and target setting. At the same time, it remains unclear whether the IDTTs continue to play a formal institutional role. The teams cannot approve or endorse programmes; they operate on an ad-hoc basis, with some regions meeting quite frequently and others less so. Membership varies according to the theme/region/ interests of staff rather than in accordance with priorities determined by national stakeholders. The IDTTs themselves do not have a real oversight function for the development of programmes as this responsibility in effect falls on the units most directly involved in programme development – the IPB and the field operations. Some field staff also lamented the dichotomy that they perceive has emerged between UNODC prioritization processes (stemming from priorities set by Member States through the GA process) and the bottom-up prioritization processes promoted by the IPA and underpinned by the principle of national and regional ownership. The proposed programme development approval process represents an attempt to address these concerns and provide more detailed guidance for programme staff regarding programme development and implementation. It is unclear however, whether the proposed process will replace the existing IDTTs, how it considers the support and oversight functions currently being provided by the IPB and field offices themselves, and how it intends reconciling the principle of national and regional leadership and ownership of programme development particularly since it is aimed at enhancing processes internal to UNODC.

More specifically, despite the realignment of institutional arrangements launched in 2009 (DO and DTA) and 2010 (DPA), and IOS recommendations put forward in 2007, the Office still faces challenges regarding integration of core functions housed across the Division of Operations (DO), the Division of Treaty Affairs (DTA) and the Division of Policy Analysis and Public Affairs (DPA). This is specifically evident with regards to policy and planning. Indeed, it remains unclear who is ultimately responsible not only for setting and disseminating “policy” in UNODC, but also for overseeing implementation of policy,

planning and reporting on results. Currently, this responsibility is covered by different units spread across DO and DPA, and increasingly, the Office of the Executive Director (OED).

This issue is not new to UNODC or its member states. Indeed, an earlier OIOS Report – MECD-2006-003 of 19 March 2007 - had recommended that in order “to improve coordination and follow-up on important management initiatives, *UNODC needs to establish a clear function that will be responsible to move them forward and follow-up on their progress - ideally a Deputy Executive Director with a dedicated responsibility over it.*” The recommendation was accepted by UNODC management but never implemented and subsequently closed by OIOS.

Funding Arrangements

(See section on Sustainability below)

Administrative and Support Arrangements

A number of internal documents have highlighted challenges in transitioning reporting, budgeting and monitoring tools towards programme level reporting, which in turn undermines the effectiveness of the integrated programming approach. Interim tools such as the IT Dashboard or Smart Sheet system are referenced as innovative measures that were adopted by Field Representatives to support the initial transition to integrated programming, not least because solutions from headquarters were not forthcoming. Yet, it appears that many of these innovative measures were/ are not consistent with administrative rules and procedures dictated in NY. The apparent absence of a corporate plan outlining the support functions required to implement the IPA, render assessment of both the efficiency and effectiveness of the approach somewhat complicated. Conversely, the literature reviewed systematically highlights a series of administrative and resource challenges that continue to represent an obstacle to IPA implementation. These challenges have been flagged by a number of staff from across a range of UNODC Divisions and functions, including the IPB, SPU, IT, HMSR, FRMS, and by Field Representatives during their annual meetings at HQ, and through the reporting structure that was implemented to accompany the IPB. They have also been highlighted in a number of audit and evaluation reports. It is unclear if and when these issues will be resolved in the near future. Again, the availability and flexibility of funding will evidently play a role.

The latter is indirectly linked to delays in developing and introducing the relevant administrative tools to accompany the shift away from a scattered project approach to one that allows for regional programming. These systems would need to remain flexible in order to capture the multi-faceted nature of UNODC’s field operations (the fact that it works via a range of frameworks including Regional Programmes, Country Programmes and Liaison and Partnership arrangements), a reality that has yet to be fully captured in core planning documents and budgeting and reporting systems. The Office’s funding situation does little to facilitate a transition to systems that capture these realities (see section below on sustainability).

Another of the goals of the IPA was to allow for decentralization and the simplification of administrative structures to allow for the efficient management of the implementation of the IPA. Based on the documentation reviewed, it is unclear what UNODC functions were to be decentralized, making it difficult to actually report on whether the IPA has been effective in this regard. In addition, the up-dated guidance on implementation of the IPA is still to be completed and disseminated to field representatives³⁷; effective monitoring, evaluation and reporting mechanisms are yet to be introduced, and as mentioned in

³⁷ A Guidance Note on the IPA was redrafted in 2011 and is still to be adopted.

several audit reports and other internal documentation, efficient administrative systems that can support full implementation of the IPA are yet to be introduced.

Knowledge Management

On another level, despite several recommendations to overcome knowledge management deficits as a means to enhance efficiency, UNODC continues to have limited knowledge management capacity. The IPA has not helped overcome these challenges. Rather, the management of knowledge regarding implementation of the approach has been rather scattered and is representative of a broader challenge across the Office regarding the collection and sharing of information. Several audit and evaluation reports have highlighted weaknesses in UNODC's knowledge management systems over the years. A report on knowledge management in UNODC was also prepared and submitted by the Strategic Planning Unit (SPU) in 2009. UNODC management acknowledged the report but requested the SPU to hold off on implementation of the report's recommendations, which to date, are still pending. Indeed, UNODC has no mechanism that allows for sharing of experiences with other offices or the collection, sharing, analysis and dissemination of information, (particularly innovative good practices and lessons/experiences) that can be shared across teams, with member states and the broader UN system. UNODC's internal system – ProFi -, which holds all programme and project relevant information needs to be modernized, and better systems for analysing data and outcomes need to be developed. The lack of dedicated funds and capacity are obviously key constraints to developing, and above all maintaining, an efficient and effective knowledge management system. However, the gains would be significant.

Efficiency

Role of the Integrated Programming and Oversight Branch led to improved integrated planning along thematic and regional lines and to reduced duplication

According to interviews conducted, UNODC's realignment process has enabled more efficiency, with the IPB playing an important role in terms of developing guidance for, and providing advice and support to Field Offices. It has also served as an important communication vehicle between the Field Offices and relevant HQ Branches/Sections (particularly the Thematic Branches in the DTA and in the DO, and the Strategic Planning Unit in DPA).

The IPB has sought to ensure that, through the IPA, dialogue with Member States is enhanced and "ownership" of the approach and operational activities is anchored. Despite significant turnover in staff, the IPB has maintained an open dialogue with donors on resource mobilization and the need for soft earmarking. The IPB is working closely with the Strategic Planning Unit to develop more efficient (and effective) planning and oversight frameworks. At the same time, however, challenges remain, including some of those raised in the JIU's 2010 Review Report, and particularly the persistent challenge of how to reconcile the alignment of various project and programming documents that are not developed, drafted and endorsed at the same time. The fact that the Programme Support and Oversight Unit (PSOU), housed within the IPB/DO, and the Strategic Planning Unit, housed within DPA, are functionally separated also hampers efficiency and coordination, not least because these functional divisions create different planning and oversight layers.

However, the realignment process between the Division of Operations and the Division of Treaty Affairs was only partially implemented due to opposition from NY to the suggested changes; and no functional alignment with DPA was envisioned, which overall compromised the efficiency of the approach.

Mobilisation of financial resources was efficient, however there is still internal competition for donor resources

There is evidence in the documentation reviewed that the IPA has allowed for more efficiency within the Office. In particular, mechanisms such as the GLOU46 project, have allowed for a much more efficient use of resources (“value for money”), as in some instances it released the seed funding needed to support the inception phase of Regional Programmes.

Interviews conducted for the purpose of the evaluation also shed light on how effective the IPA is perceived to have been in terms of securing “seed funding” and the increased interest of Member States. When the latter are particularly interested in funding anti-organized crime and trafficking initiatives in a specific region, the Regional Programme has been viewed as a viable mechanism through which to disburse funds. At the same time however, the Office’s on-going challenge of integrating the work of the HQ Thematic Branches with that of the Regional and Country Programmes could have funding implications if not resolved, such as internal competition for donor resources. As noted in the evaluation of the GLOU46 mechanism (Phase I of the current evaluation): “GLOU46 has helped raise the profile of UNODC whilst simultaneously raising expectations among donors of the potential dividend from this IPA. These expectations will have to be substantiated in the near future if continued donor funding and sustainability for the project is to be realised. This leads into a critical point that many stakeholders – in particular the donors – link GLOU46 funding not to the development and implementation of the IPA (and associated outcomes) but to the success (or failure) of the integrated CPs and RPs themselves. This perception could act as a barrier to further donor funding for GLOU46 should the CPs or RPs fail to live up to donor expectation.”³⁸

Efficiency of reporting mechanisms related to the regional and thematic programmes

The IPA has met certain administrative challenges along the way and many of these have yet to be resolved. Key amongst these challenges is the fact that the current reporting system is developed around projects, and not programmes, posing significant challenges to staff on the ground. The evaluation of GLOU46 also found this to be a real obstacle, noting that greater effort needed to be invested in “ensuring UNODC systems adapt to suit programming needs as well as project needs.”³⁹

As a means to circumvent some of these challenges, certain Field Offices have developed innovative mechanisms such as the Smart Sheet to enable programme reporting in the absence of in-house reporting tools; these initiatives have not always been welcomed by staff in Vienna – while they might help enhance efficiency at the regional level, they hamper efficiency at headquarters as all the data has to be translated back into project outputs and deliverables for accounting purposes. In addition, parallel systems may enhance inaccuracy of the data collected.

³⁸ See Independent Evaluation of GLOU46, “Support for the Integrated Programming and Oversight Branch to promote multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral cooperation.” Executive Summary, p.ix, para. 3)

³⁹ Ibid – see Recommendation Matrix

Relevance

Relevance of the IPA to the evolving development context

As noted at the outset of this evaluation report, the global development context is shifting. New centers of economic dynamism and new development actor are part of that shift as are the issues and challenges that development assistance is supposed to be targeting. The IPA is serving as an important tool through which UNODC has, and can continue advocating for more integrated global development, peace and security agendas and thus support efforts to respond to the complex challenges posed by organized crime, illicit trafficking and other related phenomena. The global development agenda itself has evolved significantly over the past years with justice and security now considered essential elements to achieving progress on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the post-2015 development agenda. Since the inception of the IPA, the Office has systematically highlighted the connection between the rule of law and poverty reduction, and called on Member States and the broader international community to devote greater attention to the joint pursuit of justice, security and development. More recently, entities such as the World Bank, UNDPKO and UNDPAs as well as humanitarian, development and security experts have been particularly advocating for the need to ensure greater links between development, political and security strategies and actors, and are urging specialized agencies such as UNODC to play a greater role in this regard. The UN Secretary-General echoed these calls for greater integration of agendas in his Five Point Action Agenda, noting that in order to respond to the heightened threat of organized crime, piracy and drug trafficking, collective action needs to be mobilized along with new tools and comprehensive regional and global strategies” which “will require integrating rule of law, public health and human rights responses.” UNODC’s Regional Programmes have served as an important platform for linking these agendas within and across borders, although as noted in the 2011 World Development Report, significant efforts are still required to fully enable bodies like UNODC to respond to the complex cross-border challenges that impact on development and security today.

The World Development Report 2011

In the WDR 2011 on Conflict, Security and Development, the World Bank stresses the role that regional approaches have in strengthening legitimate institutions and governance. The World Bank argues that currently efforts are fragmented and suffer from a multiplication of weak and uncoordinated multi-country endeavors. The WDR argues that despite some exceptions (e.g. the Asian Development Bank and the European Union’s long-standing regional programs, most development partners focus on national rather than regional support. Acting regionally and supporting the role of regional and sub-regional institutions are presented as key to improving global responses to security and development.

Source: World Development Report 2011

The 2011 WDR also stresses the importance of cross-regional approaches, particularly in relation to the spillover effects of domestic policies regarding illicit trafficking on another country or region, noting that global agencies such as UNODC could play an important role by establishing a platform for dialogue between countries

Mechanisms to coordinate the international spillovers of domestic policies are crucial. Spillovers from successful action against illegal trafficking in one country can affect another—Colombia’s actions against drug cartels have had ripple effects across Central America, Mexico, and even West Africa.¹³ Without limiting sovereign decisions, a platform for dialogue between countries would help governments identify potential impacts in advance, debate costs and benefits at a regional level, and consider options to coordinate policy or take action to mitigate impacts in countries affected by the decisions of others. Regional institutions could lead such a dialogue, as could a global agency such as UNODC.

Source: World Development Report 2011

UNODC is also using its Regional and Country Programmes as a mechanism through which greater integration of its mandated areas of responsibility with the work of UN Country Teams and UNDG Regional Teams can be achieved, and it is engaging in similar system-wide initiatives in certain conflict and fragile settings.

Notwithstanding the above, it remains unclear what the overall impact of UNODC’s increased visibility and advocacy efforts have been in relation to these core agenda. Not is it clear whether UNODC action has been effective in terms of preventing and responding to its mandated areas of responsibility, while simultaneously ensuring that these actions are integrated with those of other organizations and underpinned by a broad range of operating principles. As noted by many, translating policy into practice on cross-border and inter-regional issues remains complex and many organizations are struggling to determine how best to measure results in these areas. In this regard, and in relation to recommendations already tabled in the 2011 WDR, UNODC could use its increased visibility and advocacy more effectively to work with its core UN partners to promote a more structured debate on how to analyze, assess, monitor and measure the impact of organized crime, trafficking and other related phenomena on development, politics/ governance and security while also shedding light on the impact of inter and intra-regional efforts to prevent these phenomena. Efforts should also be made to more effectively capture the experiences of its global, regional and country operations to inform these debates.

The Relevance of Context

UNODC’s existing policy tools do not differentiate between the kinds of settings the Office operates in. As noted in recent reports, the type of response required to responding to organized crime, illicit trafficking and other related phenomena in post-conflict settings can differ significantly from the response needed in a country undergoing a non-violent political transition, or the type of response required in middle-income countries. In each of these settings, different modalities for internal integration and integration or cooperation with UN partners and the broader international community are required. An invigorated corporate-wide integration policy should include consideration of these issues.

In conflict-affected or fragile settings, UNODC has limited means to ensure the achievement of IPA and other related UNODC goals. As noted in the 2011 WDR, UNODC can however, build on this comparative advantage to support Member States to tackle these challenges. In doing so, UNODC will need to work more strategically with the broader international community and a broader base of national and regional stakeholders, and use tools at its disposal to influence responses. In this regard, and while not necessarily a direct result of the IPA, UNODC’s Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessments (TOCTAs) can help increase the Office’s contribution to the analysis of cross-border organized crime related trends in a range of different settings, including peacekeeping settings where integration of the UN

system has been placed as a central priority.⁴⁰ The fact that the TOCTAs are now being used to inform programme development and the work of the UN Task Force on Organized Crime and illicit trafficking are important steps that need to be monitored, sustained and strengthened. UNODC can assess joint initiatives such as the West Africa Coastal Initiative or the East Africa Counter Piracy Programme and use lessons from these experiences to inform future UNODC integration policy and programming. It can also build on recommendations tabled in the 2011 WDR regarding the measuring of risks and results by partnering with member states, IFIs, academia and NGOs to collect important baseline data crucial to measuring progress in transition settings.⁴¹

New development actors, including middle-income countries and emerging economies are taking on more responsibility for efforts to counter organized crime, illicit trafficking, corruption, terrorism etc. including through the funding of UNODC operations, the development and strengthening of inter- and intra-regional and national capacity, and the inclusion of related projects and initiatives in public policy formulation and implementation. The Regional Programme provides an important platform through which this work can be facilitated, although in certain settings, national counterparts have demonstrated a preference for working at the country rather than regional level. This reality has required UNODC to develop new kinds of strategic partnerships in which needs and priorities are jointly defined, and responsibility and accountability shared. In order to be effective, it will also require better integration with UNODC's thematic, research and analytical expertise.

Maximizing UNODC comparative advantages in upstream policy and normative support, and in promoting strategic cross-border initiatives

UNODC does hold a comparative advantage in some key areas, but these have yet to be properly articulated by the Office. Many interviewees cautioned that the continuing increase in mandates that its governing bodies are entrusting to UNODC might undermine existing areas of comparative advantage in the mid-to long-term. In addition, UNODC's current funding situation often obliges it to focus on issues that its donors are interested in rather than on strengthening its expertise in a prioritized set of areas. The IPA has helped maximize UNODC's expertise at the regional and country level, through its field network, but more efforts need to be devoted in ensuring better integration between core functions in the three Divisions of Operations, Treaty Affairs and Policy Analysis; and better investment needs to be made in maintaining and strengthening existing capacities so as to ensure that member states can fully benefit from the broad range of expertise the Office has to offer.

Regarding upstream policy and normative support, over the past five years in particular, UNODC has increased its role and visibility in international policy fora, and the IPA, particularly the Regional Programmes, have helped advocate for the ratification and implementation of the UN Conventions on TOC and Corruption, and increased regional cooperation and strategic cross-border initiatives. UNODC has also enhanced its efforts to integrate its work with the work of the broader UN and international community. Of particular relevance in this regard is its inclusion as co-chair with the UN Department of Political Affairs of the UN Task Force on Organized Crime and drug trafficking established by the United Nations Secretary General (UNSG) in NY, and its increased participation in a range of Security Council and General Assembly discussions and debates on topics that relate to its mandate.

Alignment of the thematic and regional programmes, the two key instruments of the IPA, with UNODC stakeholders' needs and priorities

⁴⁰ See UN IMPP of 2011 (ref. Annex IV)

⁴¹ 2011 World Development Report on Conflict, Development and Security.

The IPA has provided the organization with a range of policy (Thematic Programmes) and operational (Regional Programmes) modalities that have led to better cohesion across the Office and better reflection of UNODC stakeholder needs and priorities. According to the documentation reviewed, the Regional Programme has provided an effective mechanism for working simultaneously at the regional and country levels on core thematic areas which have been aligned as closely as possible with the 2008 Mid-Term Strategic Framework. The impact of this engagement is yet to be determined. The Regional Programmes are still at an early stage of implementation; however, the envisaged evaluations that will be conducted in Phase III of the current evaluation process will provide an in-depth insight into how the thematic and regional programmes are perceived to be responding to stakeholder needs and priorities.

At the same time, it is clear that an increasing number of Member States are keen to take on more responsibility for efforts to counter organized crime, illicit trafficking, corruption, terrorism etc. including through the funding of UNODC operations, the development and strengthening of regional and national capacity, and the inclusion of related projects and initiatives in public policy formulation and implementation. The latter is elevating UNODC's role to one of partnership in which needs and priorities can be met and responsibility and accountability can be shared.

Context also has a strong influence on the design of integrated Regional or Country Programmes. In regions such as West or East Africa where UNODC had a limited presence and impact prior to the inception of the IPA, the Regional Programme has allowed for the alignment of UNODC work with regional priorities, even if other complex challenges have emerged along the way. In others, such as East Asia and Pacific, where projects and initiatives already existed but were marked by fragmentation, limited ownership and declining funds, the Regional Programme, supported by flexible "seed funding" (provided via GLOU46) has allowed Field Representatives to bring existing work under a more coherent framework, leading to a gradual strengthening of relations with national and regional counterparts, better alignment of activities over time, and strengthened relations with donors. If managed properly, Regional Programmes can provide national and regional stakeholders the opportunity to examine existing initiatives and conduct joint exercises to determine what should be discontinued and what should be built upon in accordance with identified needs and priorities.

Background documentation and interviews conducted for the purpose of this Evaluation shed light on new or emerging developments at the field level that should be captured in the design of a strengthened integration process. These developments suggest that UNODC should not restrict its field operations to the Regional/Country Programme framework but instead maintain it as an option for engagement with regional and national stakeholders. For example, some Country Representatives noted that they remain rather disconnected from the IPA as it is overly focused on the regional approach. Indeed, as noted in many other spheres, some middle-income countries, and emerging economic powers in particular, have voiced a desire to shift away from traditional modes of technical cooperation with UNODC. Instead, they are looking to strengthen partnership arrangements with the Office, within which they can call on UNODC experts for specialized support or advice in its mandated areas of operation. To meet this reality, the Office needs to play a more strategic and advisory role, and above all, needs to be able to demonstrate and invest in maintaining its comparative advantage in specialized areas if it is to sustain this role.

Alignment of the IPA with UN policies at large, UNDG priorities, UN Deliver as One etc.
(See section on Partnerships and Cooperation below)

Alignment of the IPA with UNDG strategic priorities calling for a shift from project implementation to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions

There is evidence that the IPA has led to more coherence at the field level and to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions, particularly the establishment of seven Regional Programmes and five Thematic Programmes. In some regions, there appears to be competition (including for funds) between

pre-existing Country Programmes and the newer Regional Programmes. Efforts to reconcile this situation are on-going. (See also section on Partnerships and Cooperation below).

Partnerships and Cooperation

Enhanced cooperation with Regional entities, Member States, UN partners, multilateral bodies and civil society and UNODC's contribution to mainstreaming its mandates in an increasingly integrated global agenda (i.e. development, rule of law, security and human rights)

The IPA has served as an important mechanism through which UNODC can enhance partnerships and cooperation with strategic partners and advocate for integration of its mandated areas of work across the UN system, when relevant. UNODC has become more visible on the UN and the broader international stage since the inception of the IPA, not least through the establishment of small liaison offices in New York and Brussels and more recently through the current Executive Directors' participation in a range of different forums in NY and the regions; the inclusion of UNODC as a co-chair with DPA on the UN Task Force on Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking; the participation of NY in different UNODC-related meetings in Vienna; a more strategic engagement of UNODC Field Representatives with UN Regional and Country Teams; and through the latter, the establishment of field-level task forces or working groups on organized crime and trafficking.

At the country level, the UN's in-country coordination structure – the Resident Coordinator (RC) system has come a long way from one led primarily by UNDP to one that is more inclusive of the whole UN mandates. It is assumed that the IPA, particularly Regional Programmes, provide UNODC with an effective platform with which Field Offices can work with UN Regional and Country Teams to ensure that core issues such as corruption, organized crime and illicit trafficking as well as the violence spurred by many of these issues are considered part of broader UN system-wide regional or country strategies. As evidenced in interviews conducted for the purpose of this evaluation, some Field Representatives are working closely with Resident Coordinators and Country Teams to ensure that core UNODC mandated areas of work are injected into the UNDAF and/or (depending on the country), the Delivering as One processes. In some instances, country-level task forces on organized crime, trafficking or related issues have been or are in the process of being established. It is less clear however, how UNODC works under the Integrated Mission framework in settings where peace operations have been established; or how it works with UN Special Political Missions. In addition, the fact that most of these strategic planning frameworks are designed for country level operations rather than inter- or intra-regional operations remains an important impediment, which the UN and its international and regional partners have yet to resolve. UNODC's Regional Programming provides a useful instrument in this regard, at least for intra-regional and cross border initiatives, not least because it also provides for the development of sub-programmes including Country Programmes, and given the right resources, Field Representatives could also work with Regional Development Groups and/or depending on the context, Regional Political Missions to enhance coordination, coherence and integration at that level.⁴²

The establishment in 2011 of a Joint UN Task Force on Organized Crime and illicit trafficking in New York, co-chaired by the Department of Political Affairs (DPA) and UNODC and made up of core UN entities and departments such as DPKO, UNDP, UN Women, and World Bank can reinforce these efforts. According to the Terms of Reference, the Task Force aims to establish regional and country task forces, coordinate the development of joint technical assistance activities, engage in advocacy and developing

⁴²As part of the UN drive for system-wide coherence, the UNDG has established Regional Teams to provide support to UNCTs and UNDAFs in each region. UNODC Field Representatives have been encouraged to work with these RTs when possible.

key messages; and produce threat assessments (based on UNODC's TOCTAs). The Task Force provides UNODC with a strategic opportunity to help support the emergence of a UN system-wide response to the challenges posed by transnational organized crime and illicit trafficking worldwide. A formal letter to all Resident Coordinators (RCs) announcing the establishment of the Task Force co-signed by Under Secretary-General for Political Affairs Lyn Pascoe, UNODC Executive Director Yury Fedetov, and UNDP Administrator Helen Clarke has afforded UNODC Field Representatives additional legitimacy to bolster the focus on organized crime and trafficking at the country and regional level, particularly in settings where Resident Coordinators might not necessarily have been keen on including sensitive UNODC mandated areas of work on the UN Regional or Country Team agenda. Delays in getting the Task Force off the ground and in determining its *modus operandi* have, however, raised questions as to the benefits of yet another UN Task Force.⁴³ For now, UNODC is engaging in the Task Force in New York with the support of extra-budgetary funding.

UNODC is also actively engaged in relevant Policy Committee deliberations, undg Working Groups, as well as the UN Rule of Law Coordination and Resource Group. These various fora aim to improve the UN's ability to deliver as one and provide more effective and efficient assistance to member states. Notwithstanding, due to staffing and resource constraints, UNODC is unable to follow all core discussions, debates and decisions in areas such as the rule of law, peace building and/or development. The absence of a clear policy cycle in which experiences on the ground trickle up and inform policy and planning also means that much of the experiences on the ground are not being captured, nor are they serving to influence broader policy debate and discussions.

Specific efforts such as joint country programming, or joint regional initiatives such as the West Africa Coastal Initiative (WACI) with other UN entities are also relevant to the Office's integration process. More recently, and spurred particularly by some controversial drug control initiatives and measures, UNODC has [perhaps somewhat belatedly] has recognized that some efforts by member states to counter organized crime and trafficking can also have serious human rights implications. It has since established a special task force at UNODC Headquarters in Vienna to develop related guidance for field operations in liaison with the OHCHR in Geneva.

At the higher strategic level, as mentioned, UNODC has continued to position itself in New York, Brussels, Geneva and other key policy centers, and it is striving to ensure that some of its core partners engage with UNODC and its governing bodies in Vienna. At the same time, integration into the broader agendas at present seems to be more focused on ensuring visibility of UNODC or ensuring that its core mandate areas are mentioned/ included in planning frameworks, for example the European Commission funding instruments for the period 2014-20.

The impact of these modes of partnership, cooperation and integration in real terms remains unclear. It is equally unclear what impact its work has had (whether implemented with others or not), on strengthening the rule of law, fostering development etc. in different contexts (post-conflict, fragile settings, traditional development settings etc.). Indeed, UNODC would render a great service to member states were it to concentrate some of its research and analysis efforts on shedding light on the impact of organized crime in a range of different contexts, and highlighting what has or had not worked in counter-organized crime, terrorism and trafficking efforts.

In referring to partnerships, the intent of the IPA was to also engage more effectively with civil society, and not just government representatives. It is unclear to date the degree to which this has been achieved, although interviews with Field Representatives suggest that the balance of partnerships is tipped towards formal state actors and UN and other international organization representatives.

⁴³ For an overview of related Task Forces see: Shaky Foundations: An Assessment of UN Rule of Law Support, Kavanagh and Jones(2012),

The foreseen evaluation of the Regional Programmes could help shed light on whether these types of partnerships and modes of cooperation and integration have enhanced efficiency and effectiveness and helped UNODC and its partners meet broader results, and also determine the nature of relationships with civil society actors.

Effectiveness

The IPA identified the following objectives against which effectiveness should be evaluated:

(a) Promote regional entities and partner countries' "ownership", mutual responsibility and accountability for results;

(b) Enhance cooperation with UN partners, multilateral bodies and civil society by mainstreaming UNODC mandates in an increasingly integrated global agenda (i.e. development, rule of law, security and human rights);

(c) Maximize UNODC comparative advantages in upstream policy and normative support, and in promoting strategic cross-border initiatives;

(d) Promote an integrated approach among Member States in addressing organized crime and illicit trafficking (e.g. human beings, arms, drugs, firearms, natural resources and money) and corruption;

(e) Align with UNDG strategic priorities calling for a shift from project implementation to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions.

Internal

Better cohesion

(a) A move away from a project-based approach to technical cooperation

(b) A simplified administrative structure

(c) More decentralization for the field

Based on the interviews conducted, certain progress has been made in meeting each of these objectives. The IPA has led to more coherence at the field level and to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions, particularly through the establishment of seven Regional Programmes (three more are currently being developed) and six Thematic Programmes⁴⁴. It has presented Member States and donors with a more coherent overview of what the UNODC can offer in terms of policy support and technical assistance. It has also opened up the possibility of engaging with regional entities and partner countries on

⁴⁴ TPs: Action against Transnational Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking (2011-2013); Corruption (2010-2012); Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform (2012-2015); Addressing Health and Human Development Vulnerabilities in the Context of Drugs and Crime (2009-2011); Terrorism Prevention (2008-2011); Scientific and Forensic Services (2010-2011).

RP: East Asia and Pacific (2009-2014); East Africa (2009-2012); Central America/Caribbean (2009-2012); Eastern Europe (2009-2011); West Africa (2010-2014); Arab States (2011-2015); Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2011-2014).

a more strategic basis, and has allowed the Office to engage more strategically in international policy debates.

It will be important to ensure that the evaluations of Regional Programmes that will take place in phase III of this evaluation process take stock of the findings of the current policy evaluation and that the Terms of Reference flow from the goals that were initially set for the implementation of the IPA. It will however be important to bear in mind that meeting the IPA goals is not just the responsibility of the Regional Programmes, but also one that should be shared by Thematic Programmes, DPA and the EOD's policy outreach efforts. An invigorated corporate-wide integration policy and process managed by a dedicated policy and planning Unit can help ensure these connections in the future.

Impact

Contribution of the IPA to long-term benefits for UNODC and Member States

Given how “young” the IPA policy is, it is perhaps too early to determine the overall impact it has had. The absence of core benchmarks against which to evaluate the IPA implementation has also rendered the evaluation process somewhat difficult. Without a doubt, at the process level, the IPA has had an impact. It has helped the Office to develop a much more rigorous approach to planning and programming at the regional and country levels, and it is expected that additional steps taken by senior management such as the new Programme Development and Approval Process while somewhat time-consuming, will help strengthen these efforts. The integration policy has also helped UNODC meet some of the strategic goals laid down in the 2008 Mid-Term Strategy, particularly those related to ensuring more up-stream policy influence, ensuring national and regional ownership, and working strategically across borders.

It is unclear, at this early stage, what impact better policy and operational integration will have in terms of responding to today's complex development and security challenges and how UNODC's integration efforts contribute to meeting these challenges. It is, however, an opportune moment for UNODC to develop mechanisms to determine ways to monitor and assess its contributions in this regard. In doing so it should take into consideration some of the reflections of Field Representatives regarding the effectiveness of these approaches, particularly the fact that they are often very process driven and can have limited impact on real developments on the ground.

There is increasing consensus that current responses by Member States to organized crime and trafficking focus too heavily on law enforcement. Over the past decade, there has been an increasing recognition that organized crime and trafficking interact continuously with legitimate actors (including elected officials, public servants, security agents, law enforcement officers etc.), markets, and political processes, yet it is unclear, particularly at the high policy level, how UNODC's integration efforts respond to these complex challenges. In addition, due to the nature of the Office, and the fact that field offices depend on the good faith of the host country to establish and maintain operations in a given country, UNODC has limited leverage to react or respond when organized crime becomes interwoven with domestic processes and actors. Greater integration with the international system at the political and operational levels can help identify alternative and more integrated international responses to some of these challenges.

Means and instruments designed and/or implemented to answer the question of “impact”

At the regional and country levels, the individual evaluations of the Regional Programmes that will be conducted as part of Phase III of this evaluation process will help shed light on the impact of the IPA; however, as noted above, this process will have to consider the fact that some of the Regional

Programmes have only recently been developed and therefore a staggered approach to the evaluation process might be warranted.

Already, interviews with DPA, DO and field staff as well as repeated OIOS audits have highlighted that impact assessment is one of the main challenges that the Office is facing. Indeed, as noted in an internal report, “[a]uditors have frequently reiterated the need for UNODC to set up consistent and corporate frameworks/tools and guidelines to monitor and report progress against integrated Programmes. Ideally, these tools should also enable the linking of expenditure with progress towards programme outputs and outcomes, taking into consideration timing of donor funds and possible variance in achievements.”⁴⁵

UNODC is working on the basis of log-frames and results based management, tools that have been developed over time to monitor and measure results at the country level. They serve certain purposes particularly programme management and donor reporting. In some field offices (e.g. Bangkok and Panama) a dedicated function has been integrated into the regional or country programme, and according to interviews, these functions have been key in ensuring uniformity across programmes. They have also served to help Offices shift direction when necessary. However, as noted by several interviewees (although not mentioned in audit reports), these tools are much more difficult to apply to complex cross-border, inter- and intra-regional programming of the type that UNODC is shifting towards. While several recommendations have been put forward in different OIOS reports regarding monitoring of progress against outcomes,⁴⁶ these have been largely aimed at national/ country activities. In this regard, certain consideration needs to be afforded to the fact that developing and monitoring impact indicators for cross-border, inter- and intra-regional programming purposes will require more effort, creativity and sophistication on the part of UNODC on the one hand (including through a strengthened strategic planning, research and analysis capacity), and increased investment of resources by donors and member states on the other. UNODC and its donors could make a significant contribution to on-going debates on cross-border monitoring and evaluation by investing resources in examining how results can be better measured and monitored in this field, also in the context of a UN system wide effort in this field.

Sustainability

To what extent does the corporate fund-raising strategy ensure the sustainability of the Integrated Programming approach, i.e. Thematic and Regional Programmes?

As noted continuously over the past decade, UNODC is seriously hampered by its funding modalities. Extra budgetary or voluntary funds earmarked for specific projects continue make up the bulk of the UNODC budget (more than 90 percent). A review by the UN Joint Inspection Unit conducted in 2010 recommended that the UN General Assembly ensure that UNODC’s core functions be financed by regular budget resources, so as to allow it to carry out its mandate in a sustainable manner. However, less than one percent of the UN regular budget is currently allocated to UNODC. Coupled with: i) an overall concern that UNODC lacked a coherent corporate strategy that in itself was driving competition for funds amongst staff; ii) the near collapse of certain field operations; and iii) the explosion of the global financial crisis in the late 2000’s, these financial challenges sent a strong signal that a new approach was required.

It was assumed that the shift to regional programming and integration in general would generate increased financial support from donors who had been calling for both horizontal and vertical integration across UNODC’s normative and operational work. As a first step, a Global Project - GLOU46 – was established

⁴⁵ Internal Report, *Comparative Audit Analysis Report: Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits*

⁴⁶ Ibid - See pp. 7 and 8

to secure flexible “seed funding” from supportive donors for the initial implementation of the IPA. The Integrated Programming and Oversight Branch (IPB) holds responsibility for administering the Project. According to a recent evaluation of the GLOU46 project, the IPA funding envelope began at USD 623,800 in 2008 and grew to USD 9,400,000 in 2012. The overall purpose of the funding was to contribute to the IPA, and regional programme development in particular. In doing so it created some competition regarding the allocation of funds from HQ to the various regions. Notwithstanding, GLOU46 is generally viewed as a viable alternative to strict earmarking of other UNODC sources of funding particularly as a means to jump-start integration at the regional levels and is no panacea to UNODC’s broader funding challenge. According to a recent evaluation of the funding mechanism (phase I of the current process), GLOU46 funding has, however, been effective in securing soft-earmarked funds to enable a quick response and better flexibility during program development. Indeed, as noted in the report, “[a] clear advantage (...) in assisting in the practical application and implementation of the IPA, and the subsequent CPs and RPs, is the concept of ‘soft-earmarked’ funds. This gave the project and programme managers the ability to apportion and place funds in areas where their experience and expertise suggested it would be of greatest benefit.”⁴⁷

Beyond the GLOU46, until recently no specific arrangements were put in place to support the fundraising needs of Regional and Thematic Programmes or IPA-related policy advocacy efforts. Notwithstanding, in April 2012, UNODC adopted its first Fundraising Strategy. The Strategy recognized the challenges that UNODC and that it “operates under a complex set of conditions that has a profound impact on the way its resource mobilisation strategies are shaped:

(a) It is a highly specialized office with a wide regional presence, highly dependent on voluntary resources (more than 90%), with limited core staff to ensure systematic corporate planning, budgeting, programme management and backstopping; and

(b) At the same time, it is entrusted with a broad and multi-faceted mandate to develop, manage, implement and evaluate complex programmes funded from a wide and diverse range of donors.

It further notes that: “[t]he volume of mandated UNODC work [in its core] areas⁴⁸ has grown exponentially over the years, however its core capacity to manage and implement is still based on the traditional Regular Budget (RB) funded core infrastructure, supplemented by Special Purpose (SP) resources and PSC income to cover the increased administrative burden.⁴⁹ This funding model does not recognise the evolution in the UNODC business model comprising cumulative mandates in the different functional areas of normative work, policy support, research and technical assistance. Neither does it take into account the associated cost structure of delivering such a comprehensive range of core activities. In reality, UNODC core funding is leveraged to the extreme through volatile special purpose resources. The current UNODC business model would require critical investments in the basic infrastructure of the organisation to be effective and sustainable.”

The Fundraising Strategy aims to provide a multi-year framework for different layers of funding; an analytical base for developing a roadmap to reach a sustainable balance between core funding and programme funding; and an organizational framework that UNODC can use to ensure policy coherence and effective coordination of the Office’s fundraising function. More specifically, and in relation to the Office’s operational needs, the Strategy proposes a structure that combines different resources - i) core

⁴⁷ For further details, see the Independent Project Evaluation of the GLOU46 project “Support for the Integrated Programming and Oversight Branch to promote multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral cooperation.”

⁴⁸ Promoting and supporting the implementation of the three Drug Conventions, the UNTOC and UNCAC, and the UN standards and norms on criminal justice and crime prevention are the core functions of UNODC. In this context, it is generally accepted that the implementation of these UN Conventions require normative, policy support, research and operational work.

⁴⁹ Reference footnote 24.

infrastructure, in particular General Purpose (GP) funding for Representatives; ii) Special Purpose (SP) project funding for technical assistance; and iii) full direct programme cost recovery. The Strategy also highlights the funding needs of both Regional and Thematic Programmes, noting however that while UNODC is trying to shift towards a system of integrated programming and programmatic accountability, its administrative and financial systems are still project-based. The latter renders analysis and representation of funding needs in accordance with programmatic priorities as represented in the budget and strategic framework “a daunting task.” To this end, the Strategy has proposed “a baseline and a multi-year framework for the Office in respect of its thematic and regional funding strategies for the period 2012-2015.” It proposes that the funding strategies “will be shaped and refined through a process of semi-annual analysis and update of funding requirements and by identifying different sources of funding available through headquarters or local donor contacts.” The prioritization and socialization across the Office of funding needs serve as “the best possible guarantee for an integrated corporate fundraising approach.”

It will be important to ensure that these steps are monitored closely not least because effective implementation might help alleviate some of the pressure felt by Field Representatives and Heads of Thematic Branches to be constantly pitching for funds rather than focusing on implementation, and also help the Office become less donor and more priority-driven, as requested by Member States. UNODC Member States can help ensure more effective implementation of the IPA and help transform the Office into a more dynamic and responsive organization by supporting these efforts and ensuring that UNODC has sufficient resources and enough flexibility to implement the mandates that Member States themselves have accorded to the Office. Already through the IPA the Office has witnessed deeper involvement of member states in the development of programmes and the budgetary process. The development of Regional Programmes, and innovative programmes such as the Counter Piracy programme in East Africa or the establishment of Liaison and Partnership Offices (LPOs) are the result of some of these shifting relations between UNODC, its member states and donors. This engagement should be further strengthened through the implementation of the fundraising strategy.

UNODC can also derive some lessons from other agencies that have sought innovative ways to secure different types of funding (for example, see Table 3 below).

UNESCO's call for extra-budgetary fundraising

Since 2008 - with the issuing of the first “Extrabudgetary Resource Mobilization Strategic Plan”- UNESCO has aimed to increase the amount of resources that are provided in the form of un-earmarked, multi-annual contributions to thematic and country programmes. In 2012 UNESCO issued a report called “UNESCO's thematic programmes and targets for resource mobilization in 2012-2013: complementary additional programme” in which it provides an overview of its overall resource mobilization objectives. These are presented by different themes in order for donors to easily see whether UNESCO's priorities correspond to their own. Through this newly introduced “Complementary Additional Programme” (CAP) UNESCO can better respond to the increased need for extrabudgetary funding, the necessity to deliver against articulated results and the demand from donors to make it easier to find programmes and projects which match with their policies and priorities. Director-General of UNESCO argues that through this UNESCO can better “ensure programmatic coherence and to articulate to our partners and donors where we seek their support.”

The report is structured in five chapters, which outline the following:

- Chapter 1: resource mobilization objectives of each of UNESCO's Programme Sectors, namely Education, Natural Sciences, Social and Human Sciences, Culture, Communication and Information.
- Chapter 2: resource mobilization objectives linked to other interdisciplinary programmes (gender equality and women's rights and empowerment, a culture of peace and nonviolence, UNESCO's responses to post conflict and post – disaster situations, and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics)
- Chapter 3: resource mobilization targets for a initiatives designed to support UNESCO's programme (increasing the coherence and impact of programme delivery in the context of UN reform, improving the

multilingualism of UNESCO's information products, and enhancing outreach and visibility through multi-media communication products and special events, UNESCO's fellowships programme)

- Chapter 4: overview of UNESCO's main partners and donors

- Chapter 5: explains the various ways and means of supporting UNESCO

Case study: UNICEF and thematic funding

Thematic funding was first introduced in 2002 during the period covered by the UNICEF medium-term strategic plan (MTSP) for 2002-2005.

UNICEF established three levels of thematic funding:

Global – Donors determine the Focus Area (theme) and allow UNICEF the flexibility to allocate funds for individual country programmes according to priority needs. Headquarters and Regional Offices can also receive smaller amounts for cross-cutting work, advocacy and programme development in support of country allocations.

Regional – Donors specify both the Region and Focus Area (theme) where the funds can be utilized. The UNICEF Regional Office determines which country programmes within the region that will receive funding. The Regional Office is also eligible for a smaller share of these funds.

Country – Donors stipulate both the Country and Focus Area (theme) where the funds can be utilized. Donors can choose to fund more than one Focus Area or provide thematic funding for the entire country programme and cover all five Focus Areas.

From 2003, when the first thematic funds were received to 2007, UNICEF has taken in USD 604 million for programme focus areas, and USD 774 million in humanitarian thematic funds. A total of 17 Governments and 28 National Committees for UNICEF have provided thematic funding for the five MTSP focus areas and the humanitarian thematic pool. One of the key performance indicators for the MTSP is the proportion of thematic funding in total other resources funding. The target for 2009, 15 per cent, was already reached in 2007.

UNICEF introduced administrative and financial management rules and processes related to thematic funding which represents an important achievement towards a more coherent planning and implementation process.

Thematic funding also facilitates reporting to donors: UNICEF prepares one consolidated report per focus area, which reflects progress made in that focus area over the previous year. The financial section of these reports shows expenditures on the one focus area at the global, regional or country level. The contribution of each donor is mentioned, but not specifically tracked.

Advantages as reported by UNICEF:

- + As regular resources are declining, thematic funding is needed, as a second best option to regular resources.
- + Facilitates programme funding in a more strategic manner, with no earmarking other than to the MTSP focus area UNICEF allocates resources to areas of highest needs, including critically under-funded country programme areas.
- + Secures volume and predictability of funding for UNICEF, while reducing transaction costs and freeing resources:
 - ⇒ No specific proposals are prepared.
 - ⇒ Shared thematic donor reports reduce the burden of preparing individual project reports.
 - ⇒ Simplifies the management of funds since there is only one large fund instead of individual donor funds.
- + Allows for multi-year spending in support of improved planning and sustainability.

Extent of IPA ownership within UNODC

Until the inception of the IPA, integration had not been introduced across the Office in a systematic manner. A series of Reports and Resolutions adopted by UNODC's governing bodies have supported the

implementation of the IPA, and to date, the IPA has provided the Office with a framework within which its areas of expertise can be presented more coherently to member states as well as donors.

Through dedicated functions in Vienna, The Division of Operations (DO) has endeavoured to provide guidance to staff for implementing the integrated programming approach. The fact that most efforts to secure integration have been pushed by the IPB (former IPU) in the DO (rather than a dedicated corporate-wide planning and policy Unit) has led to certain inter-divisional challenges and laid bare the absence of general corporate ownership and oversight of IPA policy implementation.

It is unclear whether a discussion on the expected outcomes of the integration process has informed the development of new strategy design processes. Both the literature and interviews conducted for the purposes of this evaluation report suggest otherwise. In this regard, the next phase in integration might include setting benchmarks and core criteria for assessing the impact of UNODC's greater visibility in international, regional and national policy fora as well as the impact of greater national and regional ownership and so forth.

At the higher policy level, and as evidenced in the number of Resolutions and Reports adopted by UNODC's governing bodies, it is clear that member states have embraced the IPA and that they continue to support Office-wide integration and the establishment of Regional and country Programmes. However, to several donors, the current internal official position vis-à-vis integration remains somewhat unclear, as do the Office's plans for supporting and providing direction for the next phase of the IPA. This poses a significant risk to the sustainability of funding for both the Regional and country Programmes and the Thematic Programmes. Concern has also been raised regarding the lack of clarity about how UNODC is ensuring that global projects, stemming from the thematic programmes, are integrated with the regional and country programmes.

A small group of donors have supported the integration process within UNODC and are also supporting the Office's efforts to attain more visibility and influence on the international policy stage. In general where donors have shown more flexibility, including through soft earmarking, the results have been positive, at least at the process level. Greater sustainability in funding could be achieved if UNODC were to focus additional effort on understanding and assessing impact at the results level.

Extent to which ownership of the approach by regional entities and partner countries has been achieved

In general, UNODC is working very constructively with national and regional entities to promote ownership of its integration policy. In doing so it is also strengthening its work with the broader UN system, particularly at the strategic planning stages. Yet, priorities defined by countries can shift, not least when there is a change of government. In many settings, when a new government is elected, it might want to realign its own policy priorities and will not necessarily buy in to what the previous government agreed with international actors. In addition, priorities identified by governments do not always represent the needs of citizens. Indeed, at present, within UNODC, seeking national and/or regional ownership appears to mainly translate into working with governments rather than promoting a broader and more representative constituency base. This is largely understandable since not the Office, like many development agencies and funds, is largely (or fully) dependent on government buy-in and resources. Nonetheless, UNODC should be able to reach out to a broader base of stakeholders, while maintaining a degree of flexibility in its planning frameworks.

Better articulation of IPA goals is also needed, particularly given the shifting global context within which UNODC is working. The current IPA, largely articulated through the Regional Programmes, captured some of the internal and external realities UNODC was facing in 2008. Certain shifts have occurred since then, including the desire of an increasing number of middle-income countries to establish different kinds

of relations with its international partners at the country level, and not necessarily through a regional programming framework.

For example, some middle income countries are articulating a desire to move away from traditional technical cooperation frameworks into more structured, strategic partnership arrangements and are taking on greater leadership in terms of setting goals and priorities, and funding UNODC operations. This requires a new form of relationship with national governments and/or regional partners. Institutional capacity is also different in these settings and therefore might require a different form of integrated effort on the part of UNODC.

UNODC is adapting its modus operandi to this reality through the establishment of Liaison and Partnership Offices (LPOs) in countries such as Brazil and Mexico (underway). LPOs can serve to bridge policy direction and technical capacities provided by Vienna and the needs of counterparts on the ground. Over time, UNODC will also find itself compelled to invest in strengthening and maintaining its comparative advantage in its core areas so it can continue to provide these countries with the necessary expertise when requested. The latter will require continued integration between the Thematic Programmes and FOs.

At the same time, UNODC also operates in low income/low institutional settings, often times in post-conflict and volatile countries and regions. In these settings, the current IPA has been welcomed by member states, host governments and donors, not least because many of these regions and countries continue to be more dependent on external support for meeting the challenges posed by organized crime, illicit trafficking, and drug use. The IPA appears to provide an effective platform for that support and for anchoring ownership. Conversely, it remains unclear how other national stakeholders (i.e. non-governmental actors) are integrated into any of these processes.

III. CONCLUSIONS

To date, much progress has been achieved in the implementation of the IPA, not least in terms of establishing several Regional and Thematic Programmes,⁵⁰ and presenting Member States with a more coherent overview of what the UNODC can offer in terms of policy support and technical assistance. This shift has been acknowledged through an increase in funding to Regional and Thematic Programmes and the soft earmarking of funds (through the GLOU46 funding mechanism) to kick-start some of the Regional and Country Programmes.

As noted above, the IPA has led to a more effective alignment of functions at Headquarters, which in turn has led to more coherence at the field level and to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions, particularly through the establishment of seven Regional Programmes (three more are currently being developed) and six Thematic Programmes. The IPA has presented Member States and donors with a more coherent overview of what the UNODC can offer in terms of policy support and technical assistance. It has also opened up the possibility of engaging with regional entities and partner countries on a more strategic basis, and has allowed the Office to engage more strategically in international policy debates.

The evaluations of the Regional Programmes will provide a more in-depth assessment of how the IPA goals are being met in practice; however, it is evident through this evaluation that some structural weaknesses remain and that these impact on UNODC's integration efforts. These include many of the challenges already mentioned in the 2010 JIU Review Report, and also hinge on ownership, implementation and oversight of policy and planning; integration of DPA functions across Divisions and Programmes; knowledge management systems; a weak funding base; and limited capacity and tools to effectively monitor and assess impact of the different IPA goals. Failure to address these problems will prevent the Office from building on its comparative advantages to provide more integrated and effective support to Member States, and serving as an authoritative voice in international policy debates.

50

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

General recommendations (that cut across all evaluation criteria)

(a) Along the lines of the 2012 UNODC Internal Report - Comparative Audit Analysis Report - Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits, UNODC senior management should initiate a process on the basis of this evaluation report, the evaluation of the first batch of Regional Programmes, and other relevant audits and evaluations, to discuss the findings with Field Representatives, relevant DO, DTA, DPA staff and the Governing Bodies. This process should lead to:

(b) The confirmation or revision of the existing IPA, with full endorsement by the Executive Director and the relevant UNODC governing bodies, accompanied by clear high-level directives for the organization-wide adherence to the IPA.

(c) Determination of clear roles and responsibilities for implementation, oversight and responsibility of the IPA, and the provision of clear guidance related to its implementation. If UNODC is serious about integration, it should take more steps to lay out the vision, objectives and principles of the broader IPA (or a revised integration policy) in one single corporate-wide internal policy document, accompanied with related benchmarks; and coherent and consistent implementation standards and modalities for both headquarters and field operations so the latter could be used as a basis upon which the policy could be reviewed on an annual or bi-annual basis.

In this regard, and in the absence of a dedicated corporate wide Policy and Planning Unit, UNODC should seriously explore the possibility of strengthening its HQ policy function by establishing a dedicated Unit, that sits between the EOD and the Divisions (and not in one of the Divisions) which could fulfil this role. The Unit could be created by drawing relevant staff from the Programme Support and Oversight Unit in DO, the Strategic Planning Unit in DPA, and from DTA, thus ensuring an interdivisional approach. In addition to core policy functions (including trickling up lessons, experiences and evidence from the field to inform policy in UNODC and the broader UN and international system), the Unit would be responsible for developing clear internal procedures and guidelines for development and implementation of programmes, and enhancing communication and coordination between units in the different divisions and the field.

(d) Build on and refine the UNODC recently adopted Fundraising Strategy to promote a systematic effort in mobilizing donor resources in support of corporate-wide integration. In this regard, those Member States who wish to support the IPA in all its dimensions, should also consider alignment of their funding policies.

(e) Clarification of which IPA-related processes have been superseded or replaced by others and inform staff accordingly.

(f) Guarantees from senior management that effective IT, administrative and financial systems and support mechanisms are provided in a timely manner to support implementation of the IPA, particularly at the field level. This will include reviewing recommendations already put forth in different

audits, evaluations and internal reports,⁵¹ reviewing the operating procedures of the Inter-Divisional Task Teams and clarifying the role of the latter once the Programme Development and Review Process is approved; and putting in place effective and efficient knowledge management systems.

(g) Along the lines of the 2012 UNODC Internal Report - Comparative Audit Analysis Report - Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits, identify the core obstacles and risk factors that might impede the effective and efficient implementation of the IPA; and develop a plan identifying timelines and roles and responsibilities for overcoming these obstacles and working around the risk factors.

(h) Given that the latter will also depend on renewed member state commitment to supporting an invigorated integration policy, UNODC's open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of UNODC (FinGov) should be fully engaged. As noted above, Member States who wish to support UNODC integration efforts (including via the IPA) should realign their funding policies accordingly.

Design and Impact

(a) UNODC senior management should determine how more effective and deeper integration of programmatic, thematic, research and analytical work can be achieved both at the policy and operational levels as a means to avoid fragmentation of efforts and make more effective and efficient use of in-house expertise and resources. While not all areas of UNODC's work need to be integrated (some of the Global Projects stemming from the Thematic Programmes are very specialized and have specific targets that may not necessarily lend to integration), defining exactly what should be integrated through the development of a strategic matrix that includes all headquarters and field operational activities, could help clarify which activities are operational and which are normative and clarify where overlaps exist between the normative and the operational activities (TPs and RPs), enable prioritization, and by extension, help strengthen the Offices' comparative advantage, particularly in those areas where the rest of the system lacks capacity and expertise.

(b) UNODC should ensure that from the outset, UNODC's research and analytical expertise is an integrated part of programme development and a human resource strategy that responds to these types of needs.

(c) As part of an invigorated integration strategy, the Office needs to place stronger emphasis on determining how to better monitor and assess the impact of the IPA at its different levels of implementation (policy/normative and operational) including through the development of 'usable' and realistic impact indicators. This will require a coherent and consistent decision on how UNODC sees its programmes – whether as operational tools, or as guiding frameworks for operations. The 2012 UNODC Internal Report - Comparative Audit Analysis Report - Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits as well as the foreseen evaluations of the Regional Programmes can help shed light on the range of current mechanisms and tools currently being used to assess impact, and make further recommendations in light of the on-going internal discussions on results-based management and budgeting.

⁵¹ For example the relevant recommendations captured in the UNODC Internal Report *Comparative Audit Analysis Report: Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits*

Partnerships, Cooperation, Relevance

(a) UNODC should continue to increase its relevance at the upstream policy level by playing a more visible role in policy research and advocacy at the global and regional levels. In this regard, UNODC could engage more strategically with academia, think-tanks and independent experts to engage in, and disseminate the findings of independent, applied research and engage UNODC's field offices and regional and national research partners in these processes. Such efforts can also feed into important processes such as those aimed at influencing the post-2015 development agenda.

(b) In light of the findings of the evaluations of the Regional Programmes, DO and DPA (or a new dedicated Unit as proposed in Recommendation # 1 above) should develop mechanisms to determine the impact of enhanced cooperation with/ and integration of UNODC's work within the UN system and broader international community, particularly in terms of helping meet the broader rule of law, peace, security and development goals at the country, regional and global levels. The evaluation of the Regional Programmes could provide initial insights into this process. UNODC could also use its position in the UN Task Force on Organized Crime and drug trafficking to also engage other UN bodies such as DPA, DPKO, UNDP and the World Bank in these processes.

(c) UNODC needs to develop mechanisms to address the requests of some upper middle-income countries to enter into a more strategic partnership (e.g. the establishment of i.e. Liaison and Partnership offices). UNODC should use this evaluation process to determine how it can best support DO, field offices and host countries to analyze these developments, and use the findings to influence broader international policy processes, particularly those related to the post-2015 development agenda.

(d) A core issue to determine in the next phase of the IPA regarding effectiveness (as well as efficiency), is how the Regional and Country Programmes are integrated with other UN system-wide processes including One UN, Delivering as One, the Integrated Mission Planning Policy (IMPP) for peacekeeping and provide an initial assessment of the results of more effective coordination.

(e) The foreseen evaluations of the Regional Programmes should focus on assessing the results of better integration with the UN Country and UNDG Regional Teams and the impact that the inclusion of UNODC mandated areas in UNDAFs, Integrated Strategic Frameworks (ISFs) and other strategic planning frameworks applied in different contexts are having. In addition, given the fact that UN (and other) Political Missions are increasingly taking into account transnational phenomena in their areas of operation, the Regional Programme evaluations could also shed light on how UNODC is integrating its work with these operations, and provide an initial assessment of the perceived impact of this integration.

(f) The evaluations of the Regional Programmes should help shed light on whether the IPA has helped UNODC enhance relationships with civil society actors and ensure their voices are represented in the identification of priorities and in the design of Regional Programmes.

(g) Beyond the undertaking of TOCTAs, UNODC can help provide much needed research and insights on the impact of organized crime and illicit trafficking on rule of law and development and help the Office to develop better baselines upon which to measure impact and results which can be shared with the broader UN system (for example through the UN Task Force on Transnational Organized Crime and Trafficking). It could also provide analysis support to Field Representatives on challenges to implementing cross-border initiatives, building on experiences such as the West Africa Coastal Initiative (WACI).

Efficiency

(a) As already noted in the GLOU46 Evaluation, “systems should be made to fit the strategy and not make the strategy fit the systems. If integrated programming is a priority of the Office, then proper investment must be made in appropriate programme (not project) control, monitoring and evaluation systems.

(b) As a means to support UNODC integration efforts, member states and donors need to support the establishment of more effective and efficient knowledge management systems and improve processes of information exchange, including through the developing of the intranet and the Office directory. This could also help ensure that regional and field offices are aware of, and can link up to activities managed from Headquarters that are relevant to their own operation. Internally, management should revisit recommendations already made regarding strengthening internal knowledge management and determine which can be acted on in short, medium and long-term.

(c) UNODC’s IT Service should investigate the possibility of developing an internal directory based on UNIDO’s model, which includes a search function.

(d) UNODC should strengthen the IEU (or the Unit recommended in point 1 above) to enable it to analyze the outcome of audits, evaluations, internal reporting and establish a systematic system to collect lessons and experiences and good/ innovative practice related to programme implementation.

Effectiveness

(a) In addition to what is laid out in Point 1 above, the evaluations of the Regional Programmes should be used to identify why in some cases, the Regional Programmes have not been able to meet the specified goals of the IPA. The findings of these evaluations can help determine whether a different course of action is required, including higher-level political dialogue, whether an injection of resources is required to get the programme back on track, or whether the Programme should be terminated.

(b) To prevent competition among its operational vehicles (Global Projects, Regional and Country Programmes), UNODC should look into providing better incentives for [internal] integration. An effective staff development and rotation policy could help overcome these challenges.

Sustainability

(a) The Organization has seen more involvement of member states in the development of programmes and the budgetary process. The development of some of the regional programmes, and innovative thematic programmes such as the Counter Piracy programme in East Africa are the result of some of these shifting relations between UNODC, its member states and donors. This engagement should be further strengthened through the implementation of the Organization’s first fundraising strategy adopted in April 2012, and the corresponding realignment of donor funding policies where necessary. At the same time, the Strategy remains somewhat broad and should be revised to ensure a clear “roadmap” on how to mobilize funds for the sustainability of Regional Programmes and other field operations.

(b) As a means to anchor donor support (via partner countries, traditional and new donors) and demonstrate added value and comparative advantage, UNODC should focus additional effort on understanding, assessing and reporting on the impact of the IPA.

(c) The evaluations of the Regional Programmes can help determine how the IPA has helped enhance national ownership (through consultation with governmental and non-governmental actors, Core Learning Partners, UN partners etc.), which mechanisms have been put in place to ensure mutual responsibility and accountability for results and of equal, if not more importance, what the overall impact attainment of these goals has had on meeting i) the overall programme goals and ii) the Organization's strategic priorities.

(d) Awareness-raising of the IPA vis-à-vis internal and external partners would also be beneficial for its coherent and effective implementation.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE

In-Depth Evaluation of the Integrated Programming Approach

Project no. & title:	Multiple programmes
Evaluation start date:	June 2012
Evaluation end date:	October 2012
Evaluation team:	One international consultant and one member of IEU
Evaluation duration:	8 weeks, including two weeks in Vienna

Background and context

Rationale

In 2010, the Joint Inspection Unit undertook the Review of management and administration in the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

Inspectors noted that “the ongoing thematic and regional programming is an attempt to reconcile numerous fragmented and sporadic projects into a more strategic and consolidated set of programmes.” However, they identified the following problematic aspects:

(a) UNODC has to better manage the transition and the phasing out of existing projects into programming;

(b) UNODC has to manage the coexistence in its portfolio of programmes and national projects developed according to local situations;

(c) UNODC needs to adjust current managing and reporting corporate tools to meet the full requirements for financial and administrative support of more comprehensive programmes (such as reporting, tracking down information, monitoring pledges, expenditures, etc.);

(d) UNODC has to reconcile the alignment of various programming layers that are not developed, drafted and endorsed at the same time.’

There are many benefits expected from the thematic and programmatic approach: (a) the enhanced dialogue with Member States therefore increasing ownership via the involvement of regional actors at the drafting stage and their participation in the steering committees at the implementation stage; (b) the potential for resource mobilization and softer earmarking done at the programme level rather than at single projects; (c) the increased administrative effectiveness by dealing with a number of management

activities at the programme level, and (d) the creation of a reinforced oversight framework in which headquarters and field offices would contribute to increased accountability.’’

The Inspectors concluded that ‘‘strategic planning at UNODC represents a challenge given the context characterized by the unpredictability of resources mainly due to earmarking’’. They stressed that strategic planning should be based on ‘‘long-term vision and prioritization of actions to reach targeted outcomes. This is of primary importance for an organization like UNODC to avoid donor-driven programmes and activities’’.

Based on the above, the Inspectors recommended (recommendation #9) a thorough independent evaluation of thematic and regional programming implementation to be conducted and be presented to the governing bodies.

Recommendation 9

The Executive Director should present an independent evaluation of thematic and regional programming and report on its implementation status, impact and lessons learned to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice by the end of 2013.⁵²

In light of the above, the evaluation of the Integrated Programming is a response to the Joint Inspection Unit report.

This evaluation will build on the Joint Inspection Unit report and the evaluation of the GLOU46 project (‘‘Support for the Integrated Programming Unit to promote multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral technical cooperation’’), with the objective to complement these reports with further guidance and recommendations.

The evaluation fits into a three-leg approach which unfolds as follows:

(a) Leg 1: The evaluation of the GLOU46 project (‘‘Support for the Integrated Programming Unit to promote multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral technical cooperation’’)

(b) Leg 2: The evaluation of the Integrated Programming Approach

(c) Leg 3: The evaluation of the Regional Programmes (the first one to be evaluated will be the Regional Programme for East Asia and the Pacific)

The above evaluation process should be considered as a ‘‘continuum’’ ensuring the link between theory and practice. Indeed, the first two legs (HQ based evaluations) will provide the conceptual basis for the subsequent evaluations of the Regional Programmes in the field.

The evaluation of the Regional Programme for East Asia and the Pacific is planned to take place in September 2012. All the other Regional Programmes will be evaluated in the following years (2013-14).

Background Information

⁵² Review of Management and Administration in the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Joint Inspection Unit, JIU/REP/2010/10, recommendation # 9

Project Number and Title	Multiple programmes
Approved duration	2008-2011
Location	Multiple locations
Strategic Theme, Result Area, Result*	n/a
Executing Agency/ Office	UNODC/IPB, UNODC/FO

Context

Since 2008, UNODC has pursued the adoption of an "integrated programming approach", in accordance with the UNDG strategic priorities (2010-11)⁵³ which call for a shift from project implementation to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions. This initiative was in line with the principles outlined in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008) designed to promote partner countries' ownership, to align with national policies and priorities and to effectively coordinate with other donors and development agencies to encourage maximum efficiency, efficacy and results.

The objectives of the approach as identified in 2011 are as follows:

- (a) "Enhance cooperation with UN partners, multilateral bodies and civil society by mainstreaming UNODC mandates in an increasingly integrated global agenda (i.e. development, rule of law, security and human rights);
- (b) Promote regional entities and partner countries' "ownership", mutual responsibility and accountability for results;
- (c) Maximize UNODC comparative advantages in upstream policy and normative support, and in promoting strategic cross-border initiatives;
- (d) Promote an integrated approach among Member States in addressing organized crime and illicit trafficking (e.g. human beings, arms, drugs, firearms, natural resources and money) and corruption;
- (e) Align with UNDG strategic priorities calling for a shift from project implementation to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions⁵⁴.

The approach is based on the development of two key instruments – Thematic Programmes and Regional Programmes – which together cover the broad range of UNODC mandates and activities, both substantively and geographically. As strategic planning tools, the Thematic and Regional Programmes are meant to be closely interlinked to support the provision of UNODC's expertise to meet global, regional and national needs.

Thematic Programmes

⁵³ UNDG Strategic Priorities for 2010-2011, United Nations Development Group

⁵⁴ Note on UNODC Strategic Alignment (prepared by Strategic Planning Unit and Programme Support & Oversight Unit, 16 November 2011)

Thematic Programmes (TP) are developed by the Thematic Branches at HQ, in close consultation with field-based experts, in the following areas: i) Transnational organized crime and trafficking; ii) Corruption; iii) Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice; iv) Health and livelihoods (drugs and HIV); v) Terrorism prevention; and vi) Research and trend analysis. They provide the mandates, normative framework, guiding principles and tools for the delivery of technical cooperation, including the implementation of HQ-based global projects/programmes.

Regional Programmes

In the past three years, UNODC has developed Regional Programmes (RP) in several regions: i) East Asia and Pacific; ii) Eastern Africa; iii) Central America/Caribbean; iv) South Eastern Europe; v) West Africa; vi) Arab States; and vii) Afghanistan and neighboring countries. Additional RPs will be launched in Southern Africa and South Asia in 2012-13.

The above effort is enabling the Office to adopt a more integrated and upstream programme, aligned with the priorities of partner countries and regional organizations.

The RPs promote strategic regional initiatives by facilitating cross-border cooperation and dialogue, providing access to information and data about regional/global issues and trends, facilitating access to technical expertise and supporting the implementation of the UN Conventions on drugs and crime (UNTOC and UNCAC) and the UN standard and norms on criminal justice and crime prevention. They also contribute to build-up the political will of regional institutions and partner countries to put effective regional mechanisms in place.

The RPs are designed to address the main drug and crime challenges of the concerned regions, and are developed through a consultative process (i.e. experts and Ministerial meetings), in which regional/national “ownership” is the guiding principle. The RPs also facilitate UNODCs effective collaboration with the undg Regional teams, UN Country Teams and related UNDAFs, thus improving the opportunities for joint programming between UNODC and the UN system.

Organizational realignment

In order to support the above approach, the Office undertook, in the past few years, an internal "realignment" to rationalize its fragmented structure by grouping its expertise in five thematic Branches (i.e. TOC, Corruption, Justice, Health and Terrorism), combining normative and operational functions in support of field operations, and creating the Integrated Programming Branch. The realignment was intended to enable the Office to acquire a truly integrated regional and thematic perspective, and achieve benefits in terms of improved policy, strategy, programmatic work, mobilization of resources, and partnerships with all relevant stakeholders.

Purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation of the Integrated Programming Approach is summative and formative.

The purpose of this evaluation is to review the principles and main strategic criteria that have inspired UNODC's organizational and operational changes, and, following the GLOU46 project evaluation, to

assess if the Office current arrangements, modalities and tools can effectively and consistently support the integrated programming approach and provide recommendations in this regard.

This evaluation will examine how UNODC ensures the effective implementation of the RPs and TPs and their long-term sustainability. The issue of sustainability is also related to the need for a more unified system of fund allocation, monitoring and reporting, oversight, accountability and evaluation.

The evaluation will:

(a) Assess to what extent the Integrated Programming approach is perceived to have improved the performance of UNODC and enabled better coordination and how improved performance and coordination are being measured/ assessed;

(b) Assess to what extent the Integrated Programming approach has enabled the Organization to make informed decisions as to its future strategic orientation and its future programming exercises;

(c) Assess to what extent the Integrated Programming approach has enabled a close linkage between the Thematic and Regional Programmes;

(d) Identify current good practice arrangements, modalities and tools which support the integrated programming approach;

(e) Provide recommendations on how to improve the quality of Thematic and Regional Programmes, in the context of the Integrated Programming Approach;

(f) Serve as a basis for UNODC forthcoming regional programme evaluations.

The findings of the evaluation are planned to be presented at the meeting of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, in Spring 2013.

Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the introduction of the integrated programming approach within UNODC since its inception in August 2008 up-to the beginning of 2012.

The goal of the three-leg evaluation process is to assess (i) the congruence between the initial policy intent of the integrated programming approach and how it is being operationalized in practice and (ii) how the interplay between Thematic and Regional Programmes is being translated in practice.

Evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions

With the support of the Chief of the Programme Support and Oversight Unit (PSOU), and in coordination with the Chiefs of the Regional Desks/IPB and the Chief, IEU, the evaluation team will be guided by the below evaluation criteria and questions:

Relevance

(a) To what extent was the Integrated Programming Approach able to operationalize UNODC goals and priorities, in particular the UNODC Medium Term Strategy (2008 -2011)?

(b) To what extent are UNODC strategic planning tools (Medium-Term Strategy 2012-15, Strategic frameworks 2012-13 and 2014-15, Thematic Programmes and Regional Programmes) aligned?

(c) What are UNODC's comparative advantages?

(d) To what extent does the Approach maximize UNODC comparative advantages in upstream policy and normative support, and in promoting strategic cross-border initiatives?

(e) To what extent were the organizational and operational changes introduced by the Integrated Programming Approach, in line with UNODC stakeholders' needs and priorities?

(f) To what extent were the thematic and regional programmes, the two key instruments of the Integrated Programming Approach, in line with UNODC stakeholders' needs and priorities?

(g) To what extent does UNODC planning is based on evidence?

(h) To what extent is the Approach in line with UN policies at large, UNDG priorities, UN Deliver as One etc.?

(i) To what extent is the Approach in line with UNDG strategic priorities calling for a shift from project implementation to more policy, sector and programmatic interventions?

(j) To what extent is the Approach in line with relevant Audit/OIOS/Evaluations' recommendations on UNODC strategic framework?

Design

(a) To what extent is UNODC programme development and approval affect programme quality?

(b) To what extent are the Thematic and Regional Programmes evaluable?

(c) Does the design of the Thematic and Regional Programmes lend itself to results-orientation?

(d) To what extent can UNODC report against planned programme objectives?

(e) What are the interlinkages between the Thematic and the Regional Programmes in terms of planning and design?

(f) Which strengths or weaknesses do the current design practices of the RP and TP show?

(g) How are Country Programmes linked to the design of RPs and TPs?

Efficiency

(a) Does UNODC organizational realignment result in an improved integrated planning along thematic and regional lines, by reducing duplication, overlapping and internal competition for donor resources?

(b) To what extent was the driving role of IPB efficient in support of the integrated programme approach?

(c) To what extent is the role of the support services (i.e. finance, personnel, IT) in implementing the programme approach efficient?

(d) To what extent is the role of inter-divisional regional task-teams efficient in terms of strategic planning and programming?

(e) To what extent are the Thematic Branches efficiently involved in addressing the regions' needs and priorities?

(f) How efficient are the reporting mechanisms related to the Thematic and Regional Programmes?

Effectiveness

(a) Were the planned objectives and outcomes achieved?

(b) Were objectives and outcomes achieved beyond the planned design?

(c) Which good practices related to effectiveness have been gathered?

Partnerships

(a) To what extent has the Integrated Programming Approach enhanced cooperation with Regional entities, Member States, UN partners, multilateral bodies and civil society?

(b) Did the Approach contribute to mainstream UNODC mandates in an increasingly integrated global agenda (i.e. development, rule of law, security and human rights)?

(c) Are UNODC partnerships related to the regional and thematic programmes efficient and effective?

(d) On what basis have partnerships been selected and how have they been nurtured?

Internal cohesion

(a) To what extent are UNODC's work practices coherent and integrated?

(b) To what extent are relevant sections/units of UNODC aligned and equipped to support Integrated Programming?

(c) To what extent are the Thematic and Regional Programme integrated? Are they reinforcing each other in a coherent and cohesive manner?

(d) How do the Regional Programmes relate to the Country programmes/initiatives in a coherent and integrated manner?

(e) To what extent has the approach promoted mutual responsibility and accountability for results?

(f) How is internal cohesion monitored and documented?

External cohesion

(a) To what extent were Member States and donors involved in the development of the Integrated Programming approach?

(b) To what extent did the approach promote cooperation among Member States in addressing organized crime and illicit trafficking (e.g. human beings, arms, drugs, firearms, natural resources and money) and corruption?

(c) During what stages of programme planning and implementation was external cohesion pursued and how?

(d) How is external cohesion monitored and documented?

Sustainability

- (a) To what extent does the corporate fund-raising strategy ensure the sustainability of the Integrated Programming approach, i.e. Thematic and Regional Programmes?
- (b) To what extent is there ownership of the approach within UNODC?
- (c) To what extent is there ownership of the approach by regional entities and partner countries?
- (d) How has sustainability been defined through the Integrated Programming approach?

Impact

- (a) Has the approach contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term benefits for UNODC and Member States?
- (b) Has the approach led to increased organizational funding sustainability?
- (c) Which means and instruments have been designed and/or implemented to answer the question of “impact”?

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation approach is a participatory one formalized through (i) the active participation of Field Representatives and (ii) the Core Learning Partners (CLP)⁵⁵. CLP are key stakeholders of the subject evaluated who have an interest in the evaluation. Core Learning Partners (CLP) will be selected by the project managers in consultation with IEU. Members of the CLP will be selected from key stakeholder groups, including UNODC management, beneficiaries, partner organizations and Member States. The CLP will be asked to comment on key steps of the evaluation, such as the evaluation Terms of Reference and the draft evaluation report. They act as facilitators with respect to the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up actions. The evaluation team will involve the Core Learning Partners as per UNODC guidelines.

The methodology for the evaluation of the Integrated Programming Approach includes:

- (a) Desk review⁵⁶ of relevant documents related to the inception of the Integrated Programming approach and deliverables thereof and other material to be provided by PSOU, in order to provide the evaluation team with an overview of the project and results achieved to date. The desk review will entail detailed examination of key documents such as: guidance notes, programme documents, including revisions, programme progress reports, policy papers, governing bodies’ resolutions and other relevant documents produced. The evaluation will examine, at the desk-review level, all Thematic Programmes and Regional Programmes (Information stemming from secondary sources will be cross-checked and triangulated through data retrieved from primary research methods.

Primary sources of data include, among others:

⁵⁵ Please see the list of Core Learning Partners in Annex.

⁵⁶ Please see the preliminary list of documents to be consulted in Annex.

- (i) Qualitative methods: Structured and semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, key informants or representatives of different interested entities (face-to-face, by telephone or by webcam);
- (ii) Quantitative methods: The use of survey questionnaires.

Secondary sources for the desk review will include, among others:

- (i) The programme documents and revisions;
- (ii) The Evaluation of GLOU46;
- (iii) The TOR of the OIOS Programme Evaluation of UNODC;
- (iv) Monitoring data;
- (v) Baselines;
- (vi) Annual and activity reports;
- (vii) Brochures and other supplementary documents;
- (viii) TOR of the RP evaluation of East Asia and the Pacific;
- (ix) Documents from other UN agencies on integrated programming.

(b) Inception Report: The Lead Evaluator will present a summarized methodology (evaluation matrix) in an inception report which will specify the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards.

(c) Guiding questions to Field Representatives on how the Integrated Programming Approach is being adopted in the Field. Questions will be distributed to Field Representatives in advance of the interviews in order for them to prepare. Written responses, which will remain confidential, will be at the discretion of the Field Representatives.

(d) Telephone interviews with Field Representatives. The Evaluation Team will interview the Field Representatives and may build on the written responses received beforehand.

(e) Briefing and stakeholder interviews with key IPB and DO staff, IEU and staff of other branches/sections at UNODC HQs, selected Member States, telephone interviews with UNODC FO staff as required.

(f) Feedback on preliminary findings and recommendations following the preparation of a first draft of the evaluation report, the key findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented to the UNODC management for their comments and feedback at the annual Field Representatives meeting, to be held on 2-6 July 2012, in Vienna. Then, preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented to Member States for their feedback at FinGov.

In conducting the evaluation, the evaluation team needs to take into account UNODC's Evaluation Policy including the Guiding principles for evaluation in the UNODC⁵⁷. UNODC's evaluation report guidelines Standard format and guidelines of the UNODC for Evaluation Reports⁵⁸. UNODC Guidelines for

⁵⁷ http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Guidelines/Final_Evaluation_Policy.pdf

⁵⁸ http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/IEUwebsite/1_Guidelines_for_Evaluation_Reports_rev_2.pdf

Inception Reports⁵⁹ as well as the United Nations Evaluation Group’s Standards for Evaluation in the UN System and Norms for Evaluation in the UN system⁶⁰.

After completion of the evaluation, the evaluation team must fill in the Evaluation Assessment Questionnaire⁶¹ and submit it to the IEU.

Timeframe and deliverables

(a) The Lead Evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables, as specified below:

(b) Inception Report: summarizing the review of documentation (“desk review”) and briefings. It specifies the evaluation methodology determining thereby the exact focus and scope of the exercise, including the evaluation questions, the sampling strategy and the data collection instruments. It therefore contains a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools.

(c) Debriefing session and presentation to the Chief, PSOU and other key IPB/DO staff, and IEU, in order for UNODC colleagues to provide comments and inputs to the preliminary findings that will form the basis of the draft report to be produced by the evaluation team.

(d) Draft Evaluation Report: Home-based task to be performed by the evaluation team, where findings and results are analyzed, consolidated and reported, in line with UNODC evaluation policy and guidelines. The evaluation team, assisted by IEU, will circulate the draft report to the relevant stakeholders for further comments and feedback.

(e) Presentation of preliminary evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations to CLP and other key stakeholders: the lead evaluator will present and facilitate a discussion at the annual Field Representatives meeting to be held on 2 July 2012, in Vienna. The lead evaluator will also present preliminary findings to Member States at FinGov.

(f) Final Evaluation Report: Based on the inputs received from stakeholders, the evaluation team incorporates comments and completes the analysis, recommendations and report, including an annex with a management response.

The evaluation report of the GLOU46 project (“Support for the Integrated Programming Unit to promote multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral technical cooperation”) will be distributed jointly with the present evaluation. It will be attached as an annex to the evaluation report of the Integrated Programming Approach.

Indicative Timeframe for the Evaluation Process:

The evaluation is scheduled to take place between June and July 2012. The proposed duration of the evaluation will be 6/7 weeks (including two weeks in Vienna).

	<i>Main duties</i>	<i>Evaluation Consultant</i>	<i>Member of IEU</i>	<i>Quality Assurance</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Deliverables</i>
--	--------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	---------------------

⁵⁹ http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/IEUwebsite/Guidelines_for_Inception_Report.pdf

⁶⁰ http://www.unevaluation.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4

⁶¹ <http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Annex%20VI%20assessment%20questionnaire.doc>

		<i>(Lead)</i>		<i>Expert</i>		
Preparatory Stage	Desk review	5			Home-based	Inception report, containing refined workplan, methodology and evaluation tools
	Development of evaluation methodology and tools	2			Home-based	
	Briefing by UNODC programme staff and IEU	1			Vienna, Austria	
	Interviews with Core Learning Partners and other key stakeholders	2			Vienna, Austria	
	Preparation of the inception report	3			Vienna, Austria	
Implementation Stage	Piloting and adjustment of evaluation tools	1			Vienna, Austria, and Home-based	Draft evaluation report
	Data collection: Application of quantitative and qualitative evaluation tools, including interviews with Core Learning Partners and other key stakeholders, survey etc.	7			Vienna, Austria	
	Data analysis and triangulation	7			Home-based	
	Preparation of the draft evaluation report	7		5	Home-based	
Finalization Stage	Consideration of comments provided by the programme team and IEU	5			Home-based	Final evaluation report, including management response; Presentation of evaluation findings
	Circulation of draft report to CLP for comments	0			Home-based	
	Presentation of preliminary findings at the Field Representatives Seminar to be held on 2 July 2012	1			Vienna, Austria	
	Consideration of comments and preparation of the final evaluation report	5			Home-based	
	<i>Total Working Days</i>	<i>46</i>		<i>5</i>		

Evaluation team composition and qualifications

The evaluation team is comprised of:

1. A Lead Evaluator, whose roles and responsibilities are as follows:
 - (a) Lead and coordinate the evaluation process and oversee the tasks of the evaluation team;
 - (b) Carry out the desk review;
 - (c) Draft the inception report and finalise the evaluation methodology incorporating relevant comments;
 - (d) Implement data collection tools and analyse data;

- (e) Triangulate data and test rival explanations;
- (f) Ensure that all aspects of the terms of reference are fulfilled;
- (g) Draft an evaluation report in line with the UNODC evaluation policy;
- (h) Finalise the evaluation report on the basis of comments received;
- (i) Include a management response in the final report;
- (j) Present the preliminary findings and recommendations of the evaluation as required.

2. A member of the Independent Evaluation Unit, whose roles and responsibilities are as follows:

- (a) Assist the Lead Evaluator in all stages of the evaluation process;
- (b) Participate in developing the evaluation methodology and implement data collection tools;
- (c) Analyse the data collected;
- (d) Provide quality assurance throughout the evaluation process;
- (e) Comment on all deliverables of the evaluation;
- (f) Ensure that the evaluation is disseminated according to IEU guidelines;
- (g) Ensure that the evaluation findings are shared simultaneously with management and external stakeholders as per the respective resolution and IEU guidelines;
- (h) Ensure that recommendations are followed by an action plan, which will detail how and when recommendations will be implemented.

3. A quality assurance expert, whose roles and responsibilities are as follows:

- (a) Create synergies and complementarity with the GLOU46 evaluation;
- (b) Provide concrete guidance and comments on the draft report in light of his involvement in the GLOU46 evaluation;
- (b) Closely liaise with the evaluation team as well as other relevant stakeholders, as required.

The Lead Evaluator must meet the following technical qualifications:

- (a) Masters degree in international relations, public administration, social sciences, or related fields;
- (b) A minimum of 15 years of professional experience including research and evaluation of international programmes;
- (c) A track record of conducting various types of evaluation, including process, outcome and impact evaluations preferably with experience in conducting evaluations for the United Nations;
- (d) Knowledge of transnational threats such as organized crime and illicit trafficking and security issues;
- (e) Knowledge and experience of the United Nations System;
- (f) Experience as a team leader;
- (g) Excellent report writing skills.

The member of the Independent Evaluation Unit has the below qualifications:

- (a) Five years experience in evaluation, in particular in sampling, interviewing techniques, data collection, data analysis and report writing;
- (b) Strong analytical and writing skills in English.

The Quality Assurance Expert must meet the following technical qualifications:

- (a) Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in political sciences, international studies, economics or related field, with specialized training in evaluation; technical expertise in various evaluation methodologies and techniques;
- (b) Seven years of progressive experience in evaluation design methodology (qualitative and quantitative models);
- (c) Prior experience in planning, designing, implementing, analyzing and reporting results of qualitative and quantitative studies including survey design and implementation;
- (d) Academic qualifications or experience in the impact of transnational threats (transnational organized crime, illicit trafficking, corruption) on governance and politics;
- (e) Experience and knowledge of the UN system is an asset;
- (f) Knowledge of UNODC and of the GLOU46 project.

Conflict of interest

The evaluation team has the duty to disclose any reason that he/she or they would not be able to evaluate the Integrated Programming Approach in a fair and unbiased manner.

Management of evaluation process

The independent evaluation will be carried out following UNODC's evaluation policy and UNEG Norms and Standards.

Although the overall responsibility for the evaluation lies with the Lead Evaluator, the evaluation team will work closely with UNODC's Independent Evaluation Unit and report to the Chief of IEU.

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)

IEU carries out quality assurance of the different steps of this evaluation; it endorses the TOR, approves the selection of the proposed Evaluation Team and liaises closely with evaluators throughout the entire evaluation process. IEU comments on and approves the selection of evaluation consultants and the evaluation methodology and provides methodological support throughout the evaluation; IEU will comment on the draft report and will provide support in the process of issuing a management response, and, if needed, participate in disseminating the final report to stakeholders within and outside of UNODC.

IEU ensures a participatory evaluation process by involving Core Learning Partners during key stages of the evaluation.

Programme Support and Oversight Unit (PSOU)

PSOU is responsible for the provision of desk review materials to the evaluation team, commenting on the evaluation methodology, liaising with the Core Learning Partners, as well as commenting on the draft report and developing an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations.

PSOU will be in charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team.

Core Learning Partners⁶²

Core Learning Partners (CLP) are selected by PSOU in consultation with IEU. Furthermore, Core Learning Partners are selected from the key stakeholder groups, including UNODC management, mentors, beneficiaries, partner organizations and Member States. The CLP will be invited to comment on key steps of the evaluation and act as facilitators with respect to the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action.

Payment modalities

The Lead Evaluator and the Quality Assurance Expert will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with United Nations rules and procedures.

For the Lead Evaluator:

An initial payment will be made upon signature of the contract and will consist of an advance of 75% of the consultants' daily subsistence allowance and terminals. The balance will be paid after the travel has taken place, upon presentation of boarding passes and the completed travel claim forms.

Fees payment correlates to deliverables – three installments are foreseen (25%, 25% and 50% of total fees).

- (a) The first payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon receipt of the Inception Report;
- (b) The second payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon receipt of the Draft Evaluation Report;
- (c) The third and final payment (50 percent of the consultancy fee, i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report and its clearance by UNODC.

For the Quality Assurance Expert:

⁶² The list of the CLP is included in Annex 1.

Fees payment correlates to deliverables: 100 per cent of the consultancy fee will be paid upon receipt of the comments on the Draft Evaluation Report.

ANNEX 1 - List of Core Learning Partners

- OED
- DO, including Field Representatives
- DTA
- DPA
- DM

Chairs of Regional Groups:

- Africa: South Africa
- Asia-Pacific Group: India
- Eastern Europe: Lithuania
- GRULAC: Ecuador
- WEOG: Finland
- EU: Denmark
- Group of 77: Peru

ANNEX 2 - List of preliminary documentation for the desk review

Background documentation

1. Relevant CND and CCPCJ resolutions
2. Donor reports
3. Guidance/concept notes
4. Mission reports
5. Annual and activity reports
6. Brochures and other supplementary documents
7. Reports from implementing partners
8. Monitoring data
9. Baselines
10. Assessment reports

Thematic Programmes

11. Transnational organized crime and trafficking (including a sub-programme on Trafficking in Persons)
12. Action against Corruption and Economic Crime
13. Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice
14. Addressing Health and Human Development Vulnerabilities in the Context of Drugs and Crime
15. Terrorism prevention
16. Research and trend analysis
17. Scientific and Forensic services

Regional Programmes

18. East Asia and Pacific (2009-2014)
19. East Africa (2009-2012)
20. Central America/Caribbean (2009-2012)
21. Eastern Europe (2009-2011)
22. West Africa (2010-2014)
23. Arab States (2011-2015)
24. Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2011-2014)
25. Southern Africa

Global Programmes

Inter-Divisional Missions, Audits and Evaluations

26. Review of Management and Administration in the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Joint Inspection Unit, JIU/REP/2010/10
27. UNODC inter-divisional mission report
28. Evaluation of GLOU46
29. TOR of the RP evaluation of East Asia and the Pacific
30. TOR of the OIOS Programme Evaluation of UNODC

ANNEX II. EVALUATION TOOLS: INTERVIEW GUIDES

Qualitative Interview Guide for Field Representatives

<i>Interviewee information</i>	
Name(s)	
Current position	
Tenure at UNODC/ as Field Rep	
Date of Interview	
Interviewers	
Location of interview	
Interviewee context (Completed in advance of the interview)	
Key takeaways / insights (To be completed at the end of the interview)	
Key areas to probe with the interviewee (Completed in advance of the interview)	-
1. IPA Understanding	
We will start the interview with a discussion on your understanding of the Integrated Programming Approach	
1.1	Are you familiar with UNODC's use of the term "IPA"? Have you ever heard of it? If yes, how and when? (CO #4)
1.2	What does IPA mean to your Department? Can you define the concept? In what way has it stemmed from shifts in strategic direction? (IO #1)
1.3	Can you recall UNODC's situation prior to the shift to the IPA, meaning prior to programme level implementation (before 2008)? What challenges was UNODC facing at that time? To your knowledge, to what extent has the IPA helped address those challenges? (IOs)
1.4	To your knowledge, what is the added value of the IPA?
1.5	Given UNODC's mandate, what should the scope of integration be (integration across borders, thematic areas, teams (co-location), in terms of work practices, and with partners)?
1.6	Did you participate in the conceptualization of the IPA (was the shift to regional programming something that was developed at HQ or was it identified as a necessity by FOs?)? (IO #1)
1.7	Are you aware of UNODC's main thematic programmes? (CO #4, CP #5).

	What is their relationship to regional programming? (CO #1, IO #1, CP #3)	
	1.8 To your knowledge, what are the objectives of the IPA? Have these objectives changed over time? (CO #4)	
	1.9 Are the objectives relevant your own work? (IO #1)	
	1.10 How were the objectives of the IPA communicated to you? (IO #1)	
<p>2. Regional Programme (RP) design and alignment with strategic documents (intent)</p> <p>At this point we will explore how the RP has been implemented to date. In this regard, we would like to discuss how the RP is perceived to have been effective and efficient and how the latter are measured. We would also be keen to understand any implementation challenges that have emerged and the solutions that were sought to overcome these challenges, including through support provided by HQ.</p>		
	2.2 Were you consulted in the conceptualisation of the IPA? If so, please provide details on the consultation process. (IO #1)	
	2.3 To what extent does the IPA align with core UN Resolutions in which a shift to integration was encouraged? And other more recent meta policy shifts or recommendations (eg. WDR 2011)? (CO #2)	
	2.4 What type of guidance did you receive to inform the design of your RP/CP? If none, how did you proceed? (IO #1)	
	2.5 To what extent were the UNODC strategic framework and medium term strategy used to develop RPs/CPs? (IO #1 and #2)	
	2.6 To what extent did you use the Thematic Programmes/ GLO Projects to design the RP/CP? Is there coherence between the Thematic and the Regional Programmes in terms of planning, design AND implementation? (IO #2)	
	2.7 Did you use UNODC strategic framework and medium term strategy to develop your programme? (IO #1 and #2)	
	2.8 To what extent is your country programme aligned with the RP? How can you demonstrate this? (IO #1 and #2, CO #1)	
	2.9 When designing your programme, did you receive guidance/guidelines as regards to results orientation and measurability? (IO #1)	
	2.10 (In the absence of guidance), how did you ensure its measurability and results orientation?	
	2.11 How much time did you dedicate to the development of the logical framework? (GP #2)	
	2.12 Did you undertake a risks analysis at the design stage? (CO #2,3, GP #3)	
	2.13 Are you familiar with the requirements for enabling evaluation of a programme? (IO #1)	
	2.14 In your opinion, does your programme design easily allow for evaluation? (CO #4)	
	2.15 Are you aware of how donors were consulted on the design of the RP/CPs? (CO #4)	

3. Regional Programme implementation	
During this part of the interview, we would like to explore how the RP has been implemented to date. In this regard, we would like to questions related to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Regional Programmes	
3.1	Have you received guidelines on the implementation of Regional or Country Programmes? Did you participate in their development? How were these communicated to you and to the rest of the RP/CP team? (IO #1 & #3)
3.2	What specific role have you played in the implementation of the Regional Programmes? (IO #4)
3.3	Now that UNODC has shifted to programme level implementation, what does it mean with regard to your daily work? Did you have to change some of your working practices? Which ones, please describe. (IO #1,4)
3.4	What challenges have you faced and how you overcome those? Are challenges discussed at meetings/exchanges with other FRs? (IO #1,3)
3.5	To your knowledge, in what manner has the IPA helped UNODC become more effective and efficient? (IO all, CO #2).
3.6	Do you sense the IPA (RP/CP) has allowed for more flexible responses to shifting dynamic and emerging challenges on the ground? (CO #1, IO #4, CP #3)
3.7	To your knowledge, to what extent are MS aware of how UNODC operates and how it aims to implement its support through the IPA? Have you shared guidelines, concept notes with national, regional, international stakeholders on the shift to regional programming? If so, did you receive any feedback? (CO #3, 4)
3.8	To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped increase national/ regional ownership? Whose ownership? (CO #3)
3.9	To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation increased inter-regional cooperation? (CO #1, #3)
3.10	To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped increased integration between thematic and regional issues? (CO #1, IO #1)
3.11	To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped increase increased cooperation with partners in order to deliver at the upstream level? (CP #5)
3.12	In what manner does the RP/CP reflect a more comprehensive approach to regional issues? (CO #1, IO #2, CP #4)
3.13	To what extent is the RP/CP achieving integration across themes / borders /units/stakeholders/partners? (CO #1,2,3,4)
3.14	What kind of progress has been made towards building horizontal and geographical integration? (CO #1, IO #1)
3.15	To what extent has the IPA enabled you to assume a more policy oriented role in your AoR? (IO #4)
3.16	Have any particular lessons/ practices regarding UNODC's shift to integrated programming emerged (organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms used to support the RP/CP implementation)? To your knowledge, how different are these from other processes of Integration that have taken/ are taking place across the UN system? (CO #4, CP #3)
3.17	What financial and administrative steps have been taken to support implementation of the RP/CP (i.e. finance, HR, IT etc.)? (IO #3)
3.18	How would you assess UNODC's knowledge management systems and their role in supporting implementation of the IPA/RP? Do you have suggestions? (GP #2)
3.19	To what extent are older projects being phased out? What challenges or opportunities have emerged in this process? (IO #2, 3)
3.20	How often do you engage relevant Thematic Programmes/ Global Projects on programme implementation and other issues that might emerge? (CO #1)
3.21	To what extent do you believe roles and responsibilities are clear and effective (in terms of influencing decision making)? (IO #3)
3.22	What additional steps might need to be taken to render the RPs more effective and efficient? (IO all)

<p>4. RP Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting <i>During this part of the interview we will discuss the tools that have been developed to monitor implementation of the RP/CP and the practices that are being used to i) assess implementation against the specific circumstances at the country/regional level; and adapt programmes to shifting dynamics and emerging challenges.</i></p>		
	<p>4.2 What tools/ mechanisms do you use to monitor and report on progress re. implementation of the RP/CP? Does anyone from HQ participate in these processes? (IO #4, 1)</p>	
	<p>4.3 When initiating your programme did you collect a baseline? If not, how do you know that you are making progress? (CO #4)</p>	
	<p>4.4 Do you use the logical framework? How? (CO #4)</p>	
	<p>4.5 Do you use performance indicators? How? (CO #4)</p>	
	<p>4.6 How do you manage risks? Do you monitor them? Do you document challenges? (CO #4)</p>	
	<p>4.7 Are you documenting progress against planned results? At what level of the results chain: activities, outputs, outcomes, objectives? (CO #4)</p>	
	<p>4.8 Is the monitoring data available and reliable? How do you know it is reliable? (CO #4)</p>	
	<p>4.9 How is the monitoring data analysed and how does it feed into \ programme realignment and UNODC's broader policy cycle? (CO #4, IO #1)</p>	
	<p>4.10 Who is responsible for this process? Do you receive regular feedback from the IPB on the IPA/RP/CP? (IO #1, 4)</p>	
	<p>4.11 What are the reporting lines between RPs/CPs and HQ? (IO #4)</p>	
	<p>4.12 What kinds of indicators are used to guide reporting? (IO #1,3)</p>	
	<p>4.13 To what extent does context (political/ economic) inform reporting? (CO #1)</p>	
	<p>4.14 Is your RP/CP adequately equipped to be able to adapt to emerging challenges and dynamic changes that monitoring and reporting processes identify at the country, regional levels? (IO #3,4)</p>	
<p>5. National ownership & Comparative Advantage We will now discuss how alignment with national stakeholder needs and priorities is approached and how UNODC's comparative advantage works to meet these needs and priorities.</p>		
	<p>5.1 To your knowledge, to what extent are the organizational and operational changes introduced by the IPA, aligned with UNODC stakeholders' needs and priorities? Which stakeholders are you referring to (government, regional actors, civil society etc.)? (CO #3)</p>	
	<p>5.2 How is UNODC's comparative advantage being leveraged through your RP/CP to help stakeholders meet their needs and priorities? (CO #3)</p>	
	<p>5.3 Have you observed a stronger alignment between regional and national priorities and UNODC programming as a result of the IPA? In what ways? (CO #3, GP #5)</p>	
	<p>5.4 To what extent has the IPA contributed overall to ensuring UNODC mandates are more visible and integrated into broader global agendas? (CO #2, CP #5)</p>	
<p>6. Coordination and Coherence At this point we will explore how the RP/CP has enabled integration or partnerships with i) the broader UN system; and ii) other key stakeholders in the region.</p>		
	<p>6.1 Do you think the IPA has improved UNODC's ability to engage with core partners? (CP #5) Which partners?</p>	
	<p>6.2 How has your RP/CP facilitated more coherence within the UN family? And the broader international system? What type of mechanisms have been established (co-location, joint programming, full integration)? In your experience, which type of settings are these mechanisms more visible/ effective (post-conflict, fragile, developing countries, etc.)? (CO #2, CP #5)</p>	
	<p>6.3 Can you acknowledge increased cooperation between UNODC and other</p>	

	agencies at the regional level? In what manner is this cooperation impacting on the situation in-country/ in the region? (CO #2, GP #4) How are you measuring this impact?	
	6.4 Is the RP/CP assisted these partners in responding to transnational issues? (CP #4)	
	6.5 Overall, do you believe that the RP/CPs are benefiting from the right mix of partners? How should this mix of partners evolve in the future? (CO #2, GP #4)	
<p>7. Sustainability</p> <p>Finally, we will discuss your views on the longer-term sustainability of the RPs, including what this means in terms of UNODC leadership support, financial and administrative support, substantive support and relations in-country and within the region.</p>		
	7.1 What additional resources (human, financial, administrative) were allocated to support implementation of the IPA (IO all)	
	7.2 Has the IPA/ RP approach changed the way funding is allocated to field operations? (IO #3)	
	7.3 Has funding of your RP/CP increased following the shift to integrated programming? (CP #5)	
	7.4 Overall, how sustainable do you think current financial, administrative, HR support mechanisms are? (CO, IO all)	
	7.5 How do you think current funding mechanisms in particular influence the focus of regional/ country programmes? (IO #1,3,4)	
	7.6 In your view, what are the potential obstacles to the continued implementation of the IPA in general and the RPs in particular? (IO #3)	

Qualitative Interview Guide for Member States

Interviewee information	
Name(s)	
Current position	
Tenure at UNODC/ as Field Rep	
Date of Interview	
Interviewers	
Location of interview	
Interviewee context (Completed in advance of the interview)	
Key takeaways / insights (To be completed at the end of the interview)	
Key areas to probe with the interviewee (Completed in advance of the interview)	
-	
<p>1. IPA Understanding</p> <p>We will start the interview with a discussion on your understanding of the Integrated Programming Approach</p>	
1.1 Are you familiar with UNODC's use of the term "IPA"? Have you ever heard of	

it? If yes, how and when? (CO #4)	
1.2 What does IPA mean to your agency/ government? Can you define the concept? Given UNODC's mandate, what should the scope of integration be (integration across borders, thematic areas, teams (co-location), in terms of work practices, and with partners)? (CP #5)	
1.3 Can you recall UNODC's situation prior to the shift to the IPA, meaning prior to programme level implementation (before 2008)? What challenges was UNODC facing at that time? (IOs)	
1.4 To your knowledge, what is the added value of the IPA? (place this question at end of interview) (All)	
1.5 Are you aware of UNODC's main thematic programmes? (CO #4, CP #5). What is their relationship to regional programming? (CO #1, IO #1, CP #3)	
<p>2. Regional Programme (RP) design and alignment with strategic documents (intent)</p> <p>At this point we will explore how the RP has been implemented to date. In this regard, we would like to discuss how the RP is perceived to have been effective and efficient and how the latter are measured. We would also be keen to understand any implementation challenges that have emerged and the solutions that were sought to overcome these challenges, including through support provided by HQ.</p>	
2.1 Was your government consulted in the conceptualization of the IPA? If so, please provide details. (CO #2)	
2.2 To what extent does the IPA align with core UN Resolutions in which a shift to integration was encouraged? And other meta policy shifts or recommendations (eg. WDR 2011)?	
2.3 To your knowledge, how does the IPA support national stakeholder in their attempts to respond more effectively to global and regional challenges such as those that UNODC is mandated to implement (CO #3)	
2.4 How did consultation take place with donors? At what stages consultation took place? Was consultation formalized and regular throughout the CP/RP/TP programme design AND implementation? (CO #2)	
<p>3. Regional Programme implementation</p> <p>During this part of the interview, we would like to explore how the RP has been implemented to date. In this regard, we would like to questions related to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Regional Programmes</p>	
3.1 Has your government observed a shift from a project-based approach to more integrated programming? (CO #1, GP #2) If so, please provide examples and please explain why this is relevant.	
3.2 To your knowledge, in what manner has the IPA helped UNODC become more effective and efficient? (IO all, CO #2).	
3.3 Do you believe the IPA has allowed for more flexible programming in the areas you finance, in terms of allowing the Regional Programmes respond to dynamic situations and emerging challenges? (CO #1, IO #4, CP #3)	
3.4 To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped: increase ownership from Member States? (CO #3)	
3.5 To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation increased inter-regional cooperation? (CO #1 & 3)	
3.6 To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped increased integration between thematic and regional issues? (CO #1, IO #1)	
3.7 To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped increase cooperation with partners in order to deliver at the upstream level? (CP #5)	
3.8 To your knowledge, to what extent has the IPA helped address those challenges ? (IOs)	
3.9 In what manner does the IPA programming reflect a more comprehensive approach to regional issues? (CO #1, IO #2, CP #4)	
3.10 To what extent has the IPA enabled the FO to assume a more strategic/ policy role? (IO #4)	
3.11 Have any particular lessons/ practices regarding UNODC's shift to integrated programming emerged? How different are these from other processes of Integration that have taken/ are taking place across the UN system? (CO #4, CP	

#3)	
3.12 To your knowledge, what financial and administrative steps were taken to support implementation of UNODC's shift to Regional Programme (i.e. finance, HR, IT etc.)? (IO #1 & 3)	
3.13 How does your agency/ government communicate new policies and approaches that impact on the implementation of the IPA (substantively, financially, and administratively) to i) UNODC governing bodies and ii) UNODC staff?	
<p>4. RP Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting</p> <p>During this part of the interview we will discuss the tools that have been developed to monitor implementation of the RP/CP and the practices that are being used to i) assess implementation against the specific circumstances at the country/regional level; and adapt programmes to shifting dynamics and emerging challenges.</p>	
4.1 Is your government better informed of UNODC regional programming (and related impact) since the shift to an IPA was implemented? (CO #4, CP #5)	
4.2 How do the RPs monitor and report on progress to donors? Do you receive regular up-dates from UNODC on implementation of the IPA? (CO #4)	
4.3 How do current monitoring and reporting mechanisms influence shifts in your policy towards UNODC regional programmes? (CO #4)	
<p>5. National ownership & Comparative Advantage</p> <p>We will now discuss how alignment with national stakeholder needs and priorities is approached and how UNODC's comparative advantage works to meet these needs and priorities.</p>	
5.1 To your knowledge, to what extent were the organizational and operational changes introduced by the IPA, in line with UNODC stakeholders' needs and priorities? Which stakeholders are you referring to (government, regional actors, civil society etc.)? (CO #3)	
5.2 How can UNODC's comparative advantage be best leveraged through the RPs to help stakeholders meet their needs and priorities? (CO #3)	
5.3 Have you observed a stronger alignment between regional and national priorities and UNODC programming as a result of the IPA? In what ways? (CO #3, GP #5)	
5.4 To what extent has the IPA contributed overall to ensuring UNODC mandates are more visible and integrated into broader global agendas? (CO #2, CP #5)	
<p>6. Coordination and Coherence</p> <p>At this point we will explore how the RP/CP has enabled integration or partnerships with i) the broader UN system; and ii) other key stakeholders in the region.</p>	
6.1 Does your agency/government believe the IPA has improved UNODC's ability to engage with core partners? (CP #5) Which partners?	
6.2 To your knowledge, how has the RP/CP facilitated more coherence within the UN family? And the broader international system? What type of mechanisms have been established (co-location, joint programming, full integration)? In which type of settings are these mechanisms more visible (post-conflict, fragile, developing countries, etc.)? (CO #2, CP #5)	
6.3 Has your government observed increased cooperation between UNODC and other agencies that you fund? In what manner is this cooperation perceived to impact on the situation in-country/ in the region? (CO #2, GP #4)	
6.4 Has the IPA assisted these partners in responding to transnational issues? (CP #4)	
6.5 Overall, do you believe that the RP/CPs are benefiting from the right mix of partners? How should this mix of partners evolve in the future? (CO #2, GP #4)	
<p>7. Sustainability</p> <p>Finally, we will discuss your views on the longer-term sustainability of the RPs, including what this means in terms of UNODC leadership support, financial and administrative support, substantive support and relations in-country and within the region.</p>	

7.1 To your knowledge, what additional resources (human, financial, administrative) were allocated to support implementation of the IPA (IO all)	
7.2 What is your agency/ government's preference (policy) on ear marked and general funding? (IO #3)	
7.3 How has the IPA/ RP approach changed the way your funding is allocated to UNODC? And what about other donors? (IO #3)	
7.4 Has funding from your agency/ government increased following the implementation of the IPA? (CP #5)	
7.5 Overall, how sustainable do you think current financial, administrative, HR support mechanisms are? (CO, IO all)	
7.6 How do you think current funding mechanisms influence the focus of regional/ country programmes? (IO #3)	
7.7 In your view, what are the potential obstacles to the continued implementation of the IPA in general and the RPs in particular?	

Qualitative Interview Guide for HQ Staff

<i>Interviewee information</i>	
Name(s)	
Current position	
Tenure at UNODC/ as Field Rep	
Date of Interview	
Interviewers	
Location of interview	
Interviewee context (Completed in advance of the interview)	

Key takeaways / insights (To be completed at the end of the interview)	
---	--

Key areas to probe with the interviewee (Completed in advance of the interview)	-
--	---

1. IPA Understanding

We will start the interview with a discussion on your understanding of the Integrated Programming Approach

RD TB IPB DPA DM	1.1 Are you familiar with UNOC's use of the term "IPA"? Have you ever heard of it? If yes, how and when? (CO #4)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	1.11 What does IPA mean to your Department? Can you define the concept? In what way has it stemmed from shifts in strategic direction? (IO #1)	
RD TB	1.12 Can you recall UNODC's situation prior to the shift to the IPA, meaning prior to integration between thematic and regional programmes (before	

IPB DPA DM	2008)? What challenges was UNODC facing at that time? To your knowledge, to what extent has the IPA helped address those challenges? (IOs)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	1.13 To your knowledge, what is the added value of the IPA?	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	1.14 Given UNODC's mandate, what should the scope of integration be (integration across borders, thematic areas, teams (co-location), in terms of work practices, and with partners)?	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	1.15 Did you participate in the conceptualization of the IPA (was the shift to regional programming something that was developed at HQ or was it identified as a necessity by FOs?)? (IO #1)	
Field Reps	1.16 Are you aware of UNODC's main thematic programmes? (CO #4, CP #5). What is their relationship to regional programming? (CO #1, IO #1, CP #3)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	1.17 To your knowledge, what are the objectives of the IPA? Have these objectives changed over time? (CO #4)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	1.18 Are the objectives relevant your own work? (IO #1)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	1.19 How were the objectives of the IPA communicated to you? (IO #1)	
<p>2. Regional Programme (RP)/CP/TP design and alignment with strategic documents (intent)</p> <p>At this point we will explore how the RP has been implemented to date. In this regard, we would like to discuss how the RP is perceived to have been effective and efficient and how the latter are measured. We would also be keen to understand any implementation challenges that have emerged and the solutions that were sought to overcome these challenges, including through support provided by HQ.</p>		
RD DPA/ Research DM	2.1 Were you/ your Department consulted in the conceptualisation of the TP/ RP/CP? If so, please provide details on the consultation process. (IO #1)	
IPB	2.2 To what extent does the IPA (TP/RP/CP) align with core UN Resolutions in which a shift to integration was encouraged? And other meta policy shifts or recommendations (eg. WDR 2011)? (CO #2)	
RD TB	2.3 What type of guidance did you receive to inform your participation in the design of the TP/RP/CPs? If none, how did you proceed? Overall, has communication on implementation been effective? (IO #1)	
RD TB IPB	2.4 To what extent were the UNODC strategic framework and medium term strategy used to develop TP/RPs/CPs? (IO #1 and #2)	
RD TB IPB	2.5 To what extent were the Thematic Programmes/ GLO Projects used to design the different RP/CPs? Is there coherence between the Thematic and the Regional Programmes in terms of planning, design AND implementation? (IO #2)	
RD TB	2.6 Are you aware of how donors were consulted on the design of the TP/RP/CPs? (CO #4)	
<p>3 Regional Programme implementation</p>		

<p>During this part of the interview, we would like to explore how the RP has been implemented to date. In this regard, we would like to questions related to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Regional Programmes</p>		
RD TP	3.1 Have you received guidelines on the objective, design and implementation of TP/ Regional or Country Programmes? Did you/ your Dept. participate in their development? How were these communicated to you and to the rest of UNODC staff? (IO #1 & #3)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.2 What role does your Department/ Branch play in the implementation of the Regional Programmes/CP?	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.3 Has your Department observed a shift from a project-based approach to more integrated programming? (CO #1, GP #2) If so, please provide examples and please explain why this is relevant.	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.4 Now that UNODC has shifted to programme level implementation, what does it mean with regard to your daily work? Did you have to change some of your working practices? Which ones, please describe. (IO #3)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.5 To your knowledge, in what manner has the IPA helped UNODC become more effective and efficient? (IO all, CO #2).	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.6 Do you sense the IPA has allowed for more flexible programming, in terms of allowing the Regional Programmes/CP respond to dynamic situations and emerging challenges? (CO #1, IO #4, CP #3)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.7 To your knowledge, to what extent are MS aware of how UNODC operates and how it aims to implement its support through the IPA? Were guidelines, concept notes shared with Member States and how? (CO #3, 4)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.8 To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped increase national/ regional ownership? Whose ownership? (CO #3)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.9 To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation increased inter-regional cooperation? (CO #1, #3)	
RD TP IPB DPA DM	3.10 To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped increased integration between thematic and regional issues? (CO #1, IO #1)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.11 To what extent has the shift from project to programme level implementation helped increase increased cooperation with partners in order to deliver at the upstream level? (CP #5)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.12 In what manner does the IPA programming reflect a more comprehensive approach to regional issues? (CO #1, IO #2, CP #4)	
RD TP	3.13 To what extent is the RP/CP achieving integration across themes / borders /units/stakeholders/partners? (CO #1,2,3,4)	

IPB		
RD TP IPB	3.14 To what extent has the IPA enabled the FOs to assume a more policy oriented role? (IO #4)	
RD TP IPB DPA DM	3.15 Have any particular lessons/ practices regarding UNODC's shift to integrated programming emerged (organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms used by UNODC to support the RP/CP implementation)? How different are these from other processes of Integration that have taken/ are taking place across the UN system? (CO #4, CP #3)	
DPA DM	3.16 To your knowledge, what financial and administrative steps were taken to support implementation of UNODC's shift to Regional Programme (i.e. finance, HR, IT etc.)? (IO #1 & 3)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.17 How would you assess UNODC's knowledge management systems and their role in supporting implementation of the IPA? Do you have suggestions? (GP #2)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.18 To what extent are projects being phased out? What challenges and opportunities have emerged in this process? (IO #2, 3)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.19 How often is your Department consulted by the FOs on programme implementation and other issues that might emerge? (IO #1)	
RD TB IPB DPA DM	3.20 To what extent do you believe roles and responsibilities are clear and effective (in terms of influence over decision making)? (IO #3)	
RD TB IPB	3.21 What additional steps need to be taken to render the RPs more effective and efficient? (IO all)	
<p>4 RP Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting</p> <p>During this part of the interview we will discuss the tools that have been developed to monitor implementation of the RP/CP and the practices that are being used to i) assess implementation against the specific circumstances at the country/regional level; and adapt programmes to shifting dynamics and emerging challenges.</p>		
RD TB IPB	4.1 Are you/ your Dept. better informed of UNODC regional programming (and related impact) since the shift to the IPA was implemented? (CO #4, CP #5)	
RD TB IPB	4.15 Do you receive regular up-dates from the IPB or others on implementation of the IPA? (IO #1)	
RD IPB	4.16 Are you familiar with the tools/ mechanisms the RPs/CPs use to monitor and report on progress? Do you participate in these processes? (IO #4, 1)	
RD IPB	4.17 Is the monitoring data available and reliable? How do you know it is reliable? (CO #4, IO #1)	
	4.18 How is the monitoring data analyzed and how does it feed into UNODC's policy cycle and programme realignment? (CO #4, IO #1)	
	4.19 Who is responsible for this process? (IO #1, 4)	
	4.20 Are the RPs adequately equipped to be able to adapt to emerging challenges and dynamic changes that monitoring and reporting processes identify at the country, regional levels? (IO #4)	
	4.21 What are the reporting lines between RPs/CPs and HQ? (IO #4)	
	4.22 What kind of indicators are used to guide reporting? (IO #1,3)	
	4.23 To what extent does context (political/ economic) inform reporting? (CO #1)	

	4.24 How does reporting from the RP/CP inform UNODC policy formulation / policy direction?	
<p>5 National ownership & Comparative Advantage 6 We will now discuss how alignment with national stakeholder needs and priorities is approached and how UNODC's comparative advantage works to meet these needs and priorities.</p>		
	5.5 To your knowledge, to what extent were the organizational and operational changes introduced by the IPA, in line with UNODC stakeholders' needs and priorities? Which stakeholders are you referring to (government, regional actors, civil society etc.)? (CO #3)	
	5.6 How can UNODC's comparative advantage be best leveraged through the RPs to help stakeholders meet their needs and priorities? (CO #3)	
	5.7 Have you observed a stronger alignment between regional and national priorities and UNODC programming as a result of the IPA? In what ways? (CO #3, GP #5)	
	5.8 To what extent has the IPA contributed overall to ensuring UNODC mandates are more visible and integrated into broader global agendas? (CO #2, CP #5)	
<p>7 Coordination and Coherence 8 At this point we will explore how the RP/CP has enabled integration or partnerships with i) the broader UN system; and ii) other key stakeholders in the region.</p>		
	6.1 Do you/ your Department believe the IPA has improved UNODC's ability to engage with core partners? (CP #5) Which partners?	
	6.6 To your knowledge, how has the RP/CP facilitated more coherence within the UN family? And the broader international system? What type of mechanisms have been established (co-location, joint programming, full integration)? In which type of settings are these mechanisms more visible (post-conflict, fragile, developing countries, etc.)? (CO #2, CP #5)	
	6.7 Have you observed increased cooperation between UNODC and other agencies at the regional level? In what manner is this cooperation perceived to impact on the situation in-country/ in the region? (CO #2, GP #4)	
	6.8 Has the IPA assisted these partners in responding to transnational issues? (CP #4)	
	6.9 Overall, do you believe that the RP/CPs are benefitting from the right mix of partners? How should this mix of partners evolve in the future? (CO #2, GP #4)	
<p>9 Sustainability Finally, we will discuss your views on the longer-term sustainability of the RPs, including what this means in terms of UNODC leadership support, financial and administrative support, substantive support and relations in-country and within the region.</p>		
	7.1 To your knowledge, what additional resources (human, financial, administrative) were allocated to support implementation of the IPA (IO all)	
	7.7 How has the IPA/ RP approach changed the way funding is allocated to UNODC? And other donors? (IO #3)	
	7.8 Has funding increased following the implementation of the IPA? (CP #5)	
	7.9 Overall, how sustainable do you think current financial, administrative, HR support mechanisms are? (CO, IO all)	
	7.10 How do you think current funding mechanisms in particular influence the content of regional/ country programmes? (IO #1,3,4)	
	7.11 In your view, what are the potential obstacles to the continued implementation of the IPA in general and the RPs in particular? (IO #3)	

ANNEX III. DESK REVIEW LIST

Index of documents for the evaluation of the IPA (June-July 2012)

Relevant CND and CCPCJ Resolutions

- ECOSOC Resolution 2009/23 “Support for the development and implementation of the regional programmes of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime”.
- Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Fifty-fourth session, Vienna, 21-25 March 2011: “Work of the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime”
- Report of the 52th session CND
- Report of the 53th session CND.
- Report of the 54th session CND.
- “Support to the Regional Programme Approach by Member States” (document summarizing the reference to the IPA extracted from the five documents listed above).

Donor Reports

- 20.01.2010_IPU Activities
- 2008-2009 report for Canada GLOU46
- Donor Report Sweden 2009 contribution UNODC FINAL
- Interim Report 2011 Norway
- Interim Report Sweden 2010 – v2.
- IPB Report on results Canada 2010 final
- IPU Report (GLOU46) 2008-2009 final

Guidance and concept notes

- Concept Paper Strategic Planning Framework May 7.
- ECN72009_CRP6 (UNODC Regional Programmes: a strategic planning and implementation tool
- GP_and_PSC_definitions_14_May_2010.
- Guidance on implementation Integrated Programmes January 2011.
- Guiding Principles for regional programmes 5 Dec 2008_final.
- Discussion paper. Elements for the development of a UNODC enhanced integrated regional and inter-regional drug and crime control approach. June 5, 2012.
- Meeting on Regional Programme Implementation: Lessons Learned and the Way Forward. 14-15 June, 2010 – Room M2 , Vienna International Centre.
- Programme Performance Review for Thematic / Country / Regional Programmes REPORTING FORMAT and GUIDELINES.
- Key Responsibilities of IPB/DO Regional Desks.
- Proposed New Structure of the Integrated Programme and Oversight Branch, Division for Operations
- Workshop on the Implementation of UNODC Integrated Programmes. 14-15 June, 2010 - Vienna, Austria

Mission reports

- 02.02.2011_Mission Report Oslo.
- IDM Mission report BKK February 2012.
- Mission report Nairobi (Francis Maertens) 09 II.
- Mission report New York 8-10 December 2010.
- Mission report Paraguay May 2011.
- Mission report Stockholm April 2010.
- Mission Report_Madrid_04&05 June 2009.

Annual and activity reports

- Annual PR GLOU46_2008_final version.
- Annual PR_GLOU46_2009_final version.
- Budget GLOU 46 project revision Dec 2010.
- Budget revision staffing table June 2011rev1.
- Budget revision staffing table March 2011_revised.
- Egypt segment 2010.
- glou46 project revision logframe June 2010
- GLOU46 revision budget June 2010.
- GLOU46 revision June 2010.
- GLOU46 project rev. 21.1.09
- GLOU46 Project Revision - 19 Jan. 2010.
- Project Progress Report - GLOU46 (07 Jun 2012 1548).
- Project Progress Report - GLOU46 (07 Jun 2012 1549).
- Project Progress Report - GLOU46 (07 Jun 2012 1551).
- GLOU46 Project Revision December 2010.
- GLOU46 Project Revision June 2011.
- SemiAnnual PR GLOU46 2009 final version.
- SemiAnnual PR GLOU46 2010 final version.

Brouchures and other supplementary documents

- Central Africa Report_2011.
- Illicit financial flows 2011.
- Menu of Services October 2010 (most recent)
- UNODC Menu-of-services (expired version 2008)

Monitoring Data

- Evaluation GLOU46.
- Final Revised Budget PPC submission 23 Dec.
- GLOU46 120110.
- IPU Project Document for PPC July 2008.doc
- IPU Report 2008-2009 final.doc

Baselines

- Historical context 2008 – IP evaluation
- GLOU46 Evaluation Report
- JIU_REP 2010 10 Final
- OIOS IED Draft Terms of Reference 11.04.12
- TOCTA Report_2010_low_res[1]

Strategic notes

- 26 06 09 DO & DTA Terms of Reference.

- 28.7.2010 Security and Justice for All, Making the World Safer from Drugs, Crime and Terrorism.
- DO&DTA Realignment -communication from management.
- IP implementation – admin issues
- Medium Term Strategy 2012 - 2015 English.
- Realignment Report to Commissions approved by ExCom 26 January 09.
- Strategic Framework 2008-09 (relevant section is Programme 13).
- Strategic Framework 2010-11 (relevant section is Programme 13).
- Strategic_Framework_2012-13.
- Strategy Note UNODC and UN Reform 21 April 2009.
- Strategy Note UNODC engagement in post-conflict states 16 march 2009.
- UNODC Field Network Brief for ED 27 Sept 2010.
- UNODC Medium Term Strategy 2008-2011.
- UNODC_Non_Paper_on_thematic_programmes_UNDOC_Strategy_and_the_Strategic_Framework_19_November_2009.
- UNODC Strategic Alignment Note FINAL.
- UNODC Strategy 2008-2011.

Supplementary documents

- NYU/CIC Report – Shaky Foundations: A Review of the UN RoL Support Agenda, November 2011
- NYU/CIC – Annual Review of Political Missions, Thematic Essay on Transnational Threats by Cockayne and Kavanagh (2011)
- IP Academy ToC
- IPB Organigram
- Report of the ED on Drugs and Crime Commissions
- Amado de Andrés Email on Central America.
- WDR2011 Overview
- Organizational structure UNODC October 2011
- Advance Version of Report of the Secretary-General: UN Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system, ECOSOC, May 2012
- UN Secretary General's Five Year Action Agenda, January 2012

Regional Programmes

- EARP 2009-2012 14 January 2010 (Eastern Africa)
- FINAL AS ENDORSED Regional Programme 7 Dec 2011 (Afghanistan and neighbouring countries)
- Regional Programme Central America MASTER COPY 25 NOV 2008 (Central America)
- Regional Programme for West Africa (2010-2014) (West Africa)
- UNODC Regional Programme on Drug Control Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform in the Arab States 2010-2015 (Arab States)
- UNODC Regional Programme South Eastern Europe Launch (South Eastern Europe)
- UNODC Regional Programme RCEAP 45 21 Oct2009 (East Asia and the Pacific)
- Promoting the Rule of Law and Security in Central America. Regional Programme 2009 – 12 (PDF).
- Promoting the Rule of Law and Security in Central America. Regional Programme 2009 – 12 (Word).

Thematic Programmes

Integrated Programming Approach

- 1 UNODC Thematic Programme on Terrorism Prevention (approved by ExCom 30-4-08) (Terrorism Prevention)
- ExCom Justice Programme (Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform)
- Sustainable Livelihoods (Sustainable Livelihoods)
- Thematic Programme on Corruption (Corruption and Economic Crime)
- Thematic Programme on Organised Crime – Final (Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking (including THB, Smuggling, Money Laundering, Firearms) including Trafficking in Persons)
- Thematic Programme Crime Prevention Criminal Justice November 2010 (Crime prevention and criminal justice reform)
- Thematic Programme FORESICS 12 5 2010 (Scientific and Forensic Services)
- TP health 090616 (Health and human development vulnerabilities in the context of drugs and crime)

ToRs

- Chief of Branch/Service/Division - D1.
- Chief of Unit/Section - P5.
- Representative – D-1 (UNODC Field Office).
- Representative – P-5 (UNODC Field Office).
- Deputy Representative – P-4 (UNODC Field Office).

Field Rep. Meetings' Notes

- UNODC Field Representatives Seminar, 4-6 July 2011, Vienna Summary and Recommendations.
- Field Representatives Seminar (7-11 June 2010), Draft summary of main conclusions by moderators.
- FIELD REPRESENTATIVES SEMINAR 2008, Summary of key points addressed.
- Field Representatives Seminar (8-12 June 2009) Summary of main conclusions by moderators.

Quarterly mission reports

- Africa and the Middle East:
 - CONIG
 - ROEA
 - ROMENA
 - ROSAF
 - ROSEN
- Central and Eastern Europe:
 - PORUS
 - RPSOEE
- East Asia Pacific
 - RCEAP
- Latin America and the Caribbean:
 - COBOL
 - COCOL
 - ROBRA
 - ROMEX
 - ROPER
- South Asia:
 - ROCA
 - ROSA
- West Central Asia:

- COAFG
- COIRA
- COPAK
- RCEAP

Country programmes

- Country programme framework Peru. 2008-2011.
- IOM-Country Programme Framework Peru 2008-2011

Audit reports

- Management Letter on the BOA audit of the UNODC Regional Office for West and Central Africa . Summary of recommendations. 8 – 17 November 2011
- HIV/AIDS programme of the UNODC. May 2009.
- UNODC Regional Office for East Africa. Weaknesses in planning and monitoring of projects and oversight arrangements increased the risks of delays in implementing programmes and projects. 28 July 2010.
- UNODC governance arrangements and funding mechanisms. Governance arrangements and funding mechanisms do not fully support the programme of work at UNODC. 15 February 2011.
- 2006. ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT. Independent Evaluation Unit.
- ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT: 2008. Covering activities from April 2007 to March 2008. Independent Evaluation Unit.
- UNODC Internal Report. Comparative Audit Analysis Report. Lessons learned and good practices from FO audits.
- Notification of planned OIOS audit. February 2012.
- Audit of UNODC Country Office in Nigeria. April 2011.
- Audit of UNODC Country Office in Nigeria. December 2011.
- Management Letter on the BOA audit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Summary of recommendations. October - November 2011
- Management Letter on the audit of the Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific of UNODC. August 2011.
- Management Letter on the interim audit of the UNODC. September 2011.
- Management Letter on the BOA interim audit of UNODC. Summary of recommendations. September 2011
- Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its organizational and resumed organizational sessions for 2011 and at its substantive session of 2011.
- UNODC Myanmar Country Office. The achievement of UNODC strategic objectives was impeded by inadequate programme and project management. 29 August 2008.
- UNODC Regional Office for Russia and Belarus. Weakness in project planning, monitoring and reporting have resulted in low rate of project implementation. 2 December 2008.
- Board of auditors. Draft management letter on the interim unit of the UNODC.

ANNEX IV. TIMELINE

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Core Analysis													
										UNODC, The Globalization of Crime: A Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessment (2010)	UNODC, Organized Crime and Instability in West Africa - A Threat Assessment (2011)		
											UNODC Research Report: Estimating Illicit Financial flows resulting from drug trafficking and other transnational organized crimes (2011)		
											World Development Report (2011)		
Core Meta Policy Documents													
						Paris Agenda for Aid Effectiveness (2005)			Accra Agenda for Action (2008)				Busan Partnership Agreement (2011)
Core UN System Policy Documents													
	Millennium Declaration, A/RES/55/2 (2000)					World Summit Outcome Report (A/59/265)					UNDG Strategic Priorities 2010-2011		
Brahimi Report: Report of the Panel on UN Peace Operations (2008)													
Key Resolutions/PRSTs [1]	UN Convention Against TNOC and Protocols (A/RES/55/25) [SW]				UN Convention Against Corruption (A/RES/58/4) [SW]				UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Strategy for the period 2008-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Note by the Secretariat, E/CN.7/2007/14-E/CN.15/2007/5 [OW]	UN ECOSOC, Support for the development and implementation of the regional programmes of the UNODC, 2009/23, July 30, 2009. [I/OW]	UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Support for the development and implementation of the regional programmes of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Report of the Executive Director, E/CN.7/2011/6, December 30, 2010. [OW/I]	UN ECOSOC, Work of the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 11 March 2009, E/CN.7/2011/9-E/CN.15/2011/9 [OW/I]	UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Proposed Strategic Framework 2014-2015 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 05 March 2012, E/CN.7/2012/CRP.2 [OW]
						UN General Assembly, Biennial programme planned priorities for the period 2008-2009, A/61/6/Rev.1, 2007. [OW]			ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, UNODC Regional Programmes: a Strategic Planning and Implementation Tool, March 2009, E/CN.7/2009/CRP.6 [I/OW]	UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Report on the fifty-third session (2 December 2009 and 8-12 March 2010), E/2010/28 E/CN.7/2010/18 [OW]	UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Report on the fifty-fourth session (2 December 2010 and 21-25 March 2011) - NB: Support to the Regional Approach by Member States [OW]	UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Report on the fifty-fifth session (2 December 2011 and 21-25 March 2012) - NB: Support to the Regional Approach by Member States [OW]	UNSC PRST, Feb 2012 [SW]
									UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Report on the fifty-second session (14 March 2008 and 11-20 March 2009), E/2009/28 E/CN.7/2009/12	UNSC PRST [SW]	UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Addendum: Draft Strategy for the period 2012-2015 for the UNODC. In Work of the standing open-ended intergovernmental working group on improving the governance and financial situation of the UNODC. Note by the Secretariat, E/CN.7/2011/9/Add.2, November 17, 2011. [OW/I]		
									UN General Assembly, Strategic Framework for the period 2010-2011, A/63/6/Rev.1, 2009. [OW]		GND, Report on the 54th Session, Support to the Regional Programme Approach by Member States, 2011 [OW/I]		
									UNSC PRST [SW]		UN General Assembly, Strategic Framework for the period 2012-2013, A/65/6/Rev.1, 2011. [Programme 13 International drug control, crime and terrorism prevention and criminal justice] [OW]		
												UNSC PRST [SW]	
Strategic Notes/ Policy Documents/Guidans (UNODC)[2]									Integrated Programming Unit/Division of Operations, Note on UNODC Regional Programmes, December 4, 2008. [I]	Strategy Note, UNODC and UN Reform, April 2009 [OW]	UNODC, The Concept of Regular Budget and Extra-Budgetary Resources (Special Purpose Funds, Programme Support Funds and General Purpose Funds), Draft: 14.05.2010 [I/OW]	UNODC, Sustainable Livelihoods: a broader vision. Social support and integration to prevent illicit drug use, HIV/AIDS and crime. Discussion Paper, 2011. [OW]	UNODC, Fundraising Strategy 2012-2015, May 9, 2012 [OW]
									UNODC, Towards strengthened, coherent, and integrated UNODC field operations, September 2, 2008 [I]		UNODC, Guidance Note for Field Offices: Implementation of the Integrated Programme Approach- Interim Phase (Draft), January 2011.		
									Note on UNODC Regional Programmes - Guiding Principles (2008) [I]	UN ECOSOC, Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (ECOSOC), UNODC Regional Programmes: a strategic planning and implementation tool, E/CN.7/2009/CRP.6, March 19, 2009.	UNODC, Thematic Programme: Corruption, 2010-2012, January 25, 2010. [I/OW]	UNODC Organized Crime and Trafficking Branch, Division for Treaty Affairs, Thematic Programme: Action Against Transnational Organized Crime and Illicit Trafficking, Including Drug Trafficking 2011-2013, April 2011. [I/OW]	

