

EVALUATION BRIEFS

MID-TERM INDEPENDENT PROJECT EVALUATION

Global Programme for Combating Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit

Region: Global.

Duration: May 2014 to December 2018.

Donors: Belgium, CITES, EU, France, Germany, INTERPOL, Norway, United Kingdom, United States of America, World Bank Group.

Evaluation team: Mr. Peter Allan and Mr. Jonathan Barzdo.

Full report: URL

https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/reports_year_2020.html

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

In 2014 the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) established a Global Programme (GP) for Combating Wildlife and Forest Crime GLOZ31 with a key project objective of strengthening capacity to prevent and combat Wildlife and Forest Crime (WLFC) on a regional, national and local basis. One of the main tools central to its implementation is the WLFC Analytic Toolkit, a tool developed jointly by UNODC in partnership with the members of the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) to review the national capacity of a Member State (MS) to respond to wildlife and forest crime. The Toolkit aims to provide evidence-based situational analysis of the preventive, law enforcement and prosecutorial responses to such crime, to review the data-gathering and analysis processes, to identify gaps and to provide recommendations to be implemented in the short and long terms.

MAIN FINDINGS

When created in 2012 the Analytic Toolkit was well-designed and the concept still remains valid and relevant in 2020. Since 2012, WLFC has changed, yet the Analytic Toolkit has not been updated to reflect developments. The introduction of the Indicator Framework in 2016 has gone some way to enhance the Analytic Toolkit process but the Toolkit template itself remains unaltered. Some of the main drivers of WLFC, such as money laundering and corruption, are not covered. The GP has run the Analytic Toolkit assessment process efficiently. The effectiveness and impact of the assessments often lies with the ability of the recipient country to implement recommendations from the process. This has been patchy at best and often the action plan resulting from the assessment is unrealistically ambitious making the overall utility of the assessment limited. ICWC partnership cooperation tends to be focused at the end of each assessment and the initial concept of the five ICWC partners contributing throughout the process has waned over the years. There has been a recent commitment to reenergise this cooperation.



Ivory Seizure: Stockbyte/Getty Images

LESSONS LEARNED

The Toolkit failed to maintain the continued, practical assistance and commitment of all the founding ICWC partners. This was due in large part to UNODC taking de-facto ownership of the assessment process, which led other ICWC

partners to perceive this as a UNODC project. The need to ensure all partners are fully included has been recognised and the most recent ICCWC meeting, in January 2020, has produced a commitment to a more united approach.

The quality of each assessment report relies to a great extent on the quality of the consultants employed to conduct and write the assessment. The GP has recognised this and has tried to identify suitably qualified consultants to add to its pool. Additionally, there was not enough attention paid to learning lessons and identifying good practice from previous Toolkit assessment processes.

COVID-19: The data collection and analysis for this evaluation was completed before the potential impact of the COVID-19 global pandemic on future Toolkit assessments was realised. An attempt has been made to ensure the recommendations are achievable taking account of the global effects of the pandemic.

GOOD PRACTICES

The Toolkit process and its initial development involved and engaged the most appropriate international actors, utilising their technical expertise and deploying an existing governance structure via the CITES Secretariat. The Toolkit itself encouraged the participation of relevant international and national stakeholders through the eight-step process, which recognises the importance of tailoring the assessment to the national context. To this end, the development and deployment of the Indicator Framework in parallel with the Toolkit assessment has increased the utility of the final report.

METHODOLOGY

This evaluation followed a mixed-methods as well as gender-responsive evaluation methodology, in line with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and UNODC norms and standards, guidelines, and requirements. A preliminary desk review was undertaken and an Inception Report created to identify information gaps and design data collection instruments to fill those gaps. Face-to-face and telephone interviews were conducted; missions to Austria, Mozambique and Viet Nam were undertaken as case studies, allowing a more in-depth examination of the Mozambique and Viet Nam assessments; a Most Significant Change narration was completed; and a short survey was administered.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Toolkit Design:** The Analytic Toolkit should incorporate specific sections on a) corruption, b) money laundering, c) cybercrime, d) fisheries crime, and e) forestry crime.
- 2. Partnership:** UNODC should confirm with all ICCWC partners their commitment to the Toolkit assessment process.
- 3. Indicator Framework:** The advice is that all new country applications for Toolkit assessments should run the Indicator Framework as part of the Toolkit assessment process.
- 4. Guidance:** Guidance notes for consultants charged with conducting the assessments should be written, drawing upon the experience of previous assessment authors.
- 5. Feedback:** A 'ninth step' in the assessment process should be added, namely a 'structured debrief' of consultants and others integrally involved in the assessment process.
- 6. Action Plan:** Guidance for national partners should be provided on the ownership, implementation and follow-up of the action plan.
- 7. Human Rights and Gender:** In discussion with the ICCWC partnership and relevant human rights and gender resources within the United Nations family, including UNODC's human rights and gender focal points, identify how these issues should be accounted for in the Toolkit assessment process.



UNODC
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime



INDEPENDENT EVALUATION SECTION

<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/unodc-ies@un.org>